Introduction
Since the escalation of hostilities in the outskirts of Tripoli on 4 April, over 60,000 people are estimated to have been displaced from conflict-affected neighbourhoods while thousands of others remain trapped in conflict-affected areas, unable to escape to safety. Most displaced families are staying in private accommodation in different neighbourhoods and suburbs of Tripoli, while hundreds of displaced families are also being hosted in 29 active collective centres. Some 3,000 refugees and migrants remain trapped in detention centers in Abusliem, Gharyan and Qasr bin Ghashir, in close proximity to ongoing hostilities. As indiscriminate shelling and the use of medium and heavy weapons in heavily populated areas continue unabated, the humanitarian impact is expected to continue to grow.

The Protection Sector members have collectively agreed to undertake a broad assessment of the protection risks and service gaps faced by the population as a whole (Libyans and non-Libyans). This protection sector joint assessment seeks to identify the main protection concerns, existing capacities and resources of the population of concern, including positive and negative coping mechanisms. The assessment does not include site assessments of collective "safe sites" or include identification of individual cases which require direct service delivery.

The assessment objectives are:
1. To inform the prioritization of the protection response through identification of key protection risks and threats of the target population (and the diverse needs of men, women, boys and girls);
2. To analyze the capacities, vulnerabilities and coping mechanisms of the population residing in the target area;
3. To provide the protection sector with protection information to carry out advocacy with the relevant key stakeholders.

Methodology

Sampling and data collection
As the assessment is not aiming to measure prevalence protection incidents per area, but rather to have a snapshot of the protection risks faced by different vulnerable groups, it employed purposive sampling in order to stay open to the different needs of specific sample groups (with the acknowledgement that the results will not be representative of the whole affected population.) This method will allow the Protection Sector to develop a qualitative snapshot of the protection concerns which are present among some of the most vulnerable groups by deliberately selecting key informants which are richly informed about the needs of their community.

Data was collected for this joint protection assessment through structured key informant interviews (KII) by INGO and UN organization protection sector members across four days (28 April to 2 May). A total of 64 interviews (37 female, 29 male) were conducted by protection staff of member agencies either by phone or in person.

Target population and geographic coverage
The joint rapid assessment targeted both Libyans and non-Libyans in urban areas of Tripoli. While a comprehensive understanding of protection needs, support and resilience requires a look at the community as a whole, specific attention has been given to certain groups already known to the humanitarian community to be vulnerable and whose ability to cope in the onset of hostilities is of particular concern. These groups include non-libyans (refugees and migrants), pre-2019 IDPs (e.g. Tawargha and IDPs of eastern origin), persons recently displaced due the ongoing clashes.

Findings:

See dashboard: https://tinyurl.com/yxu7ajno

Key informant demographics:

The 64 key informants (37 female, 29 male) interviewed for this rapid protection assessment represent a diverse mix of community representatives, community mobilizers (for INGO/UN agencies), local actors, religious leaders and embassy officials. Regardless of position, their selection from the networks of the participating agencies were based on their ability to provide insights on behalf of Libyan and non-Libyan, displaced and non-displaced communities across the following baladiya of Tripolitania: Hay Andalous, Ain Zara, Abuselim, Tajoura, Suq alJumma and Tripoli centre. The majority of Libyan KIs were located in Hay Andalous, Ain Zara and Tripoli while the majority of non-Libyan KIs were primarily based in Tripoli, and to a lesser extent, in Hay Andalous.

Forty-five percent of key informants were Libyan while 55% were non-libyan, the majority of whom are from east Africa (49%) and west Africa (20%). The below chart shows the complete breakdown of non-Libyan KIs by nationality.

Population movement

The humanitarian impact, and large-scale population displacement, resulting from the onset of hostilities in the outskirts of the Libyan capital of Tripoli in April 2019 continues to grow, potentially posing disastrous consequences for civilians. At time of writing over 59,875 people are estimated to have been displaced by the hostilities in the outskirts of Tripoli including Ayn Zara, Khala,
Azizya, Wadi Rabiya’a, Gasr Bin Ghashir, and along the front lines of active fighting in Abu Salim, Ghrarat, Suq Al-Jumaa, and Haddbaa. While these disaggregated figures are being closely monitored by IOM’s DTM, this assessment wanted to look from a protection perspective the various obstacles to, and along the route to safety.

