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Introduction:

Oxfam has been operating and implementing development and humanitarian projects in Somaliland/Somalia for over 16 years, with WASH, Food Security, Livelihoods and Protection components. In March 2017, Oxfam began a humanitarian response to drought- and conflict-affected populations in Elafwein, Ainabo and Lasanod Districts in the Sool and Sanaag regions in Somaliland. The overall objective of the programme is to contribute to reducing acute humanitarian needs and increase the dignity of the most vulnerable men, women and children affected by drought in Somaliland. The organization has reached over 449,212 people so far since 2017.

This Protection analysis is carried out as part of an ECHO-funded project in Sool and Sanaag, with the aim of informing and supporting programming, policy and advocacy work.

Context Analysis

Somaliland claimed independence from Somalia in 1991 (although it has never been officially recognized by the international community, it has effectively governed its own territory since then). Sool and Sanaag were part of British Somaliland when it became independent in 1960; however since 1998, Puntland has claimed these regions based on the ethnic composition of their inhabitants and on their clan ties to Puntland. The resulting border and governance dispute and historical clan conflicts have meant that confrontations and violence are common, resulting in large-scale displacements of rural civilian populations, limitations to movements and difficult access to resources, services and livelihoods.¹

The intense and persistent drought which began in 2016 has devastated Somaliland and wiped out millions of livestock, the key to rural livelihoods. Erratic rains and abnormally hot and dry conditions in the first half of 2019 further exacerbated the drought crisis, and over 700,000 people have been displaced. Recovery remains elusive, as drought conditions continue and people lack the resources needed to rebuild livelihoods. Protracted displacement and recurring clan-based conflicts amplify protection risks, as competition for resources increases.²

The ECHO project targets 16 villages in the three districts of Ainabo, Elafwein and Lasanod, whilst a top-up covers another eight villages. This study was carried out in nine out of the initial 16 villages targeted by the project between July and August 2019, as illustrated by the below map:

---

¹ Conflict in Sool region: A Rapid needs assessment (26-28 September,2018)
² Eastern Somaliland Protection Briefing Note December 2018
The patterns of displacement in the target villages are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Areas of origin</th>
<th>Length of displacement</th>
<th>Reasons for displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fadhigaab</td>
<td>Nearby villages – Wareeg, Siigodheer, Saancaro, Samaado</td>
<td>Most arrived in 2017 and 2018, but arrivals have increased in last three months</td>
<td>Loss of livestock, clan conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hululul</td>
<td>Nearby villages – Wareeg, Balooley, Xaniin, Sugaale, Xaladho</td>
<td>Arrivals have increased in last three months</td>
<td>Loss of livestock, clan conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceel Lahelay</td>
<td>Nearby villages – Karamaan, Ban Cade Deexo, Macmacda, Cayn Daaddhere, Fadhigaab, Sincaro, Dogoble, Goddheere, Ceegaag</td>
<td>Most arrived in 2017 and 2018, but arrivals have increased in last three months</td>
<td>Clan disputes, water shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP Group</td>
<td>Nearby Villages</td>
<td>Most Arrived and Arrival Trends</td>
<td>Protection Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoodhe IDPs</td>
<td>Dararwayne, Dhabarmamac, Dogobe</td>
<td>Most arrived in 2016 and 2017, but arrivals have increased in last three months</td>
<td>Clan conflicts, people looking for assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maraalay</td>
<td>Tabtaag, Dhumay, Dharkayn Genyo</td>
<td>Most arrived in 2018. Disagreement between adult women and young women and men over</td>
<td>Loss of assets, people coming to find family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whether there have been new arrivals in the past three months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaqax Isku Row</td>
<td>Dhumay</td>
<td>Most arrived in late 2018. No new arrivals</td>
<td>Clan conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhiyar</td>
<td>Wadhka, Salal, Cadceed Suxull, Marqacado, Laan Xalaal, Dandooyo, Jidhaan Buur, Maraaga</td>
<td>Most arrived between 2017 and 2019. Disagreement between adult women and men and</td>
<td>Clan conflict, water shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>young women over new arrivals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godheeli</td>
<td>Waxari ka Ciday, Bandcade, Caloolo, Daadheere, Kawsawayne</td>
<td>Most arrived since 2017. Disagreement between women and men over new arrivals –</td>
<td>Clan conflicts, water and livestock shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adult men said some IDPs have left after they didn’t receive assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oog IDPs</td>
<td>Buurdhaab, Buurcaanod, Godheeli, Fadhigaab, Fadhiyar, Gowsawayne, Ceel Lahelay, Tuulo Caligari, Taygaro, Boho, Sigadheer, Higlaale, Marqa Cado, Ceeldeer</td>
<td>Most arrived in 2017 and 2018, but arrivals have increased in last three months</td>
<td>Loss of livestock, clan conflicts and water shortages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

