Detailed Site Assessment (DSA)

Key Findings

CONTEXT

Somalia continues to experience recurrent droughts, floods, and armed conflict, driving large-scale displacement. The high levels of displacement have resulted in fluctuating population estimates of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in both formal and informal settlements, thereby complicating the provision of basic services to address their needs.

The Detailed Site Assessment (DSA) was initiated in coordination with the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster in order to provide the humanitarian community with up-to-date information on the location of IDP sites, the conditions and capacity of the sites, and an estimate of the severity of humanitarian needs of residents. Data collection for the current round of the DSA took place from November 2019 to February 2020 and assessed 2,344 IDP settlements in 61 districts across Somalia.

The full dataset, analysis, and outputs of previous DSA are available here.

METHODOLOGY

Primary data collection employed a Key Informant (KI) methodology with KI interviews conducted by REACH enumerators in locations directly accessible by REACH Field Officers (FOs) and by CCCM partner organizations. Targeted urban areas within districts were determined based on a secondary literature review of previous assessments conducted on IDP populations. Following the identification of target urban areas, REACH contacted the lowest level of governance in each area to identify the locations of IDP settlements.

The methodology for the third round of the DSA was developed in close consultation with clusters and partner organisations and updated to improve the quality and reliability of data collected regarding IDP settlement locations, estimated size of resident populations, and the severity of humanitarian needs. The severity score goes from 1-5 and the severity phases are none/minimal, stress, severe, extreme, and catastrophic. For the list of indicators and the severity score calculations, see the annex on this factsheet.

ASSESSMENT COVERAGE MAP

Summary of severity score

Overall cluster severity score and severity phase classification at district level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Severity phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security / Livelihoods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Non-food items</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation/ Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top five districts with higher number of clusters in severe and extreme categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Severe clusters</th>
<th>Extreme clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daynile Mogadushu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahda Mogadushu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadajir Mogadushu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaalacayo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beletweyne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of sites by FSL severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 5%
- Severe (severity score 3): 23%
- Stress (severity score 2): 46%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 26%

Proportion of sites with no access to food markets, as reported by KIs: 40%

Average time taken to travel to nearest food market, as reported by KIs: 24 minutes

Three most common reported primary sources of food:
- Market purchases: 73%
- Food assistance from NGO aid: 9%
- Household production: 7%

Three most common reported livelihood activities conducted by the majority of residents:
- Daily wage labour: 77%
- Pastoralism: 6%
- Agriculture: 1%

Proportion of sites where the population was reportedly not able to receive food assistance: 78%

% of sites per nutrition severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 0%
- Severe (severity score 3): 36%
- Stress (severity score 2): 43%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 20%

Proportion of sites with no access to nutrition services, as reported by KIs: 32%

Average time taken to travel to nearest nutrition service, as reported by KIs: 29 minutes

Proportion of sites reporting nutrition items distributed in the past 3 months:
- Therapeutic and suppl. food: 70%
- MUAC tape: 45%
- Therapeutic milk products: 40%
- Super Cereal Plus: 23%

Proportion of sites where the population was reportedly not able to receive nutrition support: 83%

The findings related a subset of 1,190 sites where KIs reported having access to food markets.

*Respondents could select multiple options. Applies to all questions with reference ‘4’.

For more information on this factsheet please contact:
CCCM Cluster: bconner@iom.int
REACH: somalia@reach-initiative.org
% of sites per health severity score:

- Extreme: 4%
- Severe: 85%
- Stress: 8%
- No or minimal: 2%

District severity score in Health:

- District - Health: Severity score 2020 per
  - Insufficient data
  - 1 - None / Minimal
  - 2 - Stressed
  - 3 - Severe
  - 4 - Extreme

For more information on this factsheet please contact:
CCCM Cluster: bconner@iom.int
REACH: somalia@reach-initiative.org
% of sites per shelter severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 19%
- Severe (severity score 3): 63%
- Stress (severity score 2): 17%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 0%

Proportion of sites reportedly having no access to markets selling non-food items (NFI):

Jerry cans or buckets: 49%
Plastic sheets: 48%
Blankets: 43%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported shelters damaged by fires or floods 3 months prior to data collection:

- Insufficient data: 52%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported cases of evictions 3 months prior to data collection:

- 1% (severity score 1)

Proportion of sites reportedly having no access to learning facilities:

16%

Average time taken to travel to nearest learning facilities, as reported by KIs:
18 Minutes

Reported type of learning facilities available at sites:

- Primary: 58%
- Secondary: 16%
- Quoranic: 72%
- Basic Literacy/ Numeracy: 8%

Average proportion of learning facilities at sites reportedly having no gender segregated latrines:

79%

Average proportion of learning facilities at sites reportedly having no fences and clear demarcation:

81%

% of sites per education severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 37%
- Severe (severity score 3): 50%
- Stress (severity score 2): 12%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 1%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported access to markets selling non-food items:

- Blankets: 43%
- Plastic sheets: 48%
- Jerry cans or buckets: 49%

Proportion of sites reportedly having no access to markets selling non-food items:

67%

District severity score in Shelter and NFIs:

District severity score in Education:
The findings related a subset of 1,981 sites where KIs reported having access to functioning water sources. The most common reported primary source of water was chlorine tablets/aquatabs (37%), boiling (37%) and cloth filter (4%).