**Arrivals:** The overwhelming majority, 41 KIs (or 64%) reported that there had been arrivals of displaced persons to their location. These key informants were primarily referring to Tripoli centre, Hay Andalous and Ain Zara. Only 14% reported there had been no arrivals. The arrival of more than 500 individuals was reported for Hay Andalous, Tripoli centre, Ain Zara, Tajour and Abuselim.

**Departures:** Similarly 43 respondents (or 76%) indicated that there had been some level of departures, ranging from 10-100%, from those areas, showing that the conflict is particularly dynamic and many areas are serving as both hosting and departure locations.

Twenty-five percent of respondents reported that 50-75% or 75-100% of their communities had fled but the locations or communities these KIs represent require further analysis beyond collected in this assessment to draw conclusions on actual locations (muhallas in Tripoli (such as Alhodra), Abuselim and Hay Andalous were all mentioned). Areas of Janzour (Sayad IDP camp) and Hay Andalous mentioned no departures at that time.

Intended destinations for departees were reported as outside of Tripoli (21) and Tripoli centre (12). Community members’ intention to depart outside of Libya was mentioned by just two respondents.

Libyan respondents most frequently reported that community members were displaced to Tripoli centre or outside of Tripoli, finding shelter with host families (relatives), and self-rented apartments. Similarly, non-Libyan respondents most frequently reported reported that community members were displaced to Tripoli centre and outside of Tripoli with host families (relatives), host families (non-relatives) and schools being the most common types of accommodation for displaced persons.

---

Barriers to accessing safety:

As mentioned above, the surge in conflict has led to some high levels of displacement. However, despite the difficult circumstances, people in conflict-affected areas do not always decide to move either because they are afraid of looting or because roads are blocked or generally unsafe. For all the interviewed Libyan and non-Libyan male and female key informants, the main barriers to safety were: no safe routes, no options for shelter, and fear to move out of their housing because of looting in their absence. Libyan (10) and non-Libyan women (14) share the same main concern in their decision-making to flee, that being lack of safe routes. However, for non-Libyan women key informants, shelter is a higher need and concern than for Libyan women informants. Even when provided with safe routes and shelter, non-Libyan male and female face another challenge: the lack of transportation. According to the findings, only 10% of the interviewed key informants state that Libyans face challenges with transportation to safety while 31% of non-Libyans face the same challenge. Also, Eastern African non-Libyan women are facing increased fear of harassment as they try to seek shelter and safety (5). Generally, both Libyan and non-Libyan females fear harassment with 50% more than male Libyan and non-Libyan do.

Information sources that guide people’s decision to move: The three main information providers for non-Libyan people who decide to move to safety are: family and friends (40), social media (34) and CSOs/NGOs (19) while the UN hotline and worship places such as churches, mosques rank last. Libyans rely on the same channels for information, but also rely more on the crisis committees and local authorities than on NGOs. The difference, however, is marginal.

Libyan female respondents mentioned their community relying on a wider range of information providers than non-Libyan women. For example, female KIs from Chad who are usually experiencing higher vulnerabilities and discrimination, rely mostly on social media and CSOs/NGOs. Female Libyan KIs mentioned relying on CSOs/NGOs the most but also relying on family, social media and local authorities. The situation is different for male non-Libyans who are searching for information from several resources: family and friends, social media, media outlets, embassies and local authorities. Only one Ethiopian male KI reported that social media was a source of information on accessing safety for his community.

Risks people face on the road to safety: Once both Libyan and non-Libyans decide to take the journey to safety, the continuous fighting and shelling as well as blockage of roads pose the highest threats. Also, due to increased checkpoints non-Libyans fear risk of arrest and detention. Male respondents (84%) reported this risk more than women respondents (77%). While both share the same fear of movement due to blockage of roads and checkpoints (approx 54%).
**Family separation:** Key informants have also been asked whether they have knowledge of families being separated or members of their community going missing. Half of all respondents claimed that they know of families being separated. Forty-one percent of Libyan respondents indicated that families get separated or are aware of missing people due to the following reasons: arrest and detention (41%), kidnapping/abduction (41%), moving to safe areas (33%) and to join military or armed groups (33%). In addition, forty-nine percent of non-Libyan respondents indicated that family separation and missing persons occurs due to separation during fighting (53%), moving to safer areas (47%), kidnapping/abduction (29%), arrest detention (18%) and looking for income (18%).