The protection analysis employed a mixed methodology where both quantitative (HHD survey) and qualitative (FGDs, KIIs) data collection was used. A desk review was carried out to gain an understanding of the current situation and a preliminary analysis of the existing protection issues and gaps. This builds on the protection analysis done in 2018, protection trend monitoring reports and other relevant reports produced by other stakeholders operational in the areas.
All data from FGDs, KIIs and the household survey was documented with necessary ethical considerations. All necessary data quality control measures were put in place during the field work, ensuring data protection during collection, storage, transfer, analysis and reporting.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)
Key informant interviews were conducted at community and district levels. 3 KIIs were carried out in each assessment site comprising one male village leader, one female leader and one Community Protection Volunteer (CPV). In addition, 3 KII were conducted at district level comprising one male authority representative and one female activist from district-based organizations or the district authority; and the third KII respondent was chosen from an international or a local organisation operational in the target area.

Focus Group Discussions (FGD)
FGDs were carried out in each of the nine communities targeted for the survey. Each group was interviewed by a facilitator and notetaker of the same sex as the group. Each facilitator had a basic guide to follow during the FGD, covering the key questions to be answered in the analysis. Each FGD lasted around 90 minutes.

A total of 37 FGDs were conducted in target areas, with 426 participants (234 female). For the FGDs, purposive sampling was used. This involves selecting a focus group sample with specific characteristics determined as being able to supply the required information. For this research, the purposive sampling looked at groups of adult men, young men, elderly men and adult women, young women and elderly women all interviewed separately. The selection of the specific participants was done using maximum variation sampling, selecting a group to represent a wide range of experiences within the population category. The criteria were explained in the FGD interview guide to ensure diversity of the group participants, and the FGD facilitators were trained. For example, the group of adult females consisted of women heads of household, a disabled woman, a woman with children, a widow, etc. to ensure a wide range of perspectives.

Observation
A walk through the community was made in each of the targeted villages to observe potential danger zones (eg distribution points) and areas that have at-risk groups, such as women headed households. The main aim of the observation was to identify potential problems or negative effects of humanitarian interventions. The opportunity was also used to speak to members of the community who did not participate in the FGDs. Brief notes were taken on the walk and a short amount of time was taken afterwards to complete anything that there was not time to write down.

House Hold Data Survey
The household survey was conducted in nine villages under the Sool and Sanaag regions. A total of 348 respondents were interviewed, with the sample determined through taking 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. Data collection was carried out using the Mobenzi digital data collection tool, which allows for data capture in the field using mobile phones to minimize errors during data collection. A team of eight enumerators (four male and four female) supported the data collection process.
Respondents

Respondents in this analysis are broken down by category and sex as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>HH Survey (people targeted)</th>
<th>FGDs (number plus people targeted)</th>
<th>KIs (people targeted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female-Headed</td>
<td>Male-Headed</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhigaab</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huluul</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceel Lahelay</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoodhe IDPs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maraalay</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhagax Isku Row</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhiyar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godheeli</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oog IDPs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainabo District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elafwein District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasanod District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in this table, the majority of participants in this analysis, and in the HH survey, were female, although most of the respondents in the HH survey said that their households had male heads. 78% of the HH visited have been in their current location for over a year; Fadhigaab (21%), Huluul (21%), Shoodhe IDP (19%), Ceel Lahelay (3%), Dhagax Isku Row (8%) and Maraalay (6%) all had households which had arrived in the three months prior to the survey.³ 88% of respondents were IDPs.

