



FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA

*Somali Disaster Management Agency
(SoDMA)*

Site Definition Guideline

FORWORD

Somalia has been suffering since the collapse of the central government from displacement caused by natural and human disasters, which led to the random spread of internally displaced persons sites in most parts of the country. Most of the internally displaced people have self-settled in over 2,400 unplanned IDP sites with over 80% of the sites situated on privately-owned land in urban and peri-urban areas across the country.

To find and promote durable solution for impacted IDPs, Somalia Disaster Management Agency (SoDMA), was established in 2011 a semi-autonomous agency. Its legitimacy was secured later in the year 2016 after the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Somalia enacted the establishment law number 17/2016 that gives the agency the legal mandate to assume the responsibility to mitigate, prepare for, respond to and coordinate recovery and reconstruction efforts and building the durable solutions for IDPs and resilience of our nation. From the beginning of 2017 SODMA was replaced by MoHADM but later on from 16 of August 2022 the government of Somalia decided to reinstate SoDMA to replace MoHADM.

To perform the mandate mentioned above, SoDMA recognizes the importance of the site definition guidelines in Somalia as one of the initiatives to promote standards and an additional layer of advocacy in finding durable solutions for Internal Displaced Peoples.

Finally, I would like to thank the Federal line ministries, Agencies, Federal Member States and Banadir Admonition for their inputs in drawing the guidelines. I would also like to thank the Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster, which is managed by the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and the UN Migration Agency (IOM), for the full support that enabled us to validate this document after long time of consultative workshops that took place in Mogadishu and other locations in the country.

Mr. Mohamud Mo'alim Abdulle
Commissioner of Somali Disaster Management Agency

Summary Overview

The protracted IDP situation has raised the need to analyze the effectiveness and appropriateness of how IDP sites are defined within Somalia. In efforts to build consensus on the discussion, the Somalia Disaster Management Agency (SODMA) in collaboration with the CCCM cluster, initiated consultative workshops at the federal level to develop harmonized guiding principles on contextualized site definitions, and provide guidance on IDP sites characteristics. The overall objective is to enable transition into viable permanent settlements with durable solution lens and to potentially phase out IDP sites.

Acronyms

ABA	Area Based Approach
CCCM	Camp Coordination Camp Management
CMCs	Camp Management Committees
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MOHADM	Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management
NCRI	National Commission for Refugees and IDPs
PRMN	Protection and Return Monitoring Network
SNBS	Somalia National Bureau of Statistics
SODMA	Somalia Disaster Management Agency
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USWG	Urban Settlement Working Group

Contents

FORWORD	2
Summary Overview	3
Acronyms	4
Contextual Background.....	6
Objective of IDP Site Definition Guidelines	6
SODMA Site Definition Initiative.....	7
Site Definition Guidance and Terminologies	7
Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)	7
Informal Settlements:.....	8
Planned IDP sites:	8
Scattered Settlements:.....	8
IDP Registration:.....	9
Self-Settled IDP Settlements:	9
Site Splitting:	10
Relocations, Permanent Land and IDP Status:	12
Durable Solutions:	12
Area Based Approach:	13
Annex 1: Key site definition workshop outputs.....	15
Annex 2.1: Common Messages and Site Definition Consultative Workshop Outputs	19
Annex 2: Summary: IDP Site HH/Site Eligibility Criteria.....	19

Contextual Background

Somalia has experienced decades of protracted conflict combined with constant climate shocks, stunt economic growth, rising poverty, disease outbreaks amongst other factors that cause internal displacements to increase in Somalia. According to the SNBS 2020 at least 2.9 people in Somalia are IDPs making Somalia one of the countries with the highest numbers of IDPs globally.

The number of IDPs and IDP sites continue to rise every year as the country continues to experience harsh economic times, political tensions and continued military offensive against extremist elements in the country.