**Restrictions on the freedom and safety of internally displaced people:** Both Libyan and non-Libyan displaced people face increased restrictions on their movement to safety. In comparison, non-Libyan informants were more likely to report restrictions (85.7%) than Libyan informants (59%). These Libyan respondents express that these restrictions mainly happen because of the following: road blocks and checkpoints (89%), risk of ongoing fighting (78%), risk of arrest and kidnapping (78%). Non-Libyan respondents experience the same restrictions at similar levels, reported restrictions due to ongoing fighting (80%), road blocks (56%), and arrest/detention (56%). Across the board, risk of ongoing fighting, shelling and fear of kidnapping were the most frequently reported reasons for restrictions by all key informants.

Non-displaced Libyan women face greater obstacles in their movement due to increased fear of kidnapping while the recently displaced Libyan women cannot move freely due to ongoing fighting and fear of robbery. On the other hand, the main movement risks non-Libyan women face are: risk of ongoing fighting and road blockages and checkpoints.

**Physical Safety and Protection incidents:**

**Safety:** The physical safety of civilians is being increasingly threatened by indiscriminate attacks as fighting spills into different neighbourhoods of Tripoli. Non-Libyan key informants were significantly more likely to report that their locations were safe or very unsafe. However, overall 58% of key informants (69% of Libyan KIs and 49% of non-Libyan KIs) reported that their current locations were safe.

Key informants were mostly likely to indicate that their location was “safe” or “very safe” if they were based in Tripoli centre (19), Hay Andalous (8) or Ain Zara (5), however, those reporting that their location was “unsafe” or “very unsafe” were also located...
The main reasons for the perceptions of lack of safety were active fighting/presence of militia (68%), risk of shelling, rockets or bombs (63%), and risk of robbery and theft (41%). These top 3 risks were shared by both Libyan and non-Libyan KIs. Both population groups mentioned that women and children are unsafe.

**Presence of UXO:** 11% of respondents indicated the presence of unexploded ordnance (UXO) in their location (7% of Libyans KIs and 14% of non-Libyans indicated the presence of UXO on their locations). The most common Ki location pertaining to these reports was then neighbourhood of Adhora, Tripoli baladiya.

**Protection incidents:** Key informants were asked about the types of protection incidents affecting their community since the fighting began (Note: for the sake of analysis, types of incidents were grouped into violation categories: Deprivation of life, Physical violence, Denial of Liberty, Forced, denied or restricted movement, Denial of land and property, Denial of civil status, registration and documentation, Denial of family rights, and Denial of access to humanitarian aid. The categories of protection incidents most reported by KIs of all population groups to be affecting their communities since the fighting began are ranked as follows:

1. Physical violence,
2. Denial of liberty, and
3. Deprivation of life

However “forced, denied, or restricted movement” was a much more dominant concern reported by Libyan KIs. A total of 15 KIs, both Libyan and non-Libyan also mentioned the deprivation of humanitarian aid.

In terms of specific types of protection incidents, for Libyans, civilian deaths due to indiscriminate attacks (12), abduction/kidnapping/enforced disappearance (12) and destruction of property (11) were the most commonly reported specific types, while killing (14), civilian deaths due to indiscriminate attacks (12), physical assault and abuse (11), torture or inhumane treatment (11) and arbitrary detention (11) were the most common specific types of protection incidents reported by non-Libyans.

---

2 **Protection violation categories applied in the assessment tool:**

- **Deprivation of life:** Killing (incl. Extrajudicial, arbitrary or summary execution), Civilian deaths due to indiscriminate attacks
- **Physical violence:** Physical assault/abuse, Torture or inhumane, cruel and degrading treatment, Maiming or mutilation, Neglect / criminal negligence
- **Denial of Liberty:** Arbitrary or unlawful arrest / detention, Abduction, kidnappings or enforced disappearance, Forced recruitment into armed groups, Forced labour, exploitation or slavery
- **Forced, denied or restricted movement:** Asylum seekers denied access to asylum process, Refoulement, Restrictions on internal movement, Forced internal displacement, Forced return, Denial of right to return
- **Denial of land and property:** Forced eviction, Occupation of property, Destruction of property, Theft / extortion of property
- **Denial of civil status, registration and documentation:** Lack of or denial to register events related to civil status, Lack of, confiscation or denial of civil documentation
- **Denial of family rights:** Forced family separation, Denial to marry / found a family
- **Denial of access to humanitarian aid:** Humanitarians denied access to civilians, Civilians denied access to humanitarian assistance
Fifty-six percent of Libyans KIs indicated that protection incidents are significantly higher from previous months, meanwhile 26% indicated that that increase was slightly higher than before. Thirty-seven percent of non-Libyans KIs indicated that protection incidents are significantly higher from before, while 37% indicated that that increase was slightly higher than before. Unsurprisingly, 69% overall indicated that protection incidents were significantly or slightly more prevalent. Abduction, kidnapping or enforced disappearance was reportedly the most significantly increased protection incident.

