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Executive Summary

Displacement features prominently in Somalia and is characterized by complex and interconnected conflict, economic, and climatic factors. Millions of people have been displaced internally within the country over the past years. Somalia also hosts 38,463 refugees or asylum-seekers from a variety of countries of origin, while some 8,993 former refugees have returned between 2020 and 2004 with assistance from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (UNHCR, 2024). Among internally displaced people (IDPs), more than half were displaced from 2016 onwards following five consecutive failed rainy seasons in much of the country (UNHCR, 2023). They often live alongside refugee returnees, particularly those from Kenya, as well as refugees and asylum seekers, the majority from Yemen and Ethiopia. These populations endure precarious livelihood and food security conditions, overcrowded environments with limited access to essential services and face an increased risk of gender-based violence, loss of productive assets and strained relations with host communities.

Within this context, Somalia demonstrates a commitment to adhering to international laws and protocols while developing local solutions to address humanitarian and displacement challenges. It is a signatory to the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol and ratified the Convention for the Protection and Assistance of IDPs in Africa in 2009. At the 2023 Global Refugee Forum (GRF), the Government announced pledges related to legal frameworks, inclusion, climate resilience, reintegration, peace-building, and informed decision-making. These built on 2019 pledges focused on relocation and reintegration of refugees, refugee returnees and IDPs, creation of new jobs and increased access to livelihood opportunities, solutions for the root causes of climate induced displacement, and strengthened provision of durable solutions through the operationalization of the National Durable Solutions Strategy (NDSS) 2020-2024. Nationally, draft Refugee and IDP Acts are currently being enacted. Regionally, the Somaliland Refugee and Asylum Seekers Act of 2023, supported by the National Action Plan III, expressly includes refugees, asylum seekers, refugee returnees, and IDPs in various public services.

The Somalia Displacement Phone Survey provides important information to support evidence-based programming and policy around forcibly displaced persons in Somalia. It is the first to offer comparable statistics for refugees, refugee returnees and other forcibly displaced
populations, which will support outreach, targeting and programming efforts by humanitarian actors, including UNHCR. Second, it offers insights into the impacts on and responses of forcibly displaced persons to shocks, including the COVID-19 pandemic, drought and rapid increases in food prices that will be useful to the government, World Bank and other development agencies. Third, it provides a foundation for upcoming policy and strategy processes, including the NDSS, for which the revision processes will begin next year. Finally, it tests new tools and technology that can be adopted by the Somalia National Bureau of Statistics (SNBS) and others for cost-effective data collecting using phone surveys.
Box 1: The National Development Agenda and Displacement

Addressing displacement challenges is a national development priority. Three national agendas would benefit from considering displacement in their policy formulation:

**Urbanization Policy.** Cities can serve as robust economic engines, and the evidence suggests that countries with a higher urban share experience increased GDP per capita. Global data indicates that for every 1 percent rise in urbanization, GDP per capita grows by 4 percent (World Bank, 2021c). The growth in urban populations can generate agglomeration economies by reducing the distance to essential services, infrastructure, and employment opportunities. With continued displacement, Somali cities need effective planning and policy development, urban centers, and local governance structures to deal with such rapid urban growth. If successful, Somalia will be able to tap into the potential benefits of urbanization.

**Social Policy.** Somalia’s first Social Protection Policy identifies opportunities to protect individuals, particularly the poor and vulnerable, against shocks, help them to manage risks, and provide them with opportunities to overcome poverty, vulnerability, and exclusion (MoLSA, 2019). The Policy, which is expected to be developed into a framework, explicitly recognizes displacement as a feature of the social landscape. A social cohesion policy is also being developed with a focus on fostering social cohesion between displaced and host communities.

**Humanitarian Policy.** Somalia’s population grapples with severe poverty, limited access to essential social services, and insufficient livelihood opportunities. In 2022, the Somalia Aid Information Management System (AIMS) reported that humanitarian aid surpassed $1.75 billion. Some of this humanitarian aid serves IDPs. There is a recognized need to shift from a heavy reliance on the humanitarian sector for essential services towards complementarity with development approaches – for example, through coherence in service delivery models, coverage, access, and monitoring – and greater targeting of assistance based on vulnerability rather than status.

The Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) has established the National Durable Solutions Unit (DSU) to coordinate and seek sustainable resolutions for displacement-affected communities. The goal is to ensure access to basic services and foster self-reliance through a development-oriented approach. Data about education, employment, and social cohesion is needed to address the challenges IDPs face and facilitate their voluntary return, local integration, or relocation to alternative sites, ensuring a sustainable resolution to their displacement.
Key findings & recommendations

Forcibly displaced people in Somalia face enormously challenging living conditions, which require a dedicated focus on urbanization, social, and humanitarian policies. Even within the difficult context, forcibly displaced people face precarious conditions – with the vast number of IDPs, especially those in settlements, faring worse than host communities on nearly every indicator.¹

Recommendations:

- The scale and scope of conflict, poverty, and displacement in Somalia and the intermixing of displaced and host communities necessitate comprehensive and area-based solutions, along with additional thinking about targeting based on vulnerability where relevant. At the same time, the high degree of complexity and variation between locations suggests that localized and pilot programming may offer benefits.
- National and subnational urbanization, social and humanitarian policies should consider the scope, scale and needs of forcibly displaced persons.

Socioeconomic characteristics of the population and disability. More than half of the members of the studied households are below 18 years old, which is typical of Somali households. Displacement-affected households are more likely to be headed by men, larger (except for refugees), have more children (except for refugees), and have more heads with disabilities, especially among IDPs in settlements.²

Recommendations:

- Larger households and households with larger shares of dependents (children and older people who are unable to work, relative to the number of working-age adults) are shown to be at greater risk of poverty and vulnerability, necessitating targeted responses through social protection and other systems.
- The large number of young people in the population presents opportunities and challenges. To realize the benefits, investments are needed in education and skills development, employment opportunities, and engagement in decision-making processes and governance structures to address their concerns and aspirations.

¹ This is consistent with the findings from research by the World Bank which showed that 63 percent of IDPs and 45 percent of the host population in Somalia are identified as multidimensionally poor.
² See Annex 4 for a more detailed summary of the population, by population group.
Given that almost two out of ten displaced heads face some disability, targeted support may be needed in the form of healthcare services, empowerment and skills development, inclusive and accessible education, and infrastructure to ensure their wellbeing, inclusion, and empowerment.

**Access to housing, water and sanitation.** Access to housing is better for refugees but worse for IDPs in settlements, most of whom live in unimproved shelters constructed with mud and sticks. Most households across all population groups have access to improved water and sanitation, but they report insufficient supply, and many share their toilet facilities with other households.

*Recommendations:*
- Leverage urban planning and development projects to address the affordable housing needs of the IDP population and other urban poor. Partner with Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local governments, and landowners to develop innovative shelter programs that help IDPs and returnees gain stable access to shelter and land and expand access to improved housing materials.
- Increase access to improved water and sanitation through equitable and integrated service delivery for displaced populations and their host communities.

**Access to health and education services.** Between one-third and one-half of households experienced illness in the last month, but fewer than 40 percent of those could access medicine or medical services due to cost and distance to health facilities. Most households send children to school, but gender gaps persist, particularly among refugee returnees. The cost of schooling is the main barrier to children’s education, while the lack of availability of school was common among host community households, and marriage and pregnancy were notable factors for IDPs living outside settlements.

*Recommendations:*
- Reduce barriers in the health sector by maintaining regular supplies, implementing interventions directed at cultural norms, and reducing the cost of medical treatment to increase both demand for and access to health care. Develop an approach to public-private partnerships in health care provision for displaced persons.
- Address financial barriers to education by providing financial aid and scholarships and putting in place measures to avoid teen pregnancy and early marriage, complemented by programming to address girls’ domestic responsibilities.
• The low educational attainment of heads also necessitates specific approaches to adult learning. Among returning refugees, the assistance package offers opportunities to reduce the significant gender education gap.

**Employment and sources of income.** Fewer than 40 percent of the respondents worked during the week before the survey, with rates for the host community and displaced persons roughly similar. Refugees are more likely to be paid employees, while farming or caring for livestock is more common among Somali respondents. The main barriers to getting a (better) job are lack of skills and documentation for Somalis and language for refugees. The lack of skills and documentation is linked to the lower level of education of the Somalis.

**Recommendations:**
• Given that agriculture is the main source of livelihood for Somali households, strengthen agriculture practices, increase access to land, and provide training to farmers on how to use more efficient techniques and high-yielding varieties.
• Increase recognition and support for self-employment in the current policy and strategic frameworks, given its predominance as a source of household livelihoods in many households.
• Improve access to documentation by reviewing the minimum required documentation for different economic and social transactions to improve livelihoods.
• Since IDPs tend to have little or no education, a way to increase short-term employment for this group could be inclusion in public works or employment in the construction sector. Integrated graduation programs (which combine safety nets, life skills training, and savings strategies, with support for income-generating activities) offer benefits for others.

**Impact of the drought on households and food security.** More than 90 percent of households reported having experienced some form of shock in the six months preceding the survey: half of IDP households suffered from moderate hunger, while around 10 percent of refugee households reported severe hunger. Around 20 percent of households had received drought-related assistance, mainly in the form of food assistance and cash assistance from the United Nations (UN) and NGOs.

**Recommendations:**
• Establish and scale up social safety net programs that provide cash transfers, vouchers, services, or food assistance to vulnerable households as these could mitigate the impacts of drought.
shocks on them. Expanding the use of insurance products and support for diversified livelihoods in rural areas could also help.

Social cohesion and security perception. Most displaced populations positively describe their interaction with the host community and other displaced populations. However, safety at home and on the street decreased significantly between Round 1 and Round 2, perhaps due to the worsening of the drought during the period. Intensifying drought is often associated with increased physical safety and other life-threatening protection risks in Somalia. While most Somalis feel safe, fewer refugees do so, particularly on the street. Refugees feel unsafe in Somalia primarily because of political issues, as opposed to economic and social issues for displaced Somalis.

Recommendations:
• To increase social cohesion, area-based interventions that provide integrated services to hosts and displaced people while stimulating socioeconomic interactions must be expanded and accelerated. Expanding inclusive community-based planning for displaced communities, particularly in community protection, policing, and access to justice, can enhance local integration of refugees and boost their security perception.
• Protection actors should work with relevant stakeholders to incorporate an integrated protection package into the multi-sector drought response, comprising tailored, specialized protection services to affected communities and people.

Trajectories of displacement and intentions to return. IDPs are most likely to be displaced by natural disasters, whereas refugees are fleeing armed war, discrimination, and persecution. Safety, livelihood opportunities and food security are very important to refugees in informing their intention to return to their countries of origin. In contrast, improved security conditions in Somalia are a major reason for Somalia refugees to return. Only 36 percent of refugees would want to return to their country of origin, while 20 percent would like to move to another location. For the remaining 44 percent who do not intend to move out of Somalia, safety, livelihood opportunities, and food security are important catalysts for returning to the country of origin.