Somalia remains at the centre of climate change and one of the most drought-affected countries in the Horn of Africa. In 2022, more than 7.2 million people were affected by drought which is nearly half of the country's population with at least over 300,000 facing catastrophic levels -IPC 5. As of December 2022, **nearly 8.3 million people across Somalia face Crisis (IPC Phase 3) or worse acute food insecurity outcomes.**¹ Climate change is increasingly acknowledged as a major source of conflict in Somalia as the struggle for reduced resources aggravates clan tensions and inter-clan conflict. Conflict and climatic shocks remain as the primary drivers of internal displacement in Somalia over the years forcing over 1.5 million people to flee their homes in 2022.²

Most of the internally displaced people have self-settled in over 2,400 unplanned IDP sites with over 80% of the sites situated on privately-owned land in urban and peri-urban areas across the country. Some of the IDP sites have existed since 1991 – the start of the civil war in Somalia. A large percentage of displaced persons have experienced perpetual cycles of displacement caused by a combination of root causes. One of which is a lack of land tenure policy causing high eviction risk for IDPs.

It is against this backdrop that the definition of IDP sites remains challenging and generated ongoing discussion between humanitarian actors and respective government authorities in an aim to build a common consensus on; what constitutes IDP sites, when IDPs ceases to be and or when IDP sites ought to be phased out and ultimately closed.

Objective of IDP Site Definition Guidelines

The aim of this work is to draw a consensus and harmonized definition of what an IDP site in Somalia is. Furthermore, the goal is to understand common site criteria that can be used in defining IDP sites in Somalia that would lead towards mapping sites viable for durable solutions and potentially phasing out some sites (site closure).

Objectives of the site definition Guidelines

1. Provide clarification on IDP settlement definitions used by government bodies and humanitarian stakeholders alike, while updating IDP site data for the country.
2. Creating awareness that the definitions are in no way aimed at limiting support to those in need but rather having a common understanding around joint responses and area-based response
3. Promote a Durable Solution lens and linking the Humanitarian-Development Nexus e.g. drawing perspectives on if and how the definition of an IDP site should be used when permanent land has been obtained for residents

¹ <https://fsnau.org/>

² UNHCR Protection and Return Monitoring Network (PRMN)

4. Providing a platform for phasing out of sites where durable solutions have been achieved and drawing the criteria thereof
-

SODMA Site Definition Initiative

SODMA (Previously MOHADM) in collaboration with the CCCM cluster has been at the centre of the consultative forum setting some standards on site definition at 15HH per site as a minimum. This, however, has had implications of having proliferated sites due to some sites splitting into smaller sites. Moreover, IDP sites in Somalia have at times been perceived as synonymous to humanitarian aid assistance causing some IDPs to form or split sites with an aim of getting humanitarian aid. -CCCM IDP study of May 2021 indicated that **“the definition of an IDP is increasingly interlinked with humanitarian assistance. The study’s respondents overwhelmingly self-identified as IDP as a means of accessing livelihood support despite obtaining local integration through permanent land or housing”**.³

Furthermore, gatekeepers or landowners have been associated with creating sites in order to settle displaced people and benefit from either in kind taxation or rent payments setting an exploitative environment for IDPs. In extreme circumstances, gatekeepers have been associated with creation of sites as a means of bringing humanitarian aid assistance to IDP sites.

Based on these dynamics, the need to revisit the IDPs site definition has become increasingly important. In order to further contextualize on site definition within Somalia, SODMA in collaboration with the CCCM cluster organized consultative workshops throughout 2022 with respective government ministries, NGOs and UN agencies to review this important subject seeking to have common standards and criteria on site definition.

Site Definition Guidance and Terminologies

Below are some key terminologies and strategic outputs of this guiding document with regards to site definitions in Somalia, inclusive of some common outcomes of the consultative workshop held under the leadership of SoDMA supported by UNHCR & IOM through the CCCM cluster

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

IDP definition is derived from the “National Durable Solution Strategy 2020 – 2024.” The definition encompasses IDP under three main categories: conflict, land, climatic shocks, where IDPs are defined as:

- 1) persons who have been forced or obliged to leave their places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of generalized violence and insecurity, violations of human rights of natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border,
- 2) persons who are evicted from their settlement and who have not received appropriate compensation allowing them to restore their lives in a sustainable manner,
- 3) pastoralists, who have lost access to their traditional nomadic living space through loss of livestock, access to grazing and water points or markets.