Proportion of sites where the population was reportedly not able to receive water support: 6%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported to have open defecation: 54%

Proportion of sites with toilets in which KIs reported having: Handwashing facilities 14%, Locks on the inside 20%, Internal lighting 13%

The most common reported types of water treatments were chlorine tablets/aquatabs (87%), boiling (37%) and cloth filter (4%).

District severity score in WASH:

Water
Proportion of sites reportedly having no access to functioning water sources: 16%
Average time taken to travel to nearest water source, as reported by KIs: 20 minutes
Three most common reported primary source of water:
- Vendors or shop 17%
- Piped system 15%
- Water kiosk (humanitarian aid) 12%

Hygiene:
Proportion of sites reportedly having no access to bathing facilities: 96%
Average time taken to travel to nearest bathing facility, as reported by KIs: 6 Minutes

Proportion of sites where the population was reportedly not able to receive hygiene support: 13%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported to have women present in committees: 88%

Three most common reported problems experienced in the delivery of humanitarian assistance:
- Not enough for all entitled 22%
- Some population groups not receiving aid 17%
- Fighting between recipients 14%

Three most common reported site management at sites:
- Local authority 30%
- Community Leader 27%
- Gatekeeper 24%

Three most common reported established committees at sites:
- Women’s committee 74%
- Camp Management Committee 73%
- Residents’ committee 59%

Three most common sources of information, as reported by KI:
- Radio 62%
- Friends / neighborhood / family 51%
- Community / religious leaders 27%

Three most common sources of information for persons with disabilities, as reported by KIs:
- Word of mouth 50%
- Community meetings 45%
- Meetings in person 37%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported to have access to a feedback mechanism: 38%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported having access to toileting facilities: 88%

Sanitation:
Proportion of sites where KIs reported no access to functioning latrines: 20%
Proportion of sites where KIs reported open defecation: 14%

Camp Management and Accountability to Affected Populations

Three most common (used/preferred) sources of information, as reported by KI:
- Radio 62%
- Friends / neighborhood / family 51%
- Community / religious leaders 27%

Three most common sources of information for persons with disabilities, as reported by KIs:
- Word of mouth 50%
- Community meetings 45%
- Meetings in person 37%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported they have access to a feedback mechanism: 38%

Proportion of sites where KIs reported having access to latrine access: 87%

For more information on this factsheet please contact:
CCCM Cluster: bconner@iom.int
REACH: somalia@reach-initiative.org
The indicators and method for calculating the severity scores for each cluster were developed in coordination with CCCM partners. The indicators of each cluster were composed of a set of indicators and a method for scoring these indicators was developed to evaluate the severity of needs. The scoring of the indicators was based on the responses from the key informant interviews. Forty-two (42) indicators were selected to assess the severity of needs across seven clusters. Each indicator was granted a severity score from 1 to 4 with 1 being the least severe and 4 being the most severe. For each cluster, the overall score was determined by calculating the median score of all indicators included in the cluster. At the national level, the final severity score for each cluster was determined by selecting the severity score in which at least 20% of the total population fall in.

Indicators per cluster:

**Shelter / NFI:** Access to and availability of NFI and building material in local/nearby markets; Basic NFIs available; Shelter occupation and density; Shelter quality; Shelter & NFI support activities; Security of tenure; Hazards; Public lighting

**WASH:** Access to and availability of functional water sources; Access to and availability of functional toilets; Access to and availability of bathing facilities; Primary; secondary; and domestic water sources; Toilets with locks; Toilets with internal lighting; Toilets with handwashing facilities; WASH support activities; Water treatment; Presence of open defecation; Disposal of solid waste

**Health:** Access to and availability of health facilities; Health services available; Skilled health personnel for women giving birth; Health support activities; Health problems common

**Nutrition:** Access to and availability of nutrition services; Distribution of nutrition items; Nutrition support activities

**Education:** Access to and availability of learning facilities; Learning facilities available; Gender segregated latrines; Fences and clear demarcation

**Food Security:** Access to and availability of food markets; Primary and secondary food sources; Food security support received; Land available

**Protection:** Covered spaces; Women spaces; Child-friendly spaces; Types of safety and security incidents; Locations of safety and security incidents; Restrictions to movement

For a more detailed overview of the methodology and a comprehensive list of all the composite indicators that were used, you can access the terms of reference (ToR) [here](#). The indicators and their respective thresholds are included in the annex section of the ToR, page 56-78.