The findings of this assessment shed light on the current experiences and perceptions of risk held by communities, local authorities and service providers, and local NGO actors. Protection incidents and existing risks reported during these interviews are valued as testimonies throughout this report, and require follow up outside the limitations of both scope and time frame of this analysis. They have informed protection activities within the ECHO project being implemented by Oxfam and NRC, as well as advocacy actions and engagement with authorities and service providers.

Protection Risks and Coping Mechanisms

All participants in the analysis mentioned that they faced insecurity and protection risks. FGD and KII respondents reported that communities face risks on a regular basis and that they fear conflict; however

³ Note that some of these percentages are derived from a small sample. For example, in Dhagax Isku Row 13 HH were interviewed – 8% of this is one person. This may not be a good representation of the position of the whole population of the settlement when extrapolated; where possible information has been triangulated with information from FGDs in the same communities.
only an average of 12% of respondents in the HH survey across target locations stated that they had experienced threats in the three months prior to the survey. The village with the highest percentage of respondents having faced threats during this period was Shoodhe IDP, with 20% of respondents, while Godheeli had the lowest percentage, with 0% saying they had been threatened in the previous three months.4

Specific protection risks mentioned were as follows:

Rape
Rape was mentioned as an issue affecting women and girls in all the communities targeted in the analysis. Areas where women felt vulnerable included water points, open defecation areas, livestock grazing areas, homes (this was ascribed to a lack of safe and proper shelter and of lighting), areas where they collect firewood, and the roads to market. Perpetrators were reported to be men both from within and outside the community in all areas, and KII respondents also attested to this. Rape cases were reported in almost all villages to be more common in the spring; in Hululul the male FGD reported that cases increase in the rainy season as people move to the area from dry places in search of water and pasture, and men become stronger and more aggressive. Coping mechanisms include working and moving around either in groups or accompanied by a male relative, bathing inside their huts, and even sleeping in groups at night. In Ceel Lahelay the male FGD also reported that women don’t go to open defecation areas after dark, and in Fadhigaab women reported that elderly women collect water or look for missing livestock, as they are less at risk than younger women or men. A KII respondent also asserted that women who returned to their villages to collect belongings were raped and abused.

Forced and Early Marriage
The typical age at which girls get married in target communities varied across respondent groups, with little consensus between women and men and between adults and youth who participated in FGDs. The age ranges cited were all between 14 and 20 years, with women in Ceel Lahelay and Fadhiyar mentioning 12 and 13 respectively as the earliest age at which girls are married. Boys were reported to be marrying between 17 and 21 years. Communities seemed unsure of whether the practice had increase or decreased since the drought. Those respondents who said it had decreased mentioned a lack of resources to pay dowries; those who said it had increased mentioned displacement, a lack of schooling and livelihoods opportunities as all providing more opportunities for meeting people. In Ceel Lahelay women in FGDs said that early marriage increases in droughts as a means of income, whilst it decreases in conflict due to a feeling of instability in the community. Younger women in Oog mentioned that the displacement had let to a lot of unwanted pregnancies, again due to increased opportunities for meeting people and reduced daily activities for men.

Domestic violence
Domestic violence was reported in FGDs and in the HH survey in Fadhigaab, Hululul, Shoodhe, Maraalay, Fadhiyar and Oog. In the HH survey it was also reported in Ceel Lahelay by 5% of respondents as having occurred in the three months prior to the survey. The highest percentage of respondents in the HH

4 In Godheeli only eight HH were interviewed, so this information was verified with a wider sample during the FGDs.
survey reporting that there had been cases of domestic violence in the previous three months was in Fadhigaab, at 7%. Domestic violence was attributed to economic stress linked to the drought, which had led to an increase in domestic disputes over control and use of resources within the household. One KII respondent also asserted that men felt disempowered, having lost their traditional roles. In a separate question on Qat use in target communities, domestic violence was listed in all FGDs as a common impact. It should be noted however that domestic violence is commonly under-reported as it is seen as normal practice in this context.