³ When Does Displacement End? An IDP Settlement Study – Report, May 2021

Informal Settlements:

An informal settlement is an area where groups of housing units have been constructed on land that the occupations have no legal claim to, or occupy illegally; or an area where housing is not in compliance with current planning and building regulations

Planned IDP sites:

A planned settlement is a last resort settlement option by which a displaced population is accommodated, while sustainable solutions for the population are sought on a purpose-built site with infrastructure to provide basic services and centralised protection. There are currently no planned IDP settlements within Somalia despite various settlements undergoing site reconfiguration or decongestion activities that create an appearance of pre-arrangement sites.

Scattered Settlements:

Scattered shelters and/or settlements that are located within roughly a 37.5 meter radius (75 meter diameter) be classified as an IDP site (assuming that the population of these scattered shelters is of at least 50 HHs or 300 individuals). Under these circumstances, social dynamics between populations living within these settlements should have common interests and communal relations with other households within the compass of the scattered settlement. Examples of common interests include shared infrastructure such as water kiosks or latrines or similar occupations.

Social dynamics may include but are not limited to populations that have been displaced from the same area of origin, have similar community governance structures, similar demographics/backgrounds and pre-existing relationships prior to displacement.

Figure 1: Scattered Settlements

The map displays the 37.5-meter radius distance between settlements. Small scattered IDP settlements that are within the 37.5-meter minimum distance may be categorized as an IDP site if they exceed the 50-household



minimum and exhibit communal social dynamics. Sites that may be located within 37.5 meters from one another that eclipse the 50 household minimum thresholds can still be considered individual IDP sites.

IDP Registration:

It is the role of government to register its citizenry or persons within its territory. However, given the limited resources and capacities, it is encouraged that local, regional and state-level authorities work closely with national commissions for refugees and IDPs to generate a formal system utilized to register displaced IDPs on needs basis to ensure equal or fair distribution of assistance. Identification of newly formed IDP sites that have been jointly verified with support from humanitarian NGOs should also be recorded to ensure equitable targeting.

Through site verification exercises that occur bi-annually at the district-level led by CCCM, local authorities are advised to create a registration system of IDP sites to allow for authorities to have access to critical site-level information including the following data categories: IDP sites name, unique site code, GPS coordinates, household and individual population information and IDP site leader details (only if this information is voluntarily provided via informed consent). The registration of IDP sites will work to minimize incidents of site splitting as new sites created due to intra-communal conflict will only be register if there is evidence that a split is due to irreparable relationship damages.

IDP registration may be triggered by the formation of new IDP sites that have been captured via joint site verification exercises or multi-sectoral needs assessments following a displacement shock. It is important that multi-sectoral needs assessments capture intention of IDPs to either stay in current settlements or return to areas of origin when the situation presents itself. This information is vital for local authorities, CCCM partners and other humanitarian agencies to have as it may prevent large investments into settlements that will only be temporarily used for 3 days- 14 days (ie: April 2021 displacement in Mogadishu, October 2021 displacement in Guriel). Once there is clarity of the intentions for IDPs to stay in currently settled sites and based on the IDP site matching the IDP site criteria for Somalia, local authorities can move forward with registering IDP sites.

Self-Settled IDP Settlements:

This occurs when displaced populations spontaneously settle in a location without prior arrangement with the relevant actors (such as owners, local government, agencies and/or the host community). In this situation, basic services are usually not provided at the site-level. Self-settled IDP sites include situations where the displaced population settles collectively. Additionally, self-settled IDP sites also encompass scattered shelters that are located within an area that is approximately a 75-meter diameter from one another. Self-Settled IDP sites in Somalia are characterized by IDP households sharing communal resources within the confines of an established IDP settlement.