Key informants were also asked to rank the top 3 most prevalent protection concerns. If taking the average across all 3, the top five mentioned are civilian deaths due to indiscriminate attacks (26), killing (20), physical assault and abuse (15), arbitrary arrest/arbitrary detention (12), and torture (12).

Notably non-Libyan KIs ranked theft / extortion of property across all 3 top choices, while no Libyan KIs mentioned this risk.

Eviction: Twenty-five percent of key informants were aware of persons/groups in their community receiving an eviction threat (17% of Libyan KIs and 31% of non-Libyan KIs). Landlords were the overwhelming issuer of the threat for Libyans for the reason of inability to pay rent while armed groups/militia were the main eviction notice issuer for non-Libyans for other reasons. Around 38% of KIs (40% Libyan KIs and 36% of non-Libyan KIs) indicated that they thought the prevalence of eviction threats was “significantly higher”, however, notably, non-Libyan KIs across the board thought eviction threat prevalence was the same or higher compared with Libyan KIs.

Fifty-one percent of respondents reported an increase in rental prices for their community, with the average rent was reported to be 990 LYD.

Detention: Twenty-nine KIs (45%) indicated that they had heard of community members being irregularly arrested since the start of the conflict, 24 of which reports pertained to the arrest/detention of migrants or refugees. Reports of Libyans (particularly IDPs, and IDPs of eastern origin) were also made by 11 KIs. The numbers of persons arrest was widely unknown with the most common figure being 5-10 for their community (only 3 KIs mentioned more than 50 persons).

The main reasons for arrest reported by non-Libyan KIs were illegal entry and stay, lack of documentation, and security issues. The main known reasons for arrest reported by Libyan KIs were security issues, or suspicion of supporting an opposition political group. This reason was also flagged by KIs who are IDPs of eastern origin (e.g. Derna) who have sought refuge in Tripoli.
Child protection

More information is required about child protection needs and awareness raising given the majority of the respondents stated that the main child protection risks are unknown; only 10 (16%) of respondents reported knowing of children experiencing trauma due to the exposure to violence while 8 or 13% of informants indicated knowledge of children who have been seriously injured due to the conflict.

69% of the respondents reported that the presence of unaccompanied and separated children hasn’t been noticed since the onset of the conflict, while 16% were aware of an increase in the number of unaccompanied and separated children since the onset of the crisis.

According to the respondents, the key actors able to address issues of violence or abuse against children are international NGOs (27), family and relatives (26) community leaders (14) and local NGOs and Police (both 12).

Women and girls protection

The respondents were asked about the situation of women and girls in light of the ongoing crisis. They have highlighted that the problems that women and girls face are the following: no safe place and privacy (21), general fear and insecurity (12) and harassment (11). Access to assistance also seems to be a significant challenge to ensure their protection and needs. Non-Libyan women (68%) reported higher insecurity due to lack of safe spaces and privacy than Libyan women do (40%). This is also because of limited options for alternative accommodation as they flee the conflict. They usually end up sharing overcrowded shelters with both family and non-relatives which limits their privacy and can lead to conflicts between families, general harassment and intimidation. Also, 45% of non-Libyan women KIs reported that women are experiencing harassment in their community while 20% of Libyan women KIs reported women facing trauma due to exposure to violence. The general feeling of insecurity is prevalent especially amongst Libyan women KIs: 27% of them mentioned women face general insecurity.

Available services for women and girls: The majority of female Libyan and non-Libyan respondents are aware of the availability of primary health care services in their communities. However, this does not mean that access to these services is guaranteed. Only 18% of the non-Libyan females are aware of psychological counselling services being available in their community. To add more, only half of them are aware of pre and post-natal care services being offered. None of the Libyan and non-Libyan female respondents have stated the existence of family planning services which is a critical service for their health and well being.