Recommendations:
• Providing safety and peace, basic services, and access to livelihood opportunities in refugees' countries of origin are needed to facilitate voluntary repatriation of refugees and enable them to rebuild their lives upon return.
• Extend area-based programming that invests in rural resilience and improved service delivery, while strengthening grievance redress mechanisms at the community level, as recommended by the NDSS and National Development Plan (NDP).

Differences between men and women. Gender gaps exist in education and economic participation. Among all population groups, women are less likely to be educated, less likely to work, less likely to be involved in decision making, and less likely to feel safe than men. In turn, these factors elevate women’s poverty risk, which is further heightened by limitations in women’s empowerment and decision-making in the home.

Recommendations:
• Women-empowerment programs that address barriers to employment, education, and economic empowerment remain relevant for displaced populations and their hosts in Somalia. The high level of female employment in IDP camps could be an entry point for targeted programs to improve their productivity and income opportunities.
• Link programming to interventions that respond to women’s care responsibilities and address barriers to women’s economic opportunities, for example, childcare initiatives, flexible work hours, and workplace safety programming.
• Advocacy for gender equality and women’s representation in political and decision-making processes at all levels will also promote women’s empowerment in Somalia and could be encouraged through dialogues and partnerships with government authorities, including the National Commission for Refugees and IDPs (NCRI) and other agencies responsible for IDPs and refugees.

Inclusion into national surveys. Displacement-affected populations in Somalia are not systematically included in national surveys, leading to a lack of comparable, representative socioeconomic data between these populations and their host communities.

Recommendations:
• Continue to build on recent efforts to include displaced persons in national statistical systems – for example, by implementing the International Recommendations on Refugee and IDP Statistics (IRRS and IRIS) – to ensure timely and comparable data to monitor socioeconomic and living conditions.
## Table 1: Comparative Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host Community</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Refugee Returnees</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland – 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest – 22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubaland – 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntland – 14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirshabelle – 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir – 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galmudug – 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir – 66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest – 34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland – 29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest – 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntland – 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir – 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirshabelle – 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubaland – 7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galmudug – 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubaland – 77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir – 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest – 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland – 53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntland – 28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir – 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban – 45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural – 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad – 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement – 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban – 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban – 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural – 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad – 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban – 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural – 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement – 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban – 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural – 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household size</strong></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children (&lt;18 years)</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender of head</strong></td>
<td>Male (49%)</td>
<td>Male (55%)</td>
<td>Male (57%)</td>
<td>Male (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (51%)</td>
<td>Female (45%)</td>
<td>Female (43%)</td>
<td>Female (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of shelter</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mostly unimproved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Most improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to improved water</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient drinking water - 53%</td>
<td>Insufficient drinking water - 46%</td>
<td>Insufficient drinking water - 49%</td>
<td>Insufficient drinking water - 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to improved sanitation</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared toilet – 46%</td>
<td>Shared toilet – 81%</td>
<td>Shared toilet – 45%</td>
<td>Shared toilet – 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School attendance</strong></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household expenses, lack of schools</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heads with primary education</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illness</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Medical Services</strong></td>
<td>Medicine – 27%</td>
<td>Medicine – 36%</td>
<td>Medicine – 33%</td>
<td>Medicine – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service – 34%</td>
<td>Service – 41%</td>
<td>Service – 50%</td>
<td>Service – 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service – 34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other reason for not attending, besides fees
**percent of household members sick in last month of the survey
***% of those who fell sick in the last month of the survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment and Livelihoods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worked in previous week</strong></td>
<td>Round 1 – 33%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 37%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 29%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 41%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 2 – 31%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 32%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 31%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 34%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main type of work</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture – 39%</td>
<td>Employee – 29%</td>
<td>Agriculture – 34%</td>
<td>Agriculture – 28%</td>
<td>Daily labour – 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own business – 34%</td>
<td>Daily worker – 28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee – 26%</td>
<td>Employee – 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of livelihoods</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture – 42%</td>
<td>Agriculture – 25%</td>
<td>Agriculture – 37%</td>
<td>Agriculture – 29%</td>
<td>Wage emp. – 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drought</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experienced drought in the last six months</strong></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received assistance for the drought</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate or severe hunger</strong></td>
<td>Round 1 – 44%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 58%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 32%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 55%</td>
<td>Round 1 – 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 2 – 46%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 60%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 45%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 54%</td>
<td>Round 2 – 67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Displacement features prominently in Somalia and is characterized by complex and often interconnected conflict, economic, and climatic drivers. As a result, millions of people have been displaced internally within the country over the past years. The country also hosts 38,463 refugees or asylum-seekers from various countries. Among the IDPs, more than half were displaced from 2016 onwards following five consecutive failed rainy seasons in much of the country. They often live alongside refugee returnees, particularly those from Kenya, and refugees and asylum seekers, the majority from Yemen and Ethiopia, in precarious livelihood and food security situations, overcrowded environments with limited access to essential services, and face increased risk of gender-based violence, loss of productive assets and tension with host communities.

The primary pattern of internal displacement in Somalia involves rural-to-urban migration, contributing significantly to the overall urbanization process in the country's major cities. Somalia exhibits notably high urbanization rates in its urban centers, with 65 percent of the total population of about 15 million residing in urban areas. The migration of displaced communities from rural to urban settings is closely tied to the loss of livelihoods in rural regions and the need to secure new economic opportunities in urban centers. A large majority of those displaced to urban areas have experienced protracted displacement, lasting more than five years, with an increasing preference for staying in urban areas.

Urban displacement also raises specific concerns about shelter, with a significant portion of internally displaced individuals highlighting shelter as their primary concern. This is often linked to inadequate services, including overcrowded sanitation facilities and limited access to healthcare services, with some individuals having to travel long distances to reach the nearest healthcare facility. Additionally, forced evictions remain a significant issue, often due to the

---

3 The PRMN is designed to track movements as well as protection incidents underlying such movements. Movements may be short-term or secondary. It is not designed to estimate population figures. More information on the methodology is available on the website. (UNHCR, January 2024)
absence of land tenure agreements, as rapid urbanization increases land values, exacerbating the challenges faced by displaced people.

An unprecedented drought, severe flooding, and cycles of violence have recently deepened these circumstances. Between January and December 2023, the UNHCR-led Protection and Return Morning Network (PRMN) recorded 2.95 million displacement movements across Somalia, including more than 1.7 million due primarily to flooding, 0.65 million to conflict and insecurity, and 0.53 million associated with drought (UNHCR, 2023). In late December 2022, political tensions boiled over and resulted in armed conflict in Laascaanood, resulting in unspecified numbers of deaths and displacement of civilians. Furthermore, Somali security forces and its allies have started their military operation to regain territories from Al-Shabab, with the latter involved in indiscriminate reprisal attacks. During the 2023 Gu rainy season (April to May), flash floods affected and displaced thousands of Somalis, followed by severe flooding in the last quarter of the year when the Deyr rainy season (October to December) coincided with the El-Nino weather pattern. These concurrent crises add to significant setbacks caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including declines in remittances, a major source of income, and substantial increases in the price of essential food commodities in Somalia and across African countries due to the war in Ukraine.
FIGURE 1 - LOCATION OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS, REFUGEES AND ASYLUM-SEEKERS AND REFUGEE RETURNEES IN SOMALIA (MAY 2023)

SOURCE: UNHCR
Somalia’s efforts to address displacement

Within this context, Somalia demonstrates a commitment to adhering to international laws and protocols and developing local solutions to address humanitarian and displacement challenges. It is a signatory to the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol and ratified the Convention for the Protection and Assistance of IDPs in Africa in 2009. At the 2023 GRF, the Government announced pledges related to legal frameworks, inclusion, climate resilience, reintegration and peace building, and informed decision-making. These built on 2019 pledges focused on relocation and reintegration of refugees, refugee returnees and IDPs, creation of new jobs and increased access to livelihood opportunities, solutions for the root causes of climate induced displacement and strengthened provision of durable solutions through the operationalization of the NDSS 2020-2024. Nationally, draft Refugee and IDP Acts are currently being enacted. Regionally, the Somaliland Refugee and Asylum Seekers Act of 2023, supported by the National Action Plan III, expressly includes refugees, asylum seekers, refugee returnees, and IDPs in various public services.

**Box 2: The National Development Agenda and Displacement**

**Addressing displacement challenges is a national development priority. Three national agendas would benefit from considering displacement in their policy formulation:**

**Urbanization Policy.** Cities can serve as robust economic engines, and the evidence suggests that countries with a higher urban share experience increased GDP per capita. Global data indicates that for every 1 percent rise in urbanization, GDP per capita grows by 4 percent (World Bank, 2021c). The growth in urban populations can generate agglomeration economies by reducing the distance to essential services, infrastructure, and employment opportunities. With continued displacement, Somali cities need effective planning and policy development, urban centers, and local governance structures to deal with such rapid urban growth. If successful, Somalia will be able to tap into the potential benefits of urbanization.

**Social Policy.** Somalia’s first Social Protection Policy identifies opportunities to protect individuals, particularly the poor and vulnerable, against shocks, help them to manage risks, and provide them with opportunities to overcome poverty, vulnerability, and exclusion (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, 2019). The Policy, which is expected to be developed into a framework, explicitly recognizes displacement as a feature of the social landscape. A social
cohesion policy is also being developed with a focus on fostering social cohesion between displaced and host communities.

**Humanitarian Policy.** Somalia’s population grapples with severe poverty, limited access to essential social services, and insufficient livelihood opportunities. In 2022, the AIMS reported that humanitarian aid surpassed $1.75 billion. Some of these humanitarian aid serves IDPs. There is a recognized need to shift from a heavy reliance on the humanitarian sector for essential services towards complementarity with development approaches – for example, through coherence in service delivery models, coverage, access, and monitoring – and greater targeting of assistance based on vulnerability rather than status.

The FGS has established the DSU to coordinate and seek sustainable resolutions for displacement-affected communities. The goal is to ensure access to basic services and foster self-reliance through a development-oriented approach. Data about education, employment, and social cohesion is needed to address the challenges IDPs face and facilitate their voluntary return, local integration, or relocation to alternative sites, ensuring a sustainable resolution to their displacement.

The complex and rapidly changing environment presents difficulties for multi-year planning. This is particularly the case for Somaliland, Puntland and other federal states, where a precarious political and socioeconomic environment is expected to continue amid increased security and climatic hazards (see Annex for additional context on displacement-affected regions of Somalia). Furthermore, severe economic consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the drought and related food crisis continue to influence national policies and actions.

**Data gaps addressed by the report**

A lack of complete and timely socioeconomic heightens challenges in Somalia. Socioeconomic data on IDPs were last collected nationally through the 2017 Somali High-Frequency Survey (SHFS). The 2018-19 Somali Health and Demographic Survey (SHDS) did not include IDPs, while the 2020-21 COVID-19 Somali High-Frequency Phone Survey (SHFPS) did so on a limited scale. The 2022 Somalia Integrated Household Budget Survey (SIHBS) collected information on IDP households but has yet to be fully analyzed. No recent representative socioeconomic survey has covered refugees and asylum seekers. Furthermore, most of these
surveys are cross-sectional, where outcomes can only be monitored at a point in time despite rapid changes in living conditions.