The IDP site is defined as a fixed area that consists of 390 or more individuals, or a minimum of 65 households, with the majority or all residence carrying displaced status. There is flexibility in the unit that is being exercised as stakeholders are divided between the use of both individuals and households. The figure of 300 individuals is directly derived from the total of 50 households, which is an amount

that has been supported by numerous stakeholders including local authorities and participants during IDP site definition workshops (inclusive of the average household size of 6 members). However, in situations of verification when difficulties may arise in calculating the total number of households within an IDP site, individuals as a unit can be utilized to further assist in estimating the population of an IDP site.

Site Splitting:

IDP site splitting occurs when community members of an established IDP settlement decide to leave the organized settlement due to disagreement, conflict, unequal access to resources/humanitarian assistance or other discords. Typically, an IDP community will resort to physically leaving the IDP settlement choosing to settle in locations that may be both geographically and socially separated from the original settlement. In this circumstance, if the IDP community consists of a household/individual figure that exceeds the minimum threshold to constitute an IDP site, a new IDP site will be established (certain states require formal site registration with local authorities). However, if the community consists of less than the minimum figures for households that constitute an IDP site, this community will not be formally deemed an IDP site. In this situation, residents may relocate within 37.5 meters of an established IDP site where relationships are strong, and members of the newly relocated community group can access land and communal services without further marginalization. Settlements that have less than the minimum figure of households to constitute an IDP site should not be forced to resettle or leave current settled areas as movement of such settlements should be completely voluntary in nature.

There are cases where smaller IDP sites are composed of minority groups or communities that have been marginalized due to tribal or ethnic composition. Such mapped sites should continue to receive humanitarian services based on established vulnerability criteria, with these mapped sites potentially prioritized by various sectors for additional support. In cases in which an IDP site composed of minority groups decides to split, the relevant state authority working closely with CCCM cluster members responsible for managing sites should flag these occurrences to the Protection Cluster for further follow up. Furthermore, scattered sites composed of minority groups would have the ability to be classified as an IDP site based on the criteria highlighted within the scattered shelters/settlements section of this document.

Negative Consequences of Site Splitting:

1. Split sites create increased fragmentation of IDP populations making it increasingly difficult for service providers to efficiently deliver humanitarian services
2. Populations that split from established sites require additional services such as communal WASH facilities which may have been available within the original IDP site
3. IDP populations that split from established sites may be forced to settle precariously on land where the threat of eviction is high
4. Site splits often include gatekeepers creating transactional deals with other gatekeepers or predatory stakeholders which further enables the insidious industry of gatekeeping

There may be situations in which IDPs elect to split from the original IDP site but wish to not *physically* move from their current location, or choose to settle within an area that is within 37.5 meters of the original site. Regardless of the size of the community that wishes to establish a new IDP site, as long as they reside within 75 meter diameter of the original IDP site, this community will be considered a ‘neighborhood’ of the original site. Communal services that are being delivered to the entire IDP site population should continue to serve IDP site neighborhoods. Additionally, reconciliation and conflict resolution activities should target such sites with the intention promoting social cohesion between the IDP site and IDP site neighborhood.

As a means of preventing site splits from occurring, state authorities are in collaboration with CCCM partners are recommended to establish early warning systems that alert CCCM partners/HLP partners of rising tension between members of the IDP site that could potentially escalate resulting in a site split. Once alerts have been generated by Camp Management Committees (CMCs) or other site members, CCCM/HLP partners should have a prepared referral pathway for peace building partners that are able to respond to conflicts within IDP sites.