Revenge killings and killings related to clan conflicts
This risk is mostly felt directly by men, and was mentioned as an issue in FGDs in all communities targeted by the analysis. In the HH survey fear of militia was mentioned as an issue affecting families in the previous three months in Shoodhe (6% of respondents), Ceel Laelay (1.6%) and Maraalay (2.7%). Respondents in Fadhigaab, Huluul and Oog also mentioned armed groups as a factor limiting freedom of movement, and respondents in all villages said they had felt or feared insecurity in the previous three months (ranging from 31% of respondents in Oog and Dhagax Isku Row to 67% in Shoodhe). KIIIs also confirmed that IDP movement is limited as they do not feel safe. This threat of conflict, violence and insecurity has significant impacts on men’s daily activities and life. The female FGD in Fadhigaab Camp B said that men can’t even go to the other side of the village for fear of revenge killings. In Ceel Laelay men don’t take livestock for grazing, and several groups mentioned livestock grazing as being a dangerous activity, as well as travelling outside villages. FGDs in Fadhigaab, Ceel Laelay, Maraalay, Fadhiyar, Godheeli and Oog reported that men stay away from homes at night, either sleeping in hiding, staying awake in shifts, or sleeping outside and posting guards. Most villages said that men carry guns for their protection, travel in groups, use torches and keep in touch to warn each other of issues.

Although the threat of clan conflict-related killings is mainly felt by men, there are instances where women are also directly affected. The conflict has resulted in split families in cases where intermarriage had happened between clans. One KII respondent told a story of a woman whose husband and brother were from opposing clans. Both were killed in the conflict, and she doesn’t feel safe staying with either side as she is suspected of spying. At the time of the analysis it was reported that she feared for the safety of her three-year-old son if she took him to her brother’s funeral, due to his clan identity.

Issues related to privacy (lack of proper shelter, open defecation)
Women in all villages targeted in the analysis mentioned that there were issues related to their privacy and safety, both inside their homes due to a lack of proper shelter and outside due to a lack of latrines and a need to use open defecation areas. In Shoodhe, adult men said that women’s dignity was compromised due to a lack of latrines. In Fadhigaab, Ceel Lahelay, Shoodhe, Maraalay, Fadhiyar, Godheeli and Oog women and men said that women sleep in groups of six to ten women in a shelter. Men in Fadhiyar and Godheeli said that women move long distances to defecate in the open, and in Godheeli they added that the area chosen was open with no trees, which causes women to be afraid and to feel undignified.
Female Genital Mutilation (FGM)

FGM was mentioned as a practice in all communities. Women in Dhagax Isku Row said it is usually practiced in summer. Women in Ceel Lahelay reported that the practice had decreased during the drought due to awareness raising by NGOs with displaced people. Oxfam’s gender analysis found that there had been a decrease due to the high cost of the practice relative to income\(^5\); this is also corroborated by Oxfam’s previous experience in the area.

Evictions

The fear or threat of evictions was reported to be affecting Huluul, Dhagax Isku Row and three clusters in Oog. In Huluul and Dhagax Isku Row the land owner and host community clan respectively do not want the IDPs to stay, and in Oog the district administration plan to relocate these three clusters to another site (which male FGD participants reported to be hot and uninhabitable). One effect of these plans has been that the local authorities and landowners have refused to allow any permanent infrastructure, including latrines, to be put on the land. This means that insecurity and risks linked to shelter and sanitation will be perpetuated either until this policy is changed or until the IDPs are moved.

IDP/host community conflicts

Related to the evictions threat as mentioned above, there was some mention of difficulties and bad feelings between the IDP and host communities. In the household survey, 55% of respondents in Ceel Lahelay and in Fadhiyar said that relations were either bad or very bad, with conflict over resources such as water, pasture and land the principal reported cause.\(^6\) In Huluul, the chairperson stated that IDPs had been settling on flood plains and practise open defecation, causing potential hygiene problems for both IDPs and host communities. The village committee had as a result begun to allocate land to new IDPs to solve these problems and to resolve conflict. The Sarar governor in Ainabo District mentioned that tension is linked to resource sharing and to previous clan-based conflicts.

Other risks:

Falling into wells/drowning

Women in FGDs in six out of nine of the targeted communities (Fadhigaab, Huluul, Ceel Lahelay, Shoodhe IDPs, Fadhiyar and Oog IDPs) reported that children in their community are at risk of falling into wells or water catchments, either whilst fetching water or trying to swim in the catchments. This was in fact the most common threat mentioned as affecting children. In Shoodhe the protective wall around the well had been washed away during recent flooding. To mitigate or prevent risks, adults discourage children from going near water points, keep them at home or accompany them. In Godheeli and Shooode women said that parents might also follow their children to keep them safe.