The Somalia Displacement Phone Survey provides important information to support evidence-based programming and policy around forcibly displaced persons in Somalia. First, it offers comparable statistics for refugees, refugee returnees and other forcibly displaced populations, which will support outreach, targeting and programming efforts by humanitarian actors, including UNHCR.\(^4\) Second, it offers insights into the impacts on and responses of forcibly displaced persons to shocks, including the COVID-19 pandemic, drought and rapid increases in food prices that will be useful to the government, the World Bank, and other development agencies. Third, it provides a foundation for upcoming policy and strategy processes, including the NDSS, for which the revision processes will begin next year. Finally, it tests new tools and technology that can be adopted by SNBS and others for cost-effective data collecting using phone surveys.

Two survey rounds conducted from November 2021 to August 2022 yielded samples for five population groups: host communities for IDPs in and out of settlements, refugees and asylum seekers, and refugee returnees. Implementing by the World Bank in collaboration with UNHCR and in consultation with the SNBS this cost-effective phone-based survey aimed to follow the same respondents over a period of time. The first round of the survey was conducted between November 2021-March 2022, followed by a second round in July-August 2022. The sample consists of five population groups: (i) host communities, (ii) IDPs living in settlements, (iii) IDPs living outside settlements, (iv) refugees, and (v) refugee returnees. The survey provides a comprehensive snapshot of displaced households’ and host communities’ demographics, disabilities, housing characteristics, access to services, employment and income sources, shocks and coping mechanisms, food security, social cohesion, and displacement-specific sections on trajectories of displacement and intentions to move. Further discussion of the data and methodology is provided in Annex 2 (Data and Methodology) and the accompanying Methodology Note in this report.

\(^4\) Due to limited sample size, this report does not include spatial analyses across different indicators.
**BOX 3: SUMMARY OF POPULATION GROUPS (UNHCR, 2024)**

**Internally Displaced People (IDPs)**: It is estimated that around 75 percent of IDPs reside in urban areas, most in the more than 3,000 IDP settlements or in de facto slums that spread throughout cities (World Bank, 2021). Of these, 82 percent are in protracted displacement, and many have been displaced multiple times (OCHA, 2023). While drought is the most common cause of displacement for both those in and out of settlements, those in settlements are more likely to have suffered from the collapse of livelihoods and those out of settlements from armed conflict.

**Refugee returnees**: Refugee returnees are Somalis who returned to Somalia after living as refugees elsewhere. They are distinct from IDP returnees. Since January 2020, 8,993 Somali refugees have returned to Somalia, mostly from Kenya, including through voluntary and spontaneous return. The majority live in the southern border region of Lower Juba, as well as Bay and Banadir, occupying informal and peri-urban settlements, often alongside internally displaced populations.

**Refugees and asylum-seekers**: As of January 2024, Somalia hosted 38,463 refugees and asylum-seekers, mainly from Ethiopia (23,703), Yemen (10,166), and Syria (1,292). Most live in the urban areas of Woqooyi, Galbeed and Bari, interspersed with the national populations. The status and treatment of refugees in Somalia are governed by different legal frameworks depending on location within the country. Refugees and asylum seekers are generally permitted to access public education and health services, where they are available, and maintain the rights to freedom of movement and work. However, in practice, they are limited by the cultural and economic context.

**Host communities**: Host communities were selected based on the frequency of interaction with IDP populations, based on responses to the previous national phone survey (Somalia High Frequency Phone Survey) conducted by the World Bank in Somalia from June 2020 until October 2021. Households that reported interacting with IDPs at least once a month were sampled for the displacement survey.

---

5 In line with National Policy on refugee returnees and IDPs, IDPs in Somalia are defined as: Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to leave their original homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, clan-based or other forms of generalized violence and insecurity, development projects, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border; Persons or groups of persons who are forcibly evicted from their settlement, and who have no access to an adequate housing or land alternative or to appropriate compensation that would allow them to restore their lives in a sustainable manner; and Pastoralists who have lost access to their traditional nomadic living space through loss of livestock, or loss of access to grazing and water points or markets and have therefore left their habitual living space.
Key Findings

Forcibly displaced persons in Somalia face enormously challenging living conditions, which require dedicated focus on urbanization, social, and humanitarian policies. The vast number of IDPs, especially those in settlements, fare worse than host communities on nearly every indicator. These must be considered in urbanization and social and humanitarian policies.

Socioeconomic characteristics of the population

Household composition

Displaced Somali households tend to be larger than those in the host community and include more children – both of which correspond to higher vulnerability and poverty. IDPs and refugees live on average with 8.5 other household members, compared to around 6.2 for host community and refugee returnee households (Figure 2). In addition, displaced households are slightly more likely to have household members below the age of 18 years. Large households and households with larger shares of dependents (children and older people who cannot work, relative to the number of working-age adults) are shown to be at greater risk of poverty, according to the 2019 Somalia Poverty and Vulnerability Assessment (World Bank, 2019). These vulnerable households need targeted responses through social protection and other systems.

FIGURE 2 - AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY POPULATION GROUP

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

6 According to the Somali Health and Demographic Survey, the national average is 6.2 (SHDS, 2020) (Federal Government of Somalia, 2020).
Most households are headed by men, especially among refugees, whose household heads tend to be younger. Displaced households have a similar trend to that seen nationwide, where men head 58 percent of Somali households. Less than half of the households in the host community are headed by men, compared to more than half of the displaced households. Heads of refugees are younger than heads of Somali households. About 60 percent of the heads of refugee households are under 40 years, compared to 49 percent of hosts, 41 percent of IDPs in settlements, 54 percent of IDPs outside settlements and 39 percent of refugee returnee households (Figure 3). The average age of the household head for refugees is 38, while it is 42 for host communities, 43 for IDPs in settlements, 40 for IDPs out of settlements, and 44 for refugee returnees. The majority of household heads are married; however, Somali households have higher rates than refugee households (Host community – 80 percent; IDPs in settlements – 81 percent; IDPs out of settlements – 76 percent; Refugee returnees – 80 percent; Refugees – 64 percent). The comparatively high number of female-headed households is likely due to a range of factors, including the prolonged context of conflict and coping strategies like family splitting, where women may reside in IDP settlements as men look for other economic opportunities.

**Figure 3 - Age Distribution of Households Heads, by Population Groups**

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)
Educational attainment of heads of households

Heads of refugee households are the most likely to be educated, while heads of refugee returnees’ and IDPs in settlements households are the least likely to be educated. Every 7 of 10 heads of IDPs in settlements and refugee returnees’ households have no education, compared to 36 percent of refugees (Figure 4). About 23 percent of refugees have secondary or bachelor education, compared to 6 percent of IDPs in settlements, 7 percent of refugee returnees, 12 percent of hosts, and 17 percent of IDPs out of settlement. Further exploration is required to understand the relatively higher education level among IDPs out of settlements. One possible explanation is self-selection: IDPs with higher levels of education choose to live outside of settlements where there are more opportunities.

FIGURE 4 - EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY POPULATION GROUP

Disability

Disabilities are more commonly reported among heads of displaced households, male heads, and younger heads.\(^7\) The share of heads of households reporting any form of disability is largest among IDPs in settlements (20 percent), followed by refugee (19 percent) and refugee returnee (17 percent) households (Figure 5), mainly due to stated difficulty walking. These rates are higher than the national estimate of five percent from the SHDS or four to five percent from the SIHBS, which found similar rates for IDPs and non-IDPs, but are consistent with a survey of

\(^7\) Disability here is self-report, based on the six Washington Group Questions on Disability.
IDPs across 146 IDP sites led by UNHCR in Kismayo (UNHCR, 2022). Disability can impede integration into social and economic activities, consequently affecting household welfare, altering roles, and damaging interpersonal relationships in the family. Some of the recognized causes of disability in Somalia are landmines and explosive remnants of war, the collapse of the Somali health system, aging and congenital problems, and the high prevalence of female genital mutilation (Rohwerder, 2018).

**Figure 5 - Types of Disability Among Heads of Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Host Community</th>
<th>IDP in Settlement</th>
<th>IDP out of Settlement</th>
<th>Refugee-returnee</th>
<th>Refugee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing tasks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Other” aggregates the following categories: “Remembering”, “Performing tasks”, and “Communicating”

**Source:** Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

Housing, water and sanitation and education and health services

**Housing and shelter**

Access to improved housing is very low among displaced Somali households and their host communities, especially among IDPs in settlements, while occupancy status varies across the groups. More than 80 percent of displaced Somali and host community households live in shelters constructed with unimproved materials such as mud, sticks, and plastics, even though the majority are roofed with corrugated iron sheets. This is greater among IDPs in settlements

---

8 Improved housing includes shelters constructed with improved materials such as cement, stone with lime/cement, bricks, wood planks/shingles, metal, adobe (SHDS).
where about 57 percent of the households live in buul. The type of flooring used in a house can indicate the lifestyle of its inhabitants. More than half of displaced Somali and host community households have mud floors, with IDPs in settlements the most likely to live in shelters with mud floors (Host community – 65 percent; IDPs in settlement – 77 percent; IDPs out of settlements – 59 percent, Refugee-returnees – 61 percent). On the other hand, improved housing is higher among refugee households, where the majority live in rented houses constructed with stones/bricks and cement floors. Comparatively, about half of host community households live in their own shelters, and 63 percent of IDPs in settlements are hosted without rent by friends, relatives, or institutions (Figure 6). This is consistent with the findings of the Housing, Land, and Property sub-cluster (NRC, 2016). According to the Internal Displacement Profiling in Mogadishu (2016), most of the studied population indicated living in their dwelling for free, either independently or with others. IDP participants in the Focus Group Discussions (FGD) of the same study explained “free living” as paying the landlord collectively when they settle in an area and providing a portion of any humanitarian or other type of assistance, they receive (UNHCR, 2016).

---

9 Huts in Somalia are referred to as buuls.
Water and sanitation

Across all population groups, most households have access to improved drinking water sources, although the quantity is often insufficient. Universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all is one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and a target outlined in the Somalia’s NDP 2020-2024. The source of drinking water for a household determines how safe it is to drink. According to the survey, most Somali households drink from improved drinking water sources, with the primary water source being public tap/borehole (host community – 53 percent; IDPs in settlement – 65 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 57 percent; refugee returnee – 56 percent). About 30 percent of refugees drink from unimproved sources, mainly tanker trucks and donkey cart providers, which is relatively higher than other groups (19 percent for refugee returnees, 15 percent for IDPs, and 20 percent for host community). A considerable number of households report not having sufficient drinking water to meet their needs, with access deteriorating significantly for host communities in Round 2 and a lower decline for IDPs out of settlement and refugees (Figure 7). While the leading cause of insufficient drinking water reported by Somalis is a decrease in water availability, the main reason for refugees is

---

Sources that are likely to provide uncontaminated water that is suitable for drinking are known as improved water sources. They include piped water into dwelling, plot or yard; piped water into neighbor’s plot; public tap; tube well/borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; and rainwater. Unimproved water source includes unprotected wells/springs, surface water, vendor-provided water, bottled water and tanker truck-provided water (WHO).
unaffordability. The time taken to walk to the main source of water from the dwelling place is lower for displaced households, especially IDPs, than the host community households. Almost half of the displaced households (IDPs in settlement – 51%; IDPs out of settlement – 48%, Refugee-returnee – 45%, Refugee – 42%) can access the main source of water within 10 minutes or less, compared to 28% of the hosts.