Occurrences of site splitting are often linked to distributions of material provisions in IDP sites. In situations of specific distribution targeting or distribution activities in IDP sites, it is documented that site splits occur more often when service providers do not provide comprehensive communication with IDP site populations and are reliant on operating through gatekeepers or site leaders alone. In these instances, service providers may rely solely on a site leader, gatekeeper or community elder to communicate the activity and the individuals that are being targeted by the provider. As a result, the phenomenon of site splitting can only be fully mitigated through broader information sharing campaigns led by service providers and assisted by CCCM partners when possible. It is strongly recommended that any site-level intervention integrates awareness sessions that articulate the intended activity, scope of the intervention, beneficiary targeting criteria and timeline/duration of the activity. Further recommendations on mitigation on site splitting will involve Area Based Approach as discussed below in these guidelines.



Figure 2: Site Splitting without population moving from the original settlement

Relocations, Permanent Land and IDP Status:

IDPs that have voluntarily participated in relocation projects where land titles have been provided will no longer be considered IDPs. Relocation projects that fit each household with land titles and include multi-sectoral development activities and actions from authorities that look to formalize the relocation sites will be characterized as planned settlements. This is relevant for various communities such as Barwaaqo and Midnimo-I which have successfully gone through relocation activities with land titles secured for each household.

IDP site that are residing on land categorized as either owned by the IDP community collectively, dispersed land titles for each household plot or arranged by authorities for permanent and indefinite use of residents will no longer be classified as IDP sites. Long-term arrangements by IDPs show a tangible aspiration for integration and continued existence in the current settlement which trigger a change in status away from an IDP. While a status change away from IDP may occur in circumstances where land has been purchased by IDPs or IDPs residing on permanent land, needs that warrant a humanitarian/development response may still exist. The classification of an IDP should not necessarily correlate with evidence-based needs for humanitarian and development activity support.

Durable Solutions:

According to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Durable solutions are achieved when internally displaced persons no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination on account of their displacement. It can be achieved through:

1. Sustainable reintegration at the place of origin (hereinafter referred to as “return”)
2. Sustainable local integration in areas where internally displaced persons take refuge (local

integration)

3. Sustainable integration in another part of the country (settlement elsewhere in the country)

In line with the seven durable solution principles SODMA will take lead in seeking to find durable solutions from the government perspective. The Agency will continue collaborating with other partners and in finding durable solution in a participatory process of all stakeholders through a rights-based approach with age gender and diversity lens.

Through the guidance document, SODMA and CCCM cluster in coordination with protection and all other clusters will map all sites with land titles, including those where the IDPs have legally purchased. Such lands will be mapped with aim of:

- a. Classifying them as sites viable for durable solutions
- b. Categorizing such sites that upon meeting some minimum standards corresponding to services available to the host community including water, health, education, food, livelihood could be phased out from being referred to as IDPs or IDP sites
- c. Sites viable for integration with the host community and corresponding services

SODMA will coordinate with the respective government counterparts, the CCCM cluster and respective clusters to conceptualize the minimum site definitions and the above aims across the sub state level through the federal ministerial counterparts to create wider awareness on the guidelines.

As part of the action plan upon completion of the consultative workshops across state levels and ultimate launch of the agreed upon site definition guidelines, SODMA will conduct an annual review of the guidelines through consultative forums with an aim of updating the guidelines with current trends and measuring progress on the main objectives of the guidelines.

Area Based Approach:

As described above on the proliferation of IDP sites, increasing perceptions on linkages of humanitarian assistance with existence of IDP sites, self-identification of IDPs status, proximity of IDP sites within the same geographical radius, SODMA encourages a holistic approach in targeting humanitarian aid in specified geographical areas beyond singular sites.

The approach should focus on areas densely populated with IDPs such as Banadir and Baidoa. “Applying an Area Based Approach, which advocates for assistance that considers the whole population affected by a crisis, living in a specific geographic area in need of multi-sectoral support by working with multiple stakeholders contributes to this achieving holistic understanding and program logic.”⁴

⁴ Urban Settlement Working Group (USWG), Area Based Approaches in Urban Setting, 2019

SODMA will lead supervision with respective authorities in respective locations, CCCM cluster among other clusters to map out areas and service delivery to enhance holistic coverage, limit the urge of site splitting and reduce reliance on sites as the criterion of targeting on service delivery.