Debt

The contracting of debt was reported as being common in all FGDs. Most respondents said that women are more likely to take debts in order to cover basic household needs, and find it easier to do so as they are more trusted. FGDs in Shoodhe, Fadhiyar and Godheeli also said that men contract debts as they are

\(^5\) Oxfam Gender Analysis for Sool and Sanaag, July 2019
\(^6\) The Ceel Lahelay sample was of 61 respondents, the Fadhiyar sample was of 17.
responsible for their household. This practice was noted in all communities as having negative consequences, especially in case of defaulting on debts. Risks of conflict, verbal and physical abuse, harassment and arrest were all mentioned; in Shoodhe men reported that creditors could also take household assets if debts are not paid, although community elders can mediate and set new dates for debt payment.

Animal attacks
Animal attacks (specifically hyenas in Shoodhe) were mentioned as a threat for children in Shoodhe, Dhagax Isku Row, Fadhiyar and Godheeli. In Maraalay ogres or cannibals were also mentioned as eating children – this is more likely also to be animal attacks. In Ceel Lahelay and in Shoodhe snakes were also mentioned as a risk in the male FGDs.

Qat
Qat is chewed in all communities targeted by the assessment with increases in chewing mentioned as a coping mechanism for men who have lost livestock. All FGDs acknowledged that the practice causes aggression and family problems, and increases domestic violence. It also reduces resource sharing and joint decision making in the household – in Shoodhe the male FGD participants agreed that qat use has impacted every household financially. This is likely one reason for women being more trusted in contracting of debts.

Vulnerabilities to threats
All categories of people are vulnerable to different threats in the areas targeted by this analysis. When asked in FGDs if there were any particularly vulnerable groups, respondents listed women (especially pregnant women), children, the elderly, people with disabilities, people with mental problems, orphan children and minority clan members. Those who were mentioned specifically to be vulnerable to the protection risks listed above were as follows:

Women and girls
Women and girls are vulnerable to rape and other forms of sexual violence, to domestic violence, to forced and early marriage, and to FGM. Women and children were named as the most vulnerable group in all communities, with their vulnerability attributed to a lack of participation in decision making and to cultural beliefs as well as to the need to leave the village to collect water and firewood, to go to the market, to graze livestock or to defecate. Inside the villages they were vulnerable to attack at night, due to a lack of proper shelter. Women were also described as being vulnerable to conflict arising over repayment (or non-) of debts, as they are the most likely people to contract them. Their status as heads of household in some cases also makes them vulnerable (with no male HH head present), as noted in FGDs in Shoodhe and Maraalay.

Denial of dowry/dowry abuse and denial of inheritance were also mentioned, but details of these risks were not given.
Men and boys
Men and boys were described as being vulnerable to conflict and to revenge killings, especially in areas which were prone to conflict and violence and in places where there are more than one clan in a village.

Minority groups
Minority clans were reported to be among the most vulnerable in Dhagax Isku Row, Godheeli and Oog. Here vulnerability was related to their ability to access assistance, as they can be excluded and discriminated against. Respondents did not go into detail on this subject.

People with disabilities
People with disabilities were mentioned in the same way as minority groups, in the context of accessing assistance. They were mentioned more commonly than minority groups, however – in all communities.

Mapping of Actors and Referral Services
Community Structures
All of the communities targeted for this analysis reported that their primary reference point and representatives are the village committee, which is the leading village power structure. An average of 60% of households targeted in the HH survey also said that the community committee was their first point of reference for information, with only respondents from Godheeli listing family members first and the community committee second. Family members were the second reference point in all communities except Godheeli and Huluul – in Huluul traditional leaders were second and family members third.