Sexual abuse: Besides restrictive movement, fear of kidnapping and harassment, women and girls are also facing sexual abuse and exploitation. According to assessment findings, more than half of the Libyan and non-Libyan women KIs report women knowing about sexual violence in their community (57%). The main perpetrators are the militants (57%) who are perceived to be targeting non-Libyan women more than Libyan women. The most aware of militants’ sexual abuse, however, are non-Libyan females from Chad, Eritrea and Iraq. Military officials are also reportedly gravely abusing women and girls (23%). However, Libyan women are equally exposed to sexual abuse by militants as well as other civilians (42% of female KIs reported).
Priority needs / access to assistance:

When asked to prioritize the three most urgent needs for their communities, food, cash assistance and cash to pay rent were the most frequently selected priorities in the top 3 by all population groups. Health and shelter closely followed cash for rent (however, if one considers cash for rent and shelter together as one priority, shelter is the top priority after food.

However, looking at the charts to select the first priority need only, it was reported as food (39%), cash to pay rent (17%) and shelter (15%).

Availability of services:

According to the key informants, the main reasons that communities are unable to access these priority needs are 1) lack of available services, 2) lack of information about services and safety risks associated with access to the service/facilities. Distance and the inability to withdraw cash also factored in.

However, the breakdown of barriers by the top 3 priority needs as reported by respondents is as follows:

1) For the first priority needs (food, cash to pay rent and shelter), 46% of respondent states that those needs cannot be satisfied due to a lack of availability of those services, while another 12% indicated that either the respondents don’t know the reason behind the inaccessibility of services, or that there is a lack of information on the services available (both 12%).

2) For the second batch of priority needs (food, NFI and cash assistance), 21% of the respondent stated that there is a lack of information on the available services, 18% states that there are safety concerns associated to the access and presence of those services while 15% indicated that the reasons for inaccessibility of those services are unknown.

3) With regards to the third priority needs (cash assistance, primary and secondary healthcare and NFIs), 16% stated that the reason of the inaccessibility is the distance to access the necessary facilities, 13% that there is a lack of available services while 11% indicated that there is a lack of information on the services available.

Coping mechanisms: The most common strategies that members of the communities have used to meet their basic needs during the emergency situation have been: to borrow money (for 30 of the key informants), spend savings (according to 29 respondents), to reduced expenses on health food and education (according to 27 respondents), and to depended on family support/host family support (25 respondents).

Groups of concern:

IDPs (displaced pre-2019):

IDPs of eastern origin: Due to the fighting in 2014, the region of Benghazi witnessed multiple waves of displacement with hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons (IDPs) seeking safety in the urban centre of Tripoli and its surroundings. While a large number of IDPs have returned home, approximately 27,000 people are continue
to be displaced in several areas in Libya. The main reasons for displacement is linked to political opinion or perceptions of supporting a specific group. The main areas of displacements from Benghazi are in West Libya, in particular, Tripoli, Misrata, Az-Zawya, Sibrata, Al Khums, Zlita and other scattered areas inside Libya.

In addition to IDPs from Benghazi, these areas also host IDPs from Benghazi. While most Derna IDPs have returned home in the last six months, approximately 1,200 families continue to be displaced in several areas in Libya (including 600 families within Derna). The main reasons of displacement are linked to political opinions, perceptions of supporting the Darna Security Force, or families originating from West Libya. According to several IDPs previously interviewed, the families originating from West Libya were targeted and forcibly displaced, “ethnic cleansing” reasons. The main areas of displacement for the aforementioned families are Tripoli, Misrata, Azzawya, and Zliten, in addition to other scattered areas inside Libya.

Both IDPs groups from eastern Libya feel very unsafe and they will targeted by the LNA forces, meanwhile several reports indicated that IDPs members form both communities are become a target by different military groups in GNA control areas, on the account of suspected affiliations with military groups or rivalry political potions. As a result, freedom of movement is restricted in Tripoli and other location in Western area. Many of the IDP families originated from East Libya hide their identity out of fear of prosecution from militias and host communities.

100% of KIs indicated that IDPs from East Libya facing movement restriction due to presence of checkpoints, risk of arrest and lack of civil documentation. However, all Kls did also indicate that IDPs feel safe where they are now. The main protection concern for IDPs from east Libya was forced, denied on restriction of movement, with the security situation reportedly getting worse for all IDPs from the east (according to 100% of respondents). One of the most concerning findings was that 66% of Kls from the east reported knowing about evictions within their community by landlord and other reasons. Finally, the highest priority need reported by IDP Kls from the east was cash.