**Figure 7 - Proportion of Households with Sufficient Drinking Water to Meet Household Needs**

![Figure 7](image_url)

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

The majority of households have access to improved sanitation, even though sharing toilet facilities is very common across all population groups. Access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and ending open defecation are fundamental human rights, as outlined in the SDGs and the Somalia NDG. More than 70 percent of Somali households have access to improved sanitation, higher than the refugee rate of 61 percent (Figure 8). Pit-latrines (with slab or flush into pit-latrine) are more frequently used by host community households and IDPs out of settlements. More refugee households than Somali households use pit-latrines without slabs, which may account for their lower access to improved sanitation. Despite the high access to improved toilet facilities, sharing of these toilet facilities is very common, especially among IDPs.

---

11 Improved sanitation includes flush or pour-flush to piped sewer system, septic tank pit latrines, ventilated-improved pit latrines, or pit latrines with slab or composting toilets. Flush or pour-flush to elsewhere, pit latrines without slabs or open pits, bucket latrines, hanging latrines or open defecation are not considered to be improved sanitation (WHO).
in settlements and refugee households. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), shared facilities are not considered to be improved. Shared sanitation facilities are often poorly maintained, dissuading regular use and potentially increasing disease risk, risk of sexual assault, and lost opportunities for education and work.

**FIGURE 8 - TYPE OF SANITATION BY POPULATION GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host community</th>
<th>IDP in settlement</th>
<th>IDP out settlement</th>
<th>Refugee-returnee</th>
<th>Refugee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved (not shared)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved (Shared)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimproved</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facility/bush/field</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

**Education**

Somalia has one of the world’s highest proportions of children out of school. According to the Somalia Integrated Household Budget Survey (SIHBS, 2022), only 25 percent of all primary school-aged children in Somalia attend primary school, less than half the low-income Sub-Saharan countries’ average of 74 percent. Attendance rate is not significantly different between rural and urban populations (27.9 percent and 27.7 percent, respectively). However, nomadic children have an extremely low attendance rate (5.2 percent). At the secondary level, discrepancies exist with urban children more likely to attend school than rural and nomadic children, and the attendance rate decreases to 11.6 percent. School attendance in Somalia is characterized by late enrollment, which seems to be explained by the perception of Somali parents regarding the age at which children should attend school. According to the Somalia

---

12 The rates of improved sanitation are higher than what is found in the SIHBS. One possible explanation is that this survey covers households with a mobile phone, which is associated with higher levels of income.
Poverty and Vulnerability Assessment, the net enrollment rates for children aged 6-9 years ranged between 22 and 30 percent for the different population groups. This suggests that many Somali children do not start school at age 6. According to the same report, 73 percent of parents said their children between 6 and 9 years old are not enrolled in school because they are too young.

**About 3 out of 10 households with children aged 7-17 do not send them to school, and girls are less likely to attend school than boys.** Around 6 in 10 host community households report sending their children to school, similar to IDPs in settlements and refugees but lower than refugee returnees (70 percent) and IDPs outside settlements (70 percent). This underscores the sizable portion of households with children not attending school.\(^\text{13}\) Among refugees in Somaliland, UNHCR administrative records show that around 40 percent of students are enrolled in school. The findings from wave 2 of the SHFS show that only 30 percent of IDPs in settlement children aged 6-13 attended primary school, while 36 percent of those aged 14-17 attended secondary school. While there is gender parity at the primary level, differences between boys and girls are more pronounced at the secondary level. Among Somali households, girls living in displaced households are less likely to attend school than boys (Figure 12). Among refugee returnees and IDPs outside of settlements, the number of households with girls not attending school is three times those with boys not attending school, while for IDPs in settlements, this is two. There is very little difference by gender in the host community.

**For boys and girls, the main reason for not attending school is the cost of school fees.** When asked why children are not attending school, more than 60 percent of the households cited the cost of school. (Figure 9). The lack of an available school is also commonly cited by host communities.\(^\text{14}\) Another common reason for not attending school is family responsibilities (working to support household expenses or taking care of family members), while marriage/pregnancy was common among IDPs out of settlement. According to UNHCR, refugees’ challenges with enrollment included struggles with the language of instruction (especially for Yemini students), different curricula, and perceptions of safety and quality in public schools. Distance to school was

\(^\text{13}\) The differences in school attendance rates reported in this report and other reports could be explained by the difference in the methodology of the data collection. While in this report, the question is asked at the household level: are there any children of age 7-17 who are not attending school currently, in other surveys, the questions are specifically asked about each child in the household: is (name) currently attending school.

\(^\text{14}\) The host community sample is more likely to include rural areas and nomads, where distance to school is higher than camps or urban areas.
also highlighted as a challenge, with public schools lacking support for student transportation, yet this finding did not come out as strongly in the survey results. Returned refugees benefit from time-bound assistance for a year, after which there are high reports of dropouts.\textsuperscript{15} Some refugee returnee children are reported to have returned to Kenya to continue their education.

\textbf{FIGURE 9 - REASONS WHY CHILDREN ARE NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure9}
\caption{Reasons why children are not attending school}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round (2022)}

\textbf{Health}

\textbf{Prolonged conflicts, political instability, and extreme weather crises have weakened Somalia’s health system, leaving host and displaced populations with limited access and high costs.} Healthcare in Somalia is concentrated mainly in the private sector due to the collapse of the public health sector during the civil war, with limited access to remote areas. Nationally, fewer than 30 percent of Somalis have access to health services, and only 11 percent of children receive basic vaccinations (Osman, 2022). A considerable number of households reported at least one member of their households fell sick in the last month, with refugees the most likely to fall sick and fewer than half of those being able to access care and medicine (Figure 10). Across all population groups, the main reason cited by most households for not being able to buy medicine is cost.

\textsuperscript{15} This is based on reports from UNHCR. Due to the limited level of disaggregation and depth of the questionnaire, it is not possible to validate using the data.
Vaccination rates against COVID-19 rose significantly between survey rounds but remain low compared to global rates. Overall, the number of respondents who received at least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine rose from 20 percent in Round 1 to 42 percent in Round 2 but remains lower than the global rate of 72 percent as of March 2023. Initially, only 3 percent of host community members reported being fully vaccinated, rising to 21 percent in the second round. Refugees and IDPs in settlements are considered the most likely population groups to have been vaccinated (Figure 11). Most respondents cited the lack of availability of vaccines as the primary reason for not getting vaccinated – however, some also expressed concerns about safety and efficacy.

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)
Figure 11 - Number of respondents that have been vaccinated against COVID-19

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 1 and 2 (2021-2022)
Even within the difficult context of Somalia, the survey results show that forcibly displaced persons face difficult and precarious living conditions – with the vast number of IDPs, especially those in settlements, faring worse than host communities on nearly every indicator.

This is consistent with findings from the recent SIHBS 2022, which substantiates the gap between IDPs and non-IDPs regarding access to urban services. IDPs are less likely to be enrolled in primary, secondary, and tertiary schools or have access to electricity or improved sanitation. However, their rates of access to improved water are nearly comparable. This is similar to early findings from World Bank research that 63 percent of IDPs and 45 percent of the host population are identified as multidimensionally poor (Admasu, 2021).
Employment and sources of income

Employment

In both survey rounds, fewer than half of the respondents worked the week before the survey, and the rate was lower in Round 2, except for the IDPs living outside the settlements.\footnote{We asked for the employment status of the respondent. Note that this is the limitation of a phone survey since it is difficult to elicit the employment status for all household members over the phone. The statistics in this section are therefore only relevant for the respondent. The question asked was: “Last week, that is from Monday up to Sunday, did you do any work for pay, do any kind of business, farming or other activity to generate income, even if only for one hour?”} From wave 2 of the SHFS, the pre-Covid employment rate was 45 percent for the Somali population, and it was comparable for the urban, rural, IDP in settlements and nomadic populations. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the national employment rate fell to 39 percent in 2020 before slightly rising to 49 percent in 2021 (World Bank, 2022). This survey shows that the proportions of working respondents for displaced population and their host communities are lower. Across all population groups, less than 40 percent of respondents of working age worked the week before the survey. The proportion of working respondents decreased slightly between rounds except for IDPs outside settlements. Refugee returnees are the population group most likely to work and to have had a reduction in Round 2 compared to other population groups. In Round 1, about 41 percent of refugee returnees worked, compared to 33 percent of host communities, 32 percent of IDPs in settlements, 29 percent of IDPs outside settlements, and 33 percent for refugees. For Round 2, however, the proportion of working respondents is similar across all population groups (31 percent).

Work modality varies significantly among the population groups. Paid employment is most prevalent among refugees, while farming/caring for livestock is most prevalent among host communities. About 82 percent of working refugee respondents are paid employees, more likely to be daily or casual workers than long-term paid employees. While their daily/casual workers are mainly employed in the construction (25 percent) and personal service (22 percent) sectors, long-term paid refugee employees are more likely to be professionals (39 percent) or provide personal services (22 percent). On the other hand, agriculture and livestock is the main work modalities for host communities, IDPs outside settlements, and refugee returnee respondents. Host community respondents are the most likely to own businesses (second most reported work modality), followed by IDPs out of settlements and refugee returnees, while refugees are the least likely to
own businesses. Self-employed host community respondents are most likely to be involved in buying and selling (30 percent), transportation (16 percent), and construction (15 percent). In contrast, self-employed IDPs primarily work in the agriculture and manufacturing sectors. Long-term paid refugee returnee employees mainly work in the construction sector (34 percent) or are professionals (31 percent). For IDPs in settlements, most of the working respondents are paid employees, primarily working in the agriculture sector as casual/daily workers or as long-term employed professionals.