Most committees have a membership from both IDP and host communities (with the exception of Shoodhe and Oog, which are exclusively IDP communities). There was no consensus as to how many members each committee had or their gender balance, so it appears that the committee members are not all known to everyone in their villages. The following table illustrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Male members</th>
<th>Female members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fadhigaab</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huluul</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Some (including vice chairperson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceel Lahelay</td>
<td>5 (young men FGD said 12, all men)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoodhe</td>
<td>6 (male FGD said 7, all men)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maraalay</td>
<td>8 (young women said 7 men and 3 women; men said 10, all IDPs and all men made up of a selection from the camp’s sub-clans, but also a women’s forum; a teacher in Maraalay said the village committee has nine members, none of whom are female)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhagax Isku Row</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (increased from 2 during drought)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(men said all IDPs; also an elders’ committee, an NGO committee, and a women’s forum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fadhiyar</td>
<td>5 (young women and men said this – adult women said 8 men and no women)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godheeli</td>
<td>Women said between 7 and 10 members, with 2 women; men said 5, no women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oog</td>
<td>5 (younger women said 4 and 3, and that the head is a woman; men said 7 members with no women but that there is a women’s forum. Younger women also mentioned 3 IDP committees, one per camp)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents agreed that men find it easier to talk to the village committees, and that decisions are made by the male members. The women’s FGDs in Ceel Lahelay and Shoodhe said that women participate in consulting, but men make the decisions. In Maraalay women reported that they decide ‘soft issues’, whilst men make decisions on critical issues for the community. Adult women in Dhagax Isku Row (where the gender balance is apparently more even) and in Godheeli said decisions are taken together, although younger women in Godheeli disagreed and said that men are the deciders. Young men in Ceel Lahelay said “we are a patriarchal society – we don’t see that women have a significant role in the decision-making process which concerns a whole community”. KII respondents asserted that women are minority members of the village committees, and are not active in committee operations. Men resist changes to this as there is a strong belief in tradition, although all communities which had a women’s forum agreed that this had made a difference to women’s participation in village committee matters.

**GBV Services**

**Medical Services**

Some of the target communities have some level of health facility in their villages. This was the case in Oog and Ceel Lahelay which both have a health post (MCH), although in the former the MCH was in the host community and does not have qualified medical staff, and in the latter the MCH was not staffed or functioning. Cases are sometimes taken to the District health centres – Shoodhe respondents mentioned Elafwein, those in Maraalay and Dhagax Isku Row mentioned Lasanod, and those in Fadhiyar Ainabo. CARE provides a full package for GBV case management together with doctors from Ainabo hospital. Some respondents in FGDs also talked about referrals of severe cases to Burao. All of these referrals require resources and time, as they are some distance away (Maraalay is 70km from Lasanod, for example).

**Psychological/Mental Health Services**

The only place where psychological support is available is in Burao, according to respondents in FGDs.
Legal Services

*Xeer*, or customary law, is the most common reference point in target communities, with formal police and court systems being engaged when *xeer* does not lead to an agreement (women’s FGDs, Fadhigaab and Huluul). This is due partly to difficulties in accessing formal justice – in Huluul at the time of this analysis there were no police at the Huluul police post – and partly due to the costs and difficulties associated with accessing the formal systems; in Maraalay adult men said that the nearest legal services were in Lasanod. The women’s FGD in Fadhiyar reported that some cases are referred to Ainabo, but the majority of cases are resolved informally.

Women are not usually involved in *xeer* justice systems, even when they are the survivors of GBV, and they are not given the option of more formal justice. In Shoodhe male respondents said that decisions on cases are usually made by male relatives, whilst in Maraalay adult male respondents said that clan elders manage rape cases. This mediation usually results in a compensation payment to the woman’s family, a payment of fees to the arbitrator, and the perpetrator is returned to his home. One KII respondent mentioned that compensation may even not be shared with the survivor’s family, being kept instead amongst the elders concerned.

Opinions varied on whether the formal or informal systems worked better for communities and for survivors specifically. Women in Camp B in Fadhigaab said that customary law is easier for them. Men in Huluul said that women prefer the court system – when the case is resolved through *xeer* the woman gets nothing (the elders give and take some money or sheep; although in the Maraalay men’s FGD participants said that the perpetrator’s family pays five camels as compensation), and the perpetrator is returned to the community and doesn’t face justice. Sometimes the survivor is forced to marry the perpetrator (especially if she falls pregnant), and survivors commonly face stigma and discrimination. KII respondents mentioned that elders sometimes withdraw cases from the district court, as government capacity is weak and deprives them of this income – with different levels of success depending on the area.

It should be noted here that the formal justice system does not necessarily lead to adequate justice. One male FGD reported that a six-year-old girl had been raped in the six months prior to the assessment. She had been taken to Burao for medical treatment and the perpetrator had been sentenced to just six months in prison.