Annex 1: Key site definition workshop outputs

Date	Locations	Participants	Output
16 Nov. 2021	Mogadishu	Participants (35): MOHADM (09), BRA (02), MOIFAR (02), MPWRH (01), SNBS (01), NDA (02), UNHCR (03), UNOCHA (01), UNIO (01), OIC (01), NoFYL (01), AVORD (01), SCC (01), NRC (01), DRC (01), DRC (01), CESDO (01), Protection Cluster (01), Shelter Cluster (01), CCCM (03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Defined IDP sites as a fixed area consisting of a minimum of 50HH or 300 individuals ii. Developed Guidelines on site definition to build a common understanding on sites in Somalia iii. Encouraged disseminating and garnering more consensus at state and regional level on these harmonized understanding of sites to have contextualized state level site guidelines

Date	Locations	Participants	Output
19 Jan. 2022	Jubalaand, Kismayo	Participants (25): JUCRI (07), IOM (01), UNHCR (03), Mercy Corps (01), CARE (01), ACTED (01), DRC (01), SIF (01), SEDHURO (02), KD (01), SEA (01), RS (01), Intersos (01), CCCM (02)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Concurred IDP site as a portion of land occupied by IDPs accommodating a minimum of 50 HHs -updated on 17 Oct.22 ii. Sites with settlements on permanent land provided by the government with secure land tenures such as Midnimo and Madina will not be referred as IDP sites

Date	Locations	Participants	Output
24 Jan. 2022	SWS, Baidoa	Participants (34): MOIPED Minister (Ahmed Mathobe) MOHADM Minister (Nasir Abdi Arush), MOLSA Minister (Abdulkadir Omar), Director of D.S, (Abdullahi Watin) Baidoa D.Mayor, SWS LA, UNHCR, IOM, DRC, AVORD, ACTED, NRC, IRDO, CESDO, IRS, SYPD, CONCERN, MERCYCORPS, IOM, GREDO, FAO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The government characterizes IDP site as a portion of land occupied by internally displaced persons accommodating a minimum of 100 HHs (split of camps, resources, land availability etc) regardless of its status ii. Government approved that IDPs relocated to Barwaaqo 2 settlement should not be considered as IDPs rather as poor host community in need of sustainable livelihood

Date	Location	Participants	Output
9 Mar. 2022	Galmudug, Galkayo	Participants (35): MoIFAR (02), MoHADM (02), Dhusamarreb LG (02), Guriceel LG (02), Cadaado LG (02) Galkacyo LG (02) Hobyo LG (02) GCRI (02) WISE (01) IMC (01) CPD (01) Mercy Corps (01), TOUS (01) NOFYL (01), SAAHO(01) SAM (01) IRC (01), SVDG (01), KAF (01), APCC (01), OCHA (01), IOM (01), UNHCR (06)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The government characterizes IDP site as a portion of land occupied by internally displaced persons accommodating a minimum of 50 HHs (split of camps, resources, land availability etc) regardless of its status ii. Government approved that IDPs relocated to Jeehdin or Wadajir settlement should not be considered as IDPs rather as poor host community in need of sustainable livelihood iii. Future site verifications should involve a training for participants on how to identify IDP sites and IDP site shelters that are being used by host community as a means of receiving humanitarian aid as well as uninhabited shelters.