**Lack of skills and documents are the main factors preventing respondents from getting a (better) job.** Most respondents search for a job through relatives (53 percent) and friends (43 percent). Only a few respondents search for jobs through NGOs or government organizations (7 percent), with the host community the most likely to use this medium (14 percent). The higher use of family and relatives in job searches may be explained by the fact that many jobs in Somalia are not widely advertised, and employers tend to overlook job candidates who do not have the right personal connections (Karamba, 2021). Considering the barriers to jobs, for Somali households, the lack of skills is the most cited factor that prevents them from getting a job, while lack of documentation was the second most cited factor (Figure 12). The higher mention of lack of skills and lack of documents as barriers to getting a better job may be linked to their low level of education. Having appropriate education documentation is crucial for securing better job opportunities in Somalia. About 62 percent of those who cited lack of skills or lack of documents have never attended school. A considerable number of displaced Somalis also mentioned language. For refugees, not knowing relevant languages and skills were the most cited barriers to finding a better job. They also experienced discrimination when looking for a job. Compared to Somalis, lack of skills may be less of an obstacle for refugees, given their higher educational attainment.
Sources of livelihood

Host communities, IDPs, and refugee returnees rely on agriculture as their primary source of livelihood, while refugees rely on wage employment.\(^\text{17}\) Agriculture (crop farming, livestock rearing or fishery) was the most common livelihood source among host communities and IDPs outside settlements in both survey rounds (Figure 13). This is not surprising as most of them work in the agriculture sector. In Round 1, IDPs in settlements and refugee returnees reported wage employment as their main livelihood source, but in Round 2, family farming, livestock or fish rearing became their main source of livelihood. This could be explained by the refugee returnees’ transition from paid employment in Round 1 to agriculture in Round 2, whereas for IDPs living in settlements, paid employment still serves as the primary mode of employment with a sizable portion of paid workers employed in the agriculture sector (Figure 14). For refugees, aid

\(^{17}\) Total income is the sum of labor and nonlabor income. Labor income consists of income from employment and running one’s own business, both agricultural and nonagricultural. Nonlabor income consists of public and private transfers such as assistance from the family, and humanitarian and development aid and assistance. In this survey, we asked about three sources of labor income: (i) wage employment; (ii) income from farming, livestock and/or fishing; and (iii) nonfarm family business as well as three sources of nonlabor income. These include: (i) assistance from nonfamily members; (ii) assistance from family members; and (iii) aid.
(assistance from non-governmental agencies) is reported to be the most important source of livelihood (27 percent) in both survey rounds, but wage employment was more frequently reported in Round 2 (35 percent). (See Annex 3 Overview of Humanitarian Food and Non-food Assistance for details on the assistance provided to different population groups.)
**Figure 16 - Top Four Sources of Livelihood IDPs Out of Settlement**

- Farm, livestock, fish: 28% (Round 1), 37% (Round 2)
- Wage employment: 24% (Round 1), 21% (Round 2)
- Family business (non-farm): 18% (Round 1), 16% (Round 2)
- Family/Friends Assistance (in Somalia): 13% (Round 1), 21% (Round 2)

**Figure 17 - Top Four Sources of Livelihood Refugees**

- Aid (UN, NGOs): 38% (Round 1), 35% (Round 2)
- Non-family Assistance: 27% (Round 1), 23% (Round 2)
- Wage employment: 23% (Round 1), 35% (Round 2)
- Family business (non-farm): 20% (Round 1), 7% (Round 2)
Shocks, coping mechanisms, and social safety nets

Shocks are common and contribute to vulnerability and poverty in Somalia. The SIHBS 2022 found that the three top types of shocks experienced by households in the 24 months preceding the interview were significant rises in food prices (52.4 percent), drought or severe water shortage (47.3 percent), and the death of livestock (14.6 percent). The type of shock differed by geographical area – rural and nomads are most likely to be affected by climate-related stocks such as drought/severe water shortages, livestock death (especially nomads), and agricultural shocks (especially rural households). In contrast, urban areas are affected by a broader spectrum of shocks, such as significant rises in the prices of food and conflict. The SHFS 2017/18 also shows that poorer households were more likely to experience more than one shock, exacerbating their vulnerabilities.

Most households were exposed to shocks, especially twin economic and natural shocks. Almost all displaced families and their host communities reported having experienced some form of shock in the first two months of 2022 (Host community – 98 percent; IDPs in settlement – 98 percent; IDPs out of settlements – 97 percent; Refugee-returnees – 98 percent; Refugees – 97 percent). The most common types of shock experienced by households were economic, natural, and food price shocks. On average, nine in ten households reported experiencing economic or natural shocks, while around eight in ten cited increases in food prices. Only the refugee population stood out, with fewer (58 percent) references to the natural shock, perhaps due to their location in the country or urban setting. Among all groups, security and health shocks were less common (between 25 and 40 percent).

Without formal safety net mechanisms, most households relied on personal means to cope with the shocks. For IDPs and refugee returnees this included assistance from family and friends, loans, and reduced consumption. Humanitarian aid, sale of assets, and savings were less commonly used. For host communities, loans from family and friends were more common, in contrast to refugees, who relied first on reduced consumption and then assistance from family and friends.
Impact of the drought on households

The recent unprecedented crisis in Somalia has been driven by consecutive seasons of poor rainfall since 2015. By nature, Somalia has an arid and semi-arid climate, with two major rainfall seasons—the main Gu rains from April to June and the short Deyr rains from October to December. Somalia has been experiencing historic droughts following consecutive failed rainy seasons for decades. Regarding intensity and spatial/temporal distribution, the performance of the 2022 Gu season rainfall between April and June ranged from 40 – 70 percent below average across most parts of Somalia (FSNAU, 2022). This marked a fourth consecutive failed rainy season since late 2020. More than 80 percent of Somalia faced severe to extreme drought conditions comparable to 2010/11 and 2016/17.18 Moderate rain in July slightly improved the drought conditions slightly in the southern coastal areas and Awdal region. However, the severity of the drought worsened in other places, characterized by hot, dry weather, leaving 90 percent of the country in arid conditions.

Almost all Somali households reported experiencing drought since September 2021. To capture the scale and the impact of drought, households were asked in the second round of data collection if they had experienced any drought since September 2021 and, if so, what kind of damage they had suffered due to the drought. Except for refugees, more than 90 percent of all other population groups reported that they were affected by the drought. The number was the highest among IDPs in and out of settlements (Host community – 93 percent; IDPs in settlement – 97 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 95 percent; Refugee returnees – 93 percent). A lower but still considerable number of refugee households reported to have been affected by the drought (57 percent). This may be explained by the fact refugees are less likely to engage in livestock rearing or crop farming, making them less likely to be impacted by the drought.

Poor yields, loss of livestock and other assets, and death/illness were among the losses suffered by households due to the drought. The most common loss suffered by Somali households was livestock, especially among the host community and IDPs out of settlement.

18 Somalia has experienced three major drought crises in the past decade in 2010/11, 2016/17, and 2021/22.
About 40 percent of those who reported livestock loss experienced either severe or complete destruction. The damage was especially severe among host communities and IDPs, as approximately 40 percent of them reported either severe or complete destruction of the livestock. Most of the livestock lost due to the drought were cattle and goats. Since July 2021, about 3 million livestock countrywide have died due to poor pasture conditions and water scarcity brought on by the drought (IPC, 2022-2023). For refugees, loss of other assets was the most cited impact of the drought (46 percent), while one in four reported poor yields. Refugee households also experienced higher rates of illness or death (23 percent), compared to an average of eight percent among Somali households.

The impact on crop farming was especially severe among the host community and IDPs. About 40 percent of the respondents were engaged or planning to engage in farming in the six months preceding the interview. Displaced Somali households are the most likely to engage in farming, while refugees are the least likely to do so (Host community – 36 percent; IDPs in settlement – 49 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 44 percent; Refugee returnees – 44 percent; Refugees – 20 percent). About 80 percent of those engaged in farming in the six months preceding the survey reported that they had to change their farming activities due to drought. Among them, 64 percent of host community households and nearly 50 percent of IDPs and refugee returnees reported abandoning crop farming due to the drought.

Regarding drought-specific support, the survey results show that around one-third of households had received assistance at the time of final survey round in July-August 2022. Less than 30 percent of the households who experienced drought reported receiving some assistance, except for IDPs in settlement, where 42 percent reported receiving it. Among those receiving assistance, food was by far the most common type for all groups, with IDPs out of settlement and refugee returnees the most likely to have received this form of assistance (Figure 18). Host community households were the most likely to get cash assistance (62 percent), the second most prevalent type of assistance across all population groups. According to UNHCR, certain eligibility criteria using a vulnerability assessment were applied to identify the most

---

19 According to UNOCHA, humanitarian partners reached 7.3 million people of a target of 7.6 million persons (96 percent) with some form of assistance by the end of 2022. Much of this assistance came in the last quarter of the year, following the survey. UNHCR, for its part, contributed to the overall inter-agency drought response scale-up, reaching more than half a million vulnerable forcefully displaced people with protection, shelter, non-food items, cash, and camp coordination and camp management (CCCM) assistance.
vulnerable as eligible and needing assistance. The lower percentage of respondents receiving aid may be explained by the possibility that these respondents were not eligible or that the assessment or assistance was provided after the survey.

**Figure 18 - Type of assistance received for the drought**

Most commonly, this assistance comes from the UN and NGOs. Except for the host communities, which received their food assistance mainly from NGOs, the majority of displaced households received food assistance from UN organizations (Figure 19). In response to the high food insecurity in the country, the World Food Program (WFP) provided food and nutrition assistance to about 9.8 million people in 2022 through cash-based transfers and in-kind food assistance.20 However, due to funding gaps, WFP focused on IPC phases 4 & 5, the recently displaced, refugees, asylum seekers, returnees, and the nutritionally vulnerable in the most affected areas to ensure that aid reaches those who need it most. For cash assistance, except for IDPs in settlements, who mostly received support from NGOs, the majority of households got cash assistance from UN organizations (Figure 20). Drought-affected households in Somalia may have benefited from several cash transfer programs, such as the Somali Cash Consortium (funded by the European Union), the National Cash Program – Baxnaano (funded by the World Bank) and the Minimum Response Package (by UN agencies).

---

20 Impacts of the Cost of Inaction on WFP Food Assistance in Somalia (2021 & 2022)
Inflation and rise in prices

Most households reported increasing food prices, driven by the drought and global economy. According to Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit (FSNAU) - Somalia, compared to the five-year average, prices of most imported foods in August 2022 were higher in most regions of Somalia, mainly due to speculation on the international market. At the same time, local cereal and livestock prices were substantially higher (40-112 percent for cereal, 11-49 percent for livestock) in most regions due to reduced cereal supply, deterioration of health of livestock, and declining herd sizes caused by prolonged drought and global food price crisis due to Russian invasion of Ukraine. These effects were felt widely among displaced households, with more than 60 percent perceiving an increase in food prices in the 12 months preceding the survey (Figure 21). Refugee households appeared especially vulnerable to price increases, with 65 percent
experiencing significant increases in price and 19 percent suggesting they had gone up somewhat. Host community populations also had high levels of exposure to price changes, with 53 percent and 15 percent saying prices had gone up a lot or somewhat.

**FIGURE 21 - PERCEPTION ON CHANGES IN PRICE IN THE 12 MONTHS PRECEDING THE SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Went up a lot</th>
<th>Went up somewhat</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Went down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-returnee</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP out of settlement</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP in settlement</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)*

**Food and food security**

**Access to staple foods**

*Access to staple food has decreased slightly for households in the host community and IDPs in settlements.* Even though a majority of households were able to buy staple food in the seven days preceding the interview, access to staple food was more challenging among displaced populations compared to host communities. Across all population groups, host communities were the most likely to be able to buy staple food in the week preceding the interview, and refugees were the least likely to be able to do so (Host community – 86 percent; IDPs in settlements – 82 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 85 percent; Refugee-returnees – 83 percent; Refugees – 79 percent). Access to staple food decreased for host communities and IDPs in settlements between Round 1 and Round 2. These population groups were most likely to depend on agriculture for livelihood in Round 1 (Figure 22).
Lack of affordability and increased prices are the main reasons for not being able to access staple food. In Round 1, the main reason given by households for not being able to buy staple food is lack of money or affordability. Fewer households, mostly refugee returnees and refugee households, reported the price increase. However, in Round 2, the number of those who reported an increase in food price increased significantly, especially for the host community and IDP households. This could be explained by the price increases. For host community and IDP outside settlement, the increase in prices is the main reason they could not buy staple food in Round 2. For instance, only 1 percent of host communities reported price increases as a reason for being unable to access food in Round 1, while it increased to 66 percent in Round 2.