Safe Programming

Selection processes/targeting

Respondents in the majority of FGDs reported that they knew the selection criteria to be an Oxfam beneficiary, and to be a community worker, and a smaller number of FGD participants had also been involved in selection processes. More participants knew the criteria for selection of volunteers than those for unconditional cash transfers (UCTs); in Ceel Lahelay, Dhagax Isku Row women said the community committee was responsible for this selection and they believed that it was fair. They also mentioned that where assistance wasn’t enough to cover all of the vulnerable households, beneficiary families were ‘encouraged’ (a willingness to share has been a criteria for selection in the past, so the
word encouraged can be interpreted in different ways) to share. In Fadhigaab women reported that assistance is divided on the basis of clan (this was confirmed in KIIs related to Maraalay as well) and distributed by elders and the mayor; information is then shared widely as to what has been allocated to each group. In Huluul the male FGD participants said that the most vulnerable people are sometimes excluded from the selection process, and in Oog women mentioned that some pregnant women and minority clan members are excluded, which can cause harm and conflict.

An average of 63% of respondents in the HH survey said they had been consulted on the type and location of infrastructures to be installed in the villages. This was confirmed in the FGDs, with some participants having been consulted and involved and some not. In Huluul, male FGD participants reported that only men were involved in site selection for latrines and waste management, and they selected areas based on easy digging, distance from water sources and places which were not individually owned. Women reported that they did not feel safe using the infrastructures at night, which is likely a direct consequence of their not being involved.

Information and communication
In Fadhigaab, women in Camp B said that Oxfam had registered people for UCT, and as a result some people incurred debts while waiting for the distributions (registration was mentioned in several FGDs as being a basis for the contracting of debts). After a few days, the women were informed that the UCTs had been stopped. This put them in difficulties and caused risks to them as they were then unable to pay their debts. This points to a gap in information and communication with beneficiaries.

Practical implementation
A number of points were raised related to safe programming in implementation of activities:

- In the HH survey, an average 64% of respondents said that infrastructures and facilities were safe and appropriate. A notable exception to this is Godheeli, where 63% said they were not. This is notable given that 38% of respondents in Godheeli also reported that they were not able to move freely in their community, with GBV as the only reason given for this limitation. This was not confirmed in the FGDs, but needs further investigation.
- A number of respondents mentioned that they would like lights to be provided at latrines.

---

7 Staff who were asked about this incident mentioned that Oxfam had registered beneficiaries but had then found out that another organization was targeting the same communities with a similar programme. Oxfam held meetings with people who were affected by this decision and action, and explained how the situation had come about, persuading them that the organization needed to bring support to communities which were not being supported. Community members apparently accepted; however nothing practical was done to support those who were then unable to repay debts. In future this should be considered – better coordination with other organisations working in an area, and potential for supporting registration of those with debts to be registered with the other organization.

8 Although again, percentages need to be verified. Only eight people were interviewed in the HH survey in Godheeli, so 63% amounts to five people. Also in the next statement – three people reported that they are unable to move freely. Further investigation needs to be carried out in this location to verify these percentages.
In Dhagax Isku Row, young men reported that they had dug 70 latrines prior to the government stopping the construction of permanent infrastructure. The latrine pits are still open, which could potentially cause risks for children.

In Godheeli, the male FGD mentioned that distribution sites are chosen for their accessibility and safety. In Ceel Lahelay, Shoodhe, Maraalay, Dhagax Isku Row, Fadhiyar and Oog this was not the case, and elderly, pregnant women, disabled people have difficulty accessing services and assistance. In Shoodhe, men reported that older people and those with disabilities are pushed to the back of the line during distributions, so they are often the last to receive food and NFIs.

Complaints mechanisms

FGD respondents in Fadhigaab, Shoodhe, Maraalay, Fadhiyar and Godheeli mentioned the Oxfam complaints hotline; however it seems that use of the hotline is very gendered. Female respondents in Huluul, Ceel Lahelay, Maraalay, Dhagax Isku Row, Godheeli and Oog did not know about the hotline, and women in all communities said that they refer to the community committee or village leaders when they have an issue rather than using the hotline number. Men were much more likely to say that the hotline is well known and that they know how to use it.