Date	Location	Participants	Output
9 Mar. 2022	Puntland, Garowe	Participants: (32) Local authorities (6), CAD (3), PMWDO (6), SEDO (1), Y-PEER (2), PSA (4), IRC (2), Horn Vision (4), UNHCR (3), and IOM (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The stakeholders characterize IDP site as a portion of land occupied by internally displaced persons accommodating a minimum of 80 HHs (split of camps, resources, land availability etc) regardless of its status. ii. MOIFAR was in the process of developing standardized number of persons in IDP sites. The prepositions by stakeholders in the workshop would be submitted to MOIFAR and other government entities for consideration and harmonization

Date	Location	Participants	Output
16 Aug. 2022	Hirshabelle, Beletweyne	Participants: (16) Local authorities (2), IOM (2), Nutrition Cluster (1), DAN (2), MRDO (2), DRC (2), WFP (1), SOMLIFE (2), Save the Children (1), Mercy USA (1), OCHA (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The stakeholders characterize an IDP site as a portion of land occupied by internally displaced persons accommodating a minimum of 50 HHs (split of camps, resources, land availability etc) regardless of its status. ii. The issue of Bush Baris is particularly salient in Hirshabelle. Meetings with authorities is advised to generate an understanding that inflated IDP figures/sites will not equate to additional funding. Implementation of Bush Baris Guidance is paramount in Beletweyne.

Date	Location	Participants	Output
17 Oct. 2022	Mogadishu,	Participants (43) SODMA (9), Social Affairs (1), SNBS (1), MOHADM (2) MOIFAR (2) Mayor (3) HCRI (2), GCRI (2), SWCRI (1), NDSS (1) BRA (2), JUCRI (1) IOM (2), UNHCR (6), MCAN (1), NDA (1) SCC (1), SODEN (1), NOFYL (1), IRDO (1), NRC (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. SODMA with the support of CCCM cluster to develop an overarching framework or policy for site definition criteria with 65HH as the standard of site definition, the policy to cover some recommendations on actions to undertake where sites do not meet such criteria ii. Based on states level consultations, states that had lower than 50 HH/site to revise their numbers to at least 50HH/site as the criteria iii. State level agreed upon site criteria based on the contextual state level site definition guidelines to be embedded in the overarching policy iv. SODMA/CCCM to review the site definition initiative annually

Common Messages and Site Definition Consultative Workshop Outputs

- i. Encouraged Local, Regional and state-level authorities generate a formal system utilized to register newly formed IDP sites that have been jointly verified with support from humanitarian NGOs such as bi-annual site verification assessments
- ii. IDP sites on land issued with permanent land tenure would no longer be classified as IDP sites
- iii. Concurred to make concerted efforts by government and concerned stakeholders to take the necessary steps to consolidate sites or relocate IDPs to established sites that meet the defined criteria pending durable solutions. Such efforts must safeguard the principles of voluntary relocation, “do no harm” among other humanitarian principles

Annex 2: Summary: IDP Site HH/Site Eligibility Criteria

Summary: IDP Site HH/Site Eligibility Criteria

Source: Site Master List Q3

State/Region	Site meets Criteria	Total Sites	Percentage	Criteria
Banadir	1,827	2,015	91%	> 50 HH
Banadir	1,827	2,015	91%	
Galmudug	206	206	100%	>50 HH
Galgaduud	91	91	100%	
Mudug	115	115	100%	
Hirshabelle	133	140	95%	>50 HH
Hiraan	110	117	94%	
Middle Shabelle	23	23	100%	
Jubaland	258	279	92%	>50 HH
Gedo	86	95	91%	
Lower Juba	172	184	93%	
Puntland	65	68	96%	>80 HH
Bari	35	37	95%	
Nugaal	30	31	97%	
SouthWest	650	659	99%	>100 HH
Bakool	27	28	96%	
Bay	577	577	100%	
Lower Shabelle	46	54	85%	
Grand Total	3,139	3,367	93%	

- 16% of IDP (575) sites in Somalia & Somali land have less than (<) 65 HH/Site
- 9% (188) of sites in Benadir have < 50 HH/Site
- 6% (7) of sites in Hiran region in Hirshabelle have < 50 HH/site
- 9% (9) of sites in Gedo and 7% (12) in Lower Juba < 50 HH/site
- 5% (2) of sites in Bari and 3% (1) in Nugaal region < 80 HH/site
- Only one out of 28 sites in Bakool in SWS < 100 HH/site
- 9% (20) of sites in Somaliland have < 65 HH/site