Prevalence of food insecurity

Prolonged drought and high food prices exacerbated by conflict and insecurity have worsened food insecurity in Somalia. Between July and September 2022, about 26 percent of the Somali population (4.3 million) experienced crisis or, worse, acute food insecurity (IPC Phase 3 or above) (IPC, 2022-2023). Between October and December 2022, this number had risen to 5.6 million, among which 1.5 million people were classified as emergency (IPC Phase 4) and
214,000 in catastrophe (IPC Phase 5). A significant increase in multi-sectoral humanitarian aid, aided by rainfall performance that was slightly better than anticipated, has improved food security and nutrition moderately. But the situation remains dire. The current analysis shows that from January to March 2023, about 5 million Somalis were experiencing high levels of acute food insecurity, with an estimated 6.5 million between April and June 2023 due to expected below-average to poor rainfall, and high food prices exacerbated by conflict/insecurity and disease outbreaks (IPC, 2023). Although funding for humanitarian food assistance has increased since July 2022 and is currently enough to reach, on average, 6.2 million people per month throughout March, between April and June 2023, the confirmed funding would only be enough to help about 2.7 million people—roughly half the current beneficiaries.

**Box 5: Household Hunger Scale**

To measure the incidence of food insecurity among the studied population, the Household Hunger Scale (HHS) is used. The HHS is a household food deprivation scale for measuring household hunger (FANTA, 2011). The HHS is different from the other household food insecurity indicators as it assesses only the most severe experiences of food insecurity. The HHS is based on three different occurrence questions over the last 30 days and three frequency-of-occurrence questions. The occurrence questions asked are: i) Has the household experienced a complete absence of food in the house? ii) Has any household member gone to bed hungry? iii) Has a household member not eaten for a whole day due to lack of money or other resources? If the respondent answers yes to any of the occurrence questions, the frequency-of-occurrence question is asked—how often a reported condition occurred during the 30 days: rarely (1-2 days), sometimes (3-10 days), or often (more than 10 days). The resulting responses are first transformed to a continuous indicator (0-2) for each of the six questions: those who answer “No” to the occurrence questions are scored 0, while those who answered “rarely or sometimes” to the frequency occurrence questions are scored 1, and “often” are scored 2. The scores for each question are summed up, and the total HHS score ranges from 0 to 6. Households are then categorized as: little to no hunger (0-1), moderate hunger (2-3), severe hunger (4-6).
According to the HHS, one in ten refugee households suffers from severe hunger, while half of the studied households suffer from moderate hunger. The situation remains dire for most of the groups and has deteriorated for IDP households (Figure 23). The number of IDP households living outside settlements suffering from moderate hunger increased significantly between November 2021 and August 2022 (32 percent to 45 percent), while the number slightly increased for host communities and IDPs in settlements and remained the same for refugee returnees. Nearly no Somali households experienced severe hunger during either period, compared to 14 percent in November 2021 and 16 percent in August 2022 for refugee households. The socioeconomic impact of the pandemic, difficulties in finding employment (due to legal status and language barrier), and rapid increases in the price of food in urban areas where they reside could be the contributing factors to high food insecurity among refugee households.

**Figure 23 - Levels of Food Security as Measured by the Household Hunger Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host community</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP in settlement</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP out of settlement</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-returned</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Rounds 1 and 2 (2021 – 2022)*

Compared to households with income from other sources, those with agricultural income are more likely to experience high food insecurity. The stability and reliability of livelihood sources significantly affect food security. We explore the relationship between the two main sources of livelihood—agriculture and wage employment and food security. Households with livelihood sources from agriculture are more likely to be food insecure than those with income sources from non-agriculture sources (Figure 24). This aligns with other studies that find that agricultural households have a higher prevalence of food insecurity than non-agricultural
households in low-income countries. Such disparities could be due to limited access to productive resources, climate change impacts, high dependance on rain, lack of market access and price volatility, limited diversification, and agriculture practices. Given the effects of drought on households and the high prevalence of subsistence-agricultural households (90 percent of farmers are subsistence farmers) among the studied population, it is unsurprising that agricultural households are more food insecure. Similarly, households with main livelihood sources from wage employment are more food secure than those with livelihood sources from non-wage employment.

**FIGURE 24 - LEVELS OF FOOD SECURITY (HOUSEHOLD HUNGER SCALE) AMONG AGRICULTURAL AND NON-AGRICULTURE HOUSEHOLDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Non-Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host community</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP in settlement</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP out of settlement</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-returnee</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** REFUGEES ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE ANALYSIS AS VERY FEW HAVE AGRICULTURE AS THEIR MAIN SOURCE OF LIVELIHOOD (FIGURE 29)

**SOURCE:** SOMALIA PHONE SURVEY – ROUND 2 (2021 - 2022)

**Agricultural households who own livestock experienced lower food insecurity.** About 48 percent of the households reported owning some livestock (host community – 49 percent; IDPs in settlement – 38 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 49 percent; refugee returnees – 42 percent; refugees – 10 percent). The most common types of livestock owned are goats (36 percent), chickens (23 percent), and sheep (21 percent). We explore the levels of food security among households that own livestock and those that do not own any livestock. Regardless of the population group, those households who own livestock have lower food insecurity rates than those who do not own any livestock. This corroborates the existing literature emphasizing the

---

21 See for example: (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2020); (Joshi, 2018); (Kassa, 2015)
importance of livestock as a means of smoothing consumption especially in an environment where external shocks constantly hit households. However, households face a trade-off between using livestock assets to either smooth the effect of shocks or protect future income generation.

Social cohesion and perception of safety

Social cohesion

Maintaining social cohesion in Somalia is essential for building a more stable, inclusive, and resilient society where displaced and non-displaced households can thrive and contribute to the country’s recovery and development. Ongoing drought and protracted insecurity, which have led to a deteriorating humanitarian situation in Somalia, have increased pressure on water, food, and basic services. About nine in ten Somali households lack access to at least one dimension – livelihoods, electricity, education, water, and sanitation (PRESOCO, 2021). The continuous influx of IDPs and refugee returnees into certain areas, limited access to services and perception of unequal treatment often creates competition over resources, resulting in tension between displaced populations and their host communities.

Every four out of ten households who have seen pastoralists moving into their locality reported experiencing problematic interactions with those pastoralists. Half of the households reported seeing pastoralists moving into their locality due to the drought. Among the population groups, IDPs in settlements are the most likely to have seen pastoralists move into their locality (Host community – 49 percent; IDPs in settlement – 58 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 53 percent; Refugee returnee – 53 percent; Refugee – 46 percent) and they are also the most likely to report experiencing a problem interacting with those pastoralists, followed by IDPs out of settlements and refugees (Host community – 39 percent; IDPs in settlement – 49 percent; IDPs out of settlement – 47 percent; Refugee returnee – 41 percent; Refugee – 43 percent).

Overall, the majority of displaced populations would describe their interaction with the host community and other displaced populations as good. In contrast, about 16 percent of the hosts are uncomfortable with displaced populations living in their neighborhoods mainly due to economic and labor-related reasons. From Wave 1, 48 percent of hosts reported they are comfortable with IDPs, refugee returnees or refugees living in their neighborhood while 34 percent are indifferent. For those who reported not being comfortable, the reasons given were

---

22 See for example (Acosta, 2021)"
economic/labor related reasons (30 percent), COVID-related reasons (29 percent), and other health-related concerns (26 percent). Only 11 percent and two percent mentioned security/safety-related concerns and cultural/religious differences, respectively. Refugees are the most likely to describe their interaction with the other population as bad (Refugees – 13 percent; IDPs out of settlements – two percent; IDPs in settlements – one percent)

Perception of safety

For all population groups, the perception of unsafety increased significantly in the time between the two rounds of survey. However, refugees are the least likely to feel safe. In Round 2, more respondents said they didn’t always feel safe at home or on the streets, particularly among the displaced population. Even though refugees are the most likely to feel unsafe, the rates of increase in unsafety between Round 1 and Round 2 are higher among Somali households than refugee households. Among all population groups, the rates of respondents who feel unsafe on the street are higher than those reporting feeling unsafe at home. The increase in respondents who feel unsafe between the two data collection rounds may be explained by the worsening drought conditions between the two survey rounds. According to a UNHCR study on the impact of drought on protection in Somalia, the worsening drought and increased food insecurity between 2021 and 2022 have exacerbated the existing threats to physical safety and other life-threatening protection risks for Somali women, children and men (UNHCR, 2021-2022). Also, as reported by the Protection Cluster in September 2022, sexual abuse and exploitation, rape, and intimate partner violence are continuously increasing amidst the prevailing drought, especially in Bakool, Bay, Banadir, Galgaduud, Gedo, Hiraan, Lower Juba, Middle Juba, Mudug, Nugaal, Sool and Togdheer regions of Somalia and Somaliland (UNHCR, 2022).

Among displaced populations, refugees are the most likely to feel displaced populations are not safe/secure in Somalia. While 71 percent of refugees feel they are safe or secure in Somalia, more than 90 percent of displaced Somalis (IDPs and refugee returnees) share this opinion (Figure 26). Compared to less than 5 percent of the other displaced population, about 12 percent of refugees feel that the displaced population is not at all safe or secure in Somalia. Different population groups have given different reasons why they feel displaced people are unsafe or insecure in Somalia. Refugees feel unsafe/unsecured more so than internally displaced Somalis, primarily because of political issues, as opposed to economic and social problems for displaced Somalis (Figure 27).
Figure 25 - Description of Interaction with the Non-Displaced and Other Displaced Populations in the Community

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 1 (2021-2022)

Figure 26 - Proportion of Respondents That Feel Displaced Populations Are Secure/Safe in Somalia

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 1 (2021-2022)
FIGURE 27 - REASONS WHY THEY FEEL DISPLACED POPULATIONS ARE UNSAFE IN SOMALIA

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 1 (2021-2022)
Trajectories of displacement and intentions to return

Natural disasters are the most likely cause of displacement for IDPs, while refugees have fled armed conflict, discrimination, and persecution. IDPs are more likely to be displaced from the region they currently live in – 53 percent have been displaced from the same district, while 26 percent were displaced from different districts but the same region they reside in now. Most IDPs cited drought, floods, and other natural disasters as the primary causes of their displacement (Figure 28). For refugees, the main reasons for displacement are armed conflict and discrimination/persecution. While Yemenis fled mainly because of armed conflicts (82 percent), Ethiopians were displaced because of discrimination and persecution (58 percent). According to UNHCR’s registration database, the average refugee in Somalia has lived there for 6 years. Ethiopian refugees have stayed longer in Somalia than Yeminis refugees (seven years vs. five years). While 69 percent of Ethiopian refugees arrived after 2014, 99 percent of Yemenis refugees arrived after 2014. The year with the highest arrival rate for Ethiopians is 2021 (13 percent) while the majority of Yemeni refugees (33 percent) arrived in 2015.