Needs and Recommendations

Needs

All communities targeted for this analysis spoke about needs which were not being covered. These can be summed up as follows:

- In Ceel Lahelay, Shoodhe, Fadhiyar, Oog, FGD respondents recommended that water points be protected to prevent risks of children falling in.
- In Ceel Lahelay and Oog, respondents also mentioned recreational support for children to keep them occupied during the day and to prevent risky behaviours.
- In Fadhigaab women requested gas stoves and wheelbarrows to reduce the frequency of collecting firewood and water.
- In Ceel Lahelay and Huluul, women asked for lighting around latrines, for more latrines close to their home, closer water points and support to the police (given that there were no police in Huluul at the time of the analysis this may refer to support for their return). In Oog the lack of lighting was also mentioned as an issue.
- FGD respondents in all villages said that the lack of proper shelter put them at risk.
- In Ceel Lahelay, men asked for cash assistance to be increased so that the burden of sharing cash outside the recipient family is reduced.
- In Maraalay men requested more protection training targeting women and men in order to reduce SGBV and protection issues. In Oog the same was requested, but they also suggested that women’s forums should be structured as self-help groups (with income generating or savings activities) in order to make them sustainable.⁹

⁹ Note that giving IGA support to protection groups has been problematic in other contexts and has not been shown to be a contributing factor in a group’s sustainability. This needs further analysis and consideration.
In Fadhiyar, Men expressed a need for dignity kits, clothes and latrines.

KII suggestions were as follows:

- Lasanod shelter, water, food and safety
- Support to traditional leaders around peace and reconciliation
- Support to reconstruction efforts in villages which were destroyed
- Maraalay: increased solar lighting, additional training for CPVs, public awareness, shelter, NFI (esp cooking utensils).
- Programmes targeting traditional leaders and elders, youth, community activists and police related to justice for SGBV survivors.
- Awareness on security and safety.
- Bigger dams for surface water catchment.
- Mass awareness on GBV, support to women to access legal services and to know legal procedures as well as capacity strengthening on speaking in court.

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible actor</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broa PM in collaboration with WaSH team</td>
<td>In Dhagax Isku Row, initiate an action to decommission/fill in open latrine pits/ or install physical construction if allowed by authorities host communities.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam to advocate this through protection and WaSH cluster.</td>
<td>Support protection of water sources where possible in order to mitigate risks of drowning which children currently face.</td>
<td>November onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam Protection Engage HLP sub-cluster to advocate this.</td>
<td>Increase work and lobby with coordination mechanisms and shelter organisations and donors for shelter support to be provided for IDPs</td>
<td>November onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam protection team, engage HLP sub-cluster, target authorities</td>
<td>Carry out advocacy and negotiation with landowners, host community and government related to settlement infrastructures where they are currently forbidden</td>
<td>Routine advocacy throughout program implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam teams will advocate this.</td>
<td>Carry out advocacy towards service providers at District, Regional and where needed National level and with donors around provision of formal legal, medical and psychological</td>
<td>Routine advocacy throughout program implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services in rural areas; including possibilities of mobile clinics or courts (a long process but necessary for development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxfam protection team</th>
<th>Support community committees in gaining and raising awareness of their role and responsibilities in target communities. This includes a presentation of the committee to the community, so that confusion over numbers and membership is reduced</th>
<th>2020 Oxfam CPVs and protection field team will facilitate this during protection awareness sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam humanitarian teams.</td>
<td>Strengthen women’s participation in decision making, especially around humanitarian and development assistance and around justice mechanisms related to incidents which affect them. This should include strengthening women’s capacity and confidence to engage, as well as working with men to create space</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam MEAL teams</td>
<td>Strengthen Complaints and Feedback mechanism. Currently it is almost exclusively used by men; it may be necessary to reinforce the hotline with alternative ways of getting feedback within target communities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam humanitarian teams.</td>
<td>Ensure better collaboration and coordination with other organisations working in target communities to avoid duplication of interventions. Consider impacts of withdrawing support for target beneficiaries</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam WASH team.</td>
<td>Ensure that consultation around design and locations of infrastructures include women; and include the end users of the infrastructures</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annexes
Annex 1: Service Mapping in target areas