**FIGURE 28 - REASONS FOR DISPLACEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Armed conflict</th>
<th>Drought / flood / natural disasters</th>
<th>Collapse of livelihood or economic circumstances</th>
<th>Discrimination and persecution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP out of camp</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP in camp</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

**FACING PAGE IMAGE -** Women and children at the Kaharey camp for internally displaced people in Dollow, Somalia. The catastrophic drought ravaging Somalia is putting whole communities on the brink of famine. Many thousands have been forced to flee their homes in search of food, shelter and safe drinking water.
Safety, livelihood opportunities, and food security are very important to refugees in informing intention to return to their countries of origin. About 56 percent of refugee households intend to leave Somalia at some point. However, only 36 percent of these households intend to return to their country of origin, while 20 percent would want to go to another location. Yemenis are more likely to return to their home country than Ethiopians (66 percent vs. 10 percent). About 44 percent do not intend to move out of Somalia. Those who do not intend to go back to their home country would do so if it is safe to do so, if there are livelihood opportunities, and the food security situation improves in their home countries (Figure 30).

Figure 29 - Year of Arrival of Ethiopian and Yemenis Refugees into Somalia

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

Figure 30 - What Would Make Refugees Who Do Not Want to Return to Their Home Country Do So

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)
**Improved security conditions in Somalia are a major reason for Somali refugees to return.**

Between 2021 and 2023, Somalia received about 5,583 Somali refugee returnees, 72 percent of which were spontaneous returns, and the remaining 28 percent assisted (UNHCR 2023). Most refugee returnees came from Yemen (82 percent), while 13 percent came from Kenya. However, of the refugee returnees covered in this report, 54 percent arrived in 2017, 17 percent in 2018, and 12 percent in 2016. Most of them have also returned to their hometown (92 percent). The few who did not return to their hometown did not do so because of a lack of access to housing and lack of basic services in their hometown. When asked about the reason for leaving the country of asylum, 59 percent mentioned improved security conditions in Somalia (Figure 31). Other reasons for returning include family reunions (16 percent) and economic hardship in the country of asylum (12 percent). Seventy-seven percent of the refugee returnees think Somalia has improved since they left the country, while 10 percent think it has worsened.

**Figure 31 - Reasons for returning to Somalia by refugee returnees**

- **Improved security conditions in Somalia**: 59%
- **Reunite with family in Somalia**: 16%
- **Economic hardship in country of asylum**: 12%
- **Discrimination/unwelcome in country of asylum**: 5%
- **Found economic opportunity in Somalia**: 3%
- **End of drought/disaster in Somalia**: 3%

*Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)*
Hope for the future

Refugees are the most likely to be financially worse off than they were the year before and have the lowest expectations for future improvement. Somali households were the least likely to think their financial situation had worsened compared to the previous year, particularly the host community households. Compared to 47 percent of IDPs in settlements, more than half of host communities, IDPs outside settlements, and returnee households are financially better or the same (Figure 32). However, fewer than the proportion of Somali households, only 31 percent of refugee households, believe their financial situation has improved or remained the same from the previous year.

**Figure 32 - Financial status of households compared to last year**

When asked about expectations about their future finance, again, the majority of Somali households think things would get better while half of the refugees think they would be worse off (Figure 33).
Differences between men and women

There is a large gender gap regarding the educational attainment of heads of households. Across all population groups, female heads are less likely to be educated than their male counterparts. For Somali households and especially for host communities, more than 80 percent of the female heads have no education, compared to half of refugees. On the other hand, about half of their male heads have no education, which is still higher than the refugee average of 28 percent. Due to construed norms, roles, and responsibilities in Somalia, men are given advantaged access to school, which may explain the disparities.

Women are less likely than men to work, and the gender gap is most prominent among the host community households. According to the International Labour Organization’s most recent estimates, Somalia reports the lowest female labor market participation rates in Sub-Saharan Africa, with only 21 percent of women in the paid labor force compared to about 47 percent of male employment (World Bank, 2023). In the Somalia Displacement Phone Survey, the share of adults working in the past week was low across the board, but especially among women, of whom about three in ten women respondents (37 percent) had worked in the past week, compared to 58 percent of men. Similar findings are found in this study – women are less likely to work than men (26 percent vs. 37 percent). This could be explained by the prevalence of traditional gender roles in Somalia. Even though the survey does not ask the reason for not working, findings from Wave 2 of the Somalia Displacement Phone Survey showed that the gender disparity in labor
force participation is due to a higher percentage of women than men staying at home to care for their families. Considering the share of working women among the population groups, the rates are somewhat higher for IDPs in settlement and refugee-returnees and lowest for the host community. This might be traced in part to the age structure of the female populations – the host community has a higher percentage of older women (those over 55) than the other population groupings (Host community – 26 percent; IDPs in settlement – 12 percent; IDPs out of settlement – ten percent; Refugee returnees – 11 percent; Refugees – 6 percent). The gender gap was also most significant in the host community -- 17 percentage points, compared to three percentage points for IDPs in settlements, seven percentage points for IDPs out of settlements, two percentage points for refugee-returnees and five percentage points for refugees.

**About 22 to 46 percent of women are excluded from household decision-making, compared to five to 21 percent for men.** The Provisional Federal Constitution of Somalia stresses women’s equality with men, particularly in their involvement in leadership and decision-making (United Nations, 2018-20). Despite an increase in the number of Somali women participating in household decision-making over the years, a considerable number continue to be left out. Access to and control of financial resources and healthcare are critical determinants of women’s empowerment and poverty reduction. In terms of making major household purchases, about 27 percent (22–30 percent) of women claimed that their husbands make the only decision, as opposed to 15 percent (11–21 percent) of men who said their wives do (Figure 34). Men, particularly those from the host community and IDPs in settlements, are more likely to have a say in their wives’ earnings than wives are in their husbands' when it comes to decisions about how to use the earnings of a couple (Figure 35). About 39 percent of women do not participate in how their partners' earnings should be spent, compared to 23 percent of men. The data also shows that women have less autonomy than men—women are about two times less likely than men to make independent decisions regarding their earnings and health.
**Figure 34 - Decision Maker on Major Household Purchases**

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)

**Figure 35 - Decision Maker on How Partner’s Earning Should Be Used**

Source: Somalia Phone Survey – Round 2 (2022)
Women are more likely to feel unsafe than men. The survey results indicate that women generally feel less safe at home than men – the gap is most prominent among IDPs living outside of settlements (16 percentage points). The high reported levels of safety in the street may be surprising but are consistent with the 2021 Gallup survey that found 86 percent of women in Somalia felt safe walking in their neighborhood at night, the best level in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, there is a 17-percentage point gender gap in the feeling of safety in the community for
IDPs living outside of settlements and an 8-percentage point gap in the host community. The gap narrows to one percentage point among IDPs in settlements, although 7 percent of men and 5 percent of women in settlements said that they never felt safe.

**Figure 38 - Perception about safety by population group and gender**

![Bar chart showing perception about safety by population group and gender](source: somalia phone survey – round 2 (2022))

Previous studies show the connection between household composition, gender, and poverty and the need for targeted responses to address these. Compared to IDP families without children, IDP single female caregivers and couples with children are shown to be 17-20 percentage points more likely to be poor, which is not the case among non-IDP families. For IDP households, the least poverty risk is associated with having more female earners. Besides factors like geographic location and nutritional status, cash transfer programs must consider household composition.
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## Annex 1: Regional context for displacement in Somalia

### TABLE A1: SUMMARY OF CONTEXT FOR DISPLACEMENT-AFFECTED REGIONS OF SOMALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banadir</td>
<td>The Banadir region, which hosts the largest number of internally displaced persons (IDPs), confronts acute challenges due to rapid urbanization driven by internal displacement. Providing access to basic services, housing, and employment for displaced communities presents significant difficulties. With over 1.1 million existing IDPs and an additional 96,000 individuals expected in 2022/23, the strain on resources and infrastructure is immense. This influx of people, combined with natural urban population growth, has led to the expansion of underserved peripheral and informal settlements in Mogadishu. Life in these settlements is precarious due to the constant threat of eviction or exploitation by both governmental and non-state land-controlling groups. Evictions and resettlement to outlying areas are increasing, often resulting in worse living conditions due to &quot;secondary displacement.&quot; The Banadir Regional Administration has developed a region-specific Durable Solutions Strategy for 2020-2024 to address these pressing needs. The 2019 National Evictions Guidelines were also developed to address the scale of forced evictions in Mogadishu; in 2018, over 228,000 individuals were forcibly displaced, and by 2022, the number had decreased to 145,820.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>Bay is the second largest IDP-hosting region in the country, with over 678,000 IDPs and an additional 103,000 in 2022, with the majority residing in Baidoa, the interim capital of the federal South West State. Baidoa is one of the main nodes in central Somalia and at the center of what is, in normal times, the breadbasket of the country. However, due to the consecutive droughts, Baidoa hosts the second highest number of drought-displaced persons in Somalia with 176,935 displaced by drought between July 2021 and July 2023. As a consequence of rapid urbanization and displacement, the total urban population of Baidoa has increased five to six times in the last five years, resulting in dire urban conditions and increasing pressure on resources, settlements, and livelihood options. In 2023, the Baidoa City Strategy was developed to address chronic infrastructure and service delivery needs for the rapidly growing city and its communities affected by displacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiraan</td>
<td>Beledweyne in the Hiraan region is situated on the Shabelle River and the main road connecting Mogadishu to the rest of the central regions in Somalia. Its proximity to the Shabelle River means that Beledweyne has been affected by the most significant flood-induced emergencies in Somalia. The floods of 2018 and 2019 were particularly devastating, and from January 2023 to July 2023, over 260,000 persons were displaced by flooding in Hiraan, with 258,000 displaced in Beledweyne. No specific regional response plans or strategies have been developed for displacement in Hirshabelle State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland and Puntland</td>
<td>Somaliland and Puntland have enjoyed a semblance of peace and security since the Federal Government of Somalia's collapse in 1991. Despite the stability in these regions, the failure of multiple rainy seasons in 2021 and 2022 has led to widespread crop loss, livestock deaths, and further mass displacement. In February 2023, the conflict in the disputed town of Las-anod displaced 185,000 people. Puntland has instated the Refugee Protection Act of 2017 and the Local Integration Strategy 2018-2022 to respond to the needs of refugees and IDPs in the region. In Somaliland, the National Displacement and Refugee Agency (NDRA) applies the 2011 National Asylum Policy to respond to all issues of displacement and refugees.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions</td>
<td>Regions with a high density of pastoral communities, such as Gedo in Jubaland and Galgaduud and Mudug regions in Galmudug State, have seen unprecedented displacement figures since the onset of the 2021-2023 drought, since January 2021, there have been 1.1 million persons displaced by drought and conflict in these regions, the vast majority of the displaced are going to rural towns that are historically underdeveloped and under-resourced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Annex 2: Data and methodology

Except for IDPs in settlements, the majority of the displacement-affected households surveyed live in urban areas. The majority of the refugees in Somalia are from Ethiopia (54 percent) or Yemen (41 percent). Therefore, this survey focused on these two refugee groups. The refugee households mostly live in Somaliland (53 percent), with a considerable number in Puntland (28 percent) and Banadir (15 percent). Regarding refugee returnees, about 11,606 households were registered in the UNHCR database at the time of sample selection, mainly from Kenya (97 percent) and Yemen (2 percent). Both these groups were included in the sample proportionally to their population share. The majority of the sampled refugee returnees live in Jubaland (78 percent). As for settlement-based IDPs, we focused on two main regions—Banadir and Bay—which host almost 50 percent of the settlement-based IDPs in Somalia. In our sample, 66 percent live in Banadir, while 34 percent reside in the South West State. The majority of refugees, refugee returnees, and IDPs out of the settlements surveyed live in urban areas, with a higher proportion of refugees than the other population groups. However, only 45 percent of the households in the host community reside in urban areas; the remainder are nomads or located in rural areas.

The first round of data collection started in November 2021, beginning with host communities and IDPs living outside settlements, followed by the other population groups in January 2022 and a second round of data collection for all groups in July-August 2022. For the remaining populations, data were collected during January 2022 and March 2022. The final number of successful interviews was 2,471. After data cleaning, 2,442 were used for further data analysis, consisting of 539 host communities, 493 IDPs in settlements, 460 IDPs outside the settlements, 403 refugees, and 547 refugee returnees. The second round of data collection was conducted in July - August 2022. Enumerators called the same households that reached the first round and, in the end, successfully conducted interviews with 2,020 households. An additional 520 new households were added to increase the sample size. The final data comprises 469 host communities, 551 IDPs in settlements, 503 IDPs outside settlements, 467 refugees, and 550 refugee returnees.

As the survey was conducted through phone interviews, working phone numbers were needed for the target populations. The survey data was collected via telephone due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The phone numbers for the host communities and IDPs living outside settlements were available from the previous national phone survey (Somalia High Frequency Phone Survey) conducted by the World Bank in Somalia from June 2020 until October 2021. The sample for host communities was selected based on the frequency of interaction with IDP populations, with households that reported that they had interacted with the IDPs at least once a month collected for the sample. For IDPs living in the settlements, phone numbers were collected by UNHCR, while those for refugees and refugee returnees were provided from the UNHCR database.

---

24 It should be noted that in this analysis, the host community was sampled based on the interaction with the IDPs, both inside and outside settlements, who constitute the majority of forcibly displaced persons in Somalia. Given that refugee returnees and refugees frequently settle in the same areas and face similar living conditions, the comparison remains relevant to them as well as presented in this report.
The requirement for working phone numbers means that all indicators may not be representative. People who respond to phone interviews may have systematically different characteristics from those who do not respond to phone interviews, and some populations are entirely excluded from phone surveys because they do not own phones and may not have connectivity despite mobile phone ownership and may not have access to reliable sources of energy. For example, in rural Somalia, many households do not own phones, while telephone ownership in urban areas is nearly 90 percent. Since phone ownership is essential for phone interviews, such an unbalanced distribution of phone ownership makes collecting nationally representative data challenging. Besides the unbalanced phone ownership, responses to phone interviews often diverge from those in the face-to-face survey. Thus, data from phone surveys are often not nationally representative. Nevertheless, there are ways to address these issues partially through reweighting exercises. In this survey, we adjusted sampling weights so that weighted averages of key statistics become as representative of the target group of Somalia as possible.

The survey questionnaire was designed to cover important and relevant topics for displaced populations. Modules included household- and individual-level sociodemographic characteristics, knowledge of COVID-19 and adoption of preventive behavior, access to basic goods and services, access to social assistance, impacts of COVID-19 on economic activity and income sources, households' exposure to shocks including ongoing drought and coping mechanisms as well as displacement-specific topics such as interaction between the displaced and host communities. The respondent to these questionnaires was any knowledgeable adult in the household. A household was defined as a group of people living in the same dwelling space who eat meals together or pool resources together. For refugees, even though the sample was drawn from the UNHCR registration database (proGres), which registers families as “cases” (proGres family), sampled “cases” were interviewed using the definition of household above (UNHCR, 2021). Across all population groups, the head of household was defined as making critical decisions.

**TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF POPULATION GROUPS AND SAMPLE SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area of residence in the survey</th>
<th>State of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host communities</td>
<td>Host community members identified as having frequent interactions with IDPs in 2020/21 SHFPS</td>
<td>Urban – 45% Rural – 27% Nomad – 27%</td>
<td>Somaliland – 25% South West – 22% Jubaland – 17% Puntland – 14% Hirshabelle – 12% Banadir – 6% Galmudug – 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in settlements</td>
<td>Settlements primarily in Banadir and Bay, phone numbers provided by UNHCR</td>
<td>Settlement – 90% Urban – 10%</td>
<td>Banadir – 66% South West – 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-493/551</td>
<td>-2017 SHFS 2020/21 SHFPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs outside of settlements</td>
<td>Based on sampling from 2020/21 SHFPS</td>
<td>Urban – 62% Rural - 33% Nomad – 5%</td>
<td>Somaliland – 29% South West – 23% Puntland - 17% Banadir – 13% Hirshabelle – 9% Jubaland – 7% Galmudug – 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-460/503</td>
<td>-2022 SIHBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee returnees</td>
<td>Primarily those returning from Kenya. Phone numbers provided by UNHCR</td>
<td>Urban – 75%</td>
<td>Jubaland – 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-547/550</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural – 15%</td>
<td>Banadir – 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement – 9%</td>
<td>South West – 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugees and asylum seekers</th>
<th>Primary from Yemen and Ethiopia. Phone numbers provided by UNHCR</th>
<th>Urban – 90%</th>
<th>Somaliland – 53%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-403/467</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural – 10%</td>
<td>Puntland – 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banadir – 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 3: Overview of humanitarian food and non-food assistance for displaced persons

### TABLE A2: SUMMARY OF ASSISTANCE BY POPULATION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Non-food assistance</th>
<th>Food assistance</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **IDPs**         | Largest sectors by persons targeted from HRP 2022:  
• Health (4.7 million targeting, most of whom are IDPs)  
• Food security (3.1 million)  
• Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (3.1 million) and  
• Protection (3 million)  
• Shelter/ NFI (1.2 million) | • Food and livelihood assistance targeting those experiencing severe to extreme food insecurity (IPC 3 and 4) in accessible areas (HRP 2022).  
• Humanitarian Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) reached some 1.7 million individuals from January until September 2021 in comparison to 1.5 million in 2020 (of 4m targeted) (HRP 2021). | • Humanitarian assistance provided by 171 organizations (101 national non-governmental organizations (NNGOs), 61 international NGOs (INGOs) and 9 UN organizations under HRP 2022). Targeted assistance following vulnerability assessment, often one-time assistance (versus continuing cash assistance for refugees). |
| **Refugee returnees** | 24 hours accommodation/meals – with few exceptions when one is waiting for connecting flights/relatives to arrive to pick him/her up.  
• 3-day accommodation/meals  
• One-time reinstallation cash grant ($200 per person)  
• Monthly subsistence allowance for 6-months (HH size 1-5, $200 per household; 6-10, $300 per household; 10+ $400 per household)  
• Non-food item (in-kind: blankets, sanitary items, cooking equipment, sleeping mats, plastic sheeting, or cash)  
• Mobile phone, with sim card – all will be registered by the partner managing way station  
• Education support for primary and secondary school students ($25 fee to school per enrolled student, plus a one-time grant for academic materials and uniform)  
• Other services include referrals for specific needs, psycho-social support, business starter kits, and livelihoods training. | Food assistance for 6-months (WFP SCOPE card) | Food assistance provided by WFP  
Non-food assistance provided by UNHCR  
Returnees from Yemen and Libya provided additional support by IOM |
| **Refugees and asylum seekers** | Support for continual access to health and education, including education grants (e.g., in Somaliland, UNHCR provides one-year school levies for refugee students of $5 for primary and $15.5 for secondary)  
• Shelter, including emergency and transitional shelter  
• Livelihoods, including vocational skills training and business support packages  
• Protection and specific needs, including legal assistance, GBV survivor kits, child protection services, and registration and documentation | Cash assistance for vulnerable households | Assistance is based on vulnerability and needs (no blanket assistance)  
Assistance for refugees provided by UNHCR Sub-Offices, with some variation across locations. |

---

25 Assistance provided under UNHCR’s Somalia Return and Reintegration Protection Package (2020)
## Annex 4: Profile of populations, by population group

### Table 3: Profile of populations, by population group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host community</strong></td>
<td>Host community households are those that regularly interact with IDP households. In practice many are co-located with refugees, refugee returnees, and nomadic communities, who are increasingly in urban areas. They live in smaller households, have a larger share of working-age family members, and lower rates of disability. Yet, many still live in unimproved housing, struggle to send their children to school and share the same challenges related to food insecurity, reductions in income due to the pandemic and recent increases in prices. Agriculture is the most common sector of employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **IDPs** | IDPs are by far the largest displaced population group and therefore warrant specific attention to their needs and living conditions.  
**IDPs in settlements** face extreme hardship. They live in the largest households of any population groups and are also the youngest, report the greatest number of disabilities and generally occupy unimproved housing. Most work as employees or daily workers in agriculture or wage employment. They face widespread food insecurity and reduced income from the pandemic, yet they are less likely to receive external support through remittances and assistance than IDPs outside of settlements. Beyond drought, they are most likely to be displaced by the collapse of livelihoods.  
**IDPs outside settlements** are older, more likely to be working, and live in slightly smaller households. They occupy more mixed housing and their household heads are more likely than those in settlements to have completed at least some primary education. But their levels of disability are still significant. Beyond drought, they are more likely to have been displaced by conflict. |
| **Refugee returnees** | Refugee returnees face many of the same challenges as IDPs, with whom they often live side by side. Household heads are less likely to be educated themselves, and they are also less likely to have enrolled their children in schools. Children not attending school are also more likely than the other groups to be female. They are more likely to be employed in agriculture or as employees and rely on wage employment, family businesses, or agriculture. Most report feeling safe. Fewer report high levels of food insecurity or loss of income from the pandemic than other groups, but it is still more than half of the population. |
| **Refugees and asylum seekers** | Refugees and asylum seekers appear to struggle with several distinct vulnerabilities despite being more highly educated than other displaced populations and even many host community households. They generally live in urban areas with better standards of service yet are more likely to be ill and lack access to treatment, worry about their safety, and cite discrimination and language as barriers to employment. They are more likely to be impacted by recent price increases and they are less likely to believe their condition will improve in the future. |
| **All population groups** | The increases in food costs impact all population groups, report significant income losses from the pandemic, and describe high levels of food insecurity. While remittances are a cushion for some households, many go without. Although the need for area-based programs that involve an all-inclusive and integrated service delivery and programming cannot be overstated, the disparities in the socioeconomic characteristics of the various populations may necessitate highly tailored solutions for particular population groups. |