IDPs from Tawargha: Interview results from Tawargha IDP key informants indicate their perception that the situation is not safe and suitable for them to flee: 60% of Tawerghan key informants who live in Hai Alandalus reported that there has been no population movement in their area since the beginning of the conflict. In addition to this, 80% of Tawerghan key informants reported that there is no departure from Tripoli City Center. It is worth to mention that Tawerghan key informants also reported that Tawerghan IDPs do not leave their houses because the road is not safe for them to move and even though they manage to safely pass the road, they do not have any shelter to go. Furthermore, harassment or extortion, arrest and detention, and ongoing fighting have been reported by the key informants as the main risks to accessing to safety.

Regarding protection incidents, 40% of interviewed Tawerghan key informants reported that protection incidents have slightly increased since the beginning of the conflict. The rapid protection assessment results have shown that the main protection risks for Tawerghan IDPs have been arbitrary or unlawful arrest and detention, death of civilians because of indiscriminate attacks, and restriction of internal movements. All Tawergha key informants reported that nobody in Tawergha community has received eviction threat since the beginning of the conflict.

As the safety situation has been deteriorated, it is reported that Tawerghan IDPs developed different coping mechanism strategies to be able to meet their basic needs in this emergency situation. According to Tawerghan key informants, members of their community either took additional jobs to meet their basic needs or started to spend their savings. Their current gaps, and highest priority need (according to the assessment) is food, followed by access to drinking water and health care services. It is also reported by Tawerghan key informants that the reason why they cannot access to needed services is either lack of service provision or safety risks associated with access to/presence at facilities.
IDPs (newly displaced in 2019):

Seven out of nine interviewed persons indicated that they aware of the family separation for the newly displaced during the ongoing conflict due to arrest, kidnapping, moving to safer area, and due to joining the army. Freedom of movement is also reported as a concern as reported, as 44% of KIs report communities have some restriction and or full restriction of movement (33%). The main reasons reported for restriction of movement were due to the risks posed by the ongoing conflict, risk of robbery/ theft and risk of kidnapping.

Thirty-three percent of respondents indicated that the current location is very unsafe due to risk of shelling and rocket, active fighting and presence of militia, and risk of abduction, extortion and harassment. The main protection incidents reported for the newly displaced group was physical violence (8), forced, denial and restriction of movement (8) deprivation of life (7), denial of liberty (7), and denial of land and property (5).

The priority needs reported by newly displaced IDP KIs was 1) food, 2) cash and 3) health services; 44% of key informants indicated that newly displaced lack of access to assistance

Detainees in detention centres:

This assessment was not conducted in detention settings, however, the protection sector would like to flag that detained migrants and refugees remain a group of particular concern within the current context. As of 8 May, more than 6,000 migrants and refugees are estimated remain arbitrarily detained in 37 detention centres (DC) across Libya, including some 3,380 in DCs located in conflict-affected areas around Tripoli.

Migrants and refugees are held in undignified and inhumane conditions. They have no access to adequate and specialized medical care, including sexual and reproductive health care, insufficient and nutritious food and drinking water, have inadequate access to washing and sanitation facilities, and no access to basic necessities including clean bedding, clothing and items of personal hygiene.

Many of individuals in vulnerable situations have been detained in these centres, including children, in particular those are unaccompanied or separated families; pregnant and nursing women; survivors of trafficking, torture and rape; person with particular physical or mental needs; and person living with disabilities.

UNHCR and IOM have been organizing the relocation/transfer of detainees from high-risk locations to safer areas (1,200 persons thus far), as well as to expedite either the IOM’s Voluntary Humanitarian Returns (VHR) programme, or UNHCR facilitated evacuation to third safe countries. However, as the conflict intensifies the international community needs to advocate with Libyan duty-bearers to find a more adequate long-term solution, including the release of all arbitrarily detained persons.

Recommendations:

To the international community:

1. Ensuring the protection of civilians remains paramount, therefore international actors should continue to advocate for a political solution to the situation in Libya based on the rule of law and incorporating human rights protections to avoid further suffering.
2. The international community must call on all parties to the conflict to take immediate measures to protect civilians from both direct attack and the indirect effects of armed conflict, including:
   a. Ensure that civilians and migrant women and girls are able to physically move away from conflict areas. All parties must commit to providing warning and ensuring humanitarian corridors for women and girls and other civilians out of affected areas.
   b. Ensure that migrants and refugees in detention centers are not involved in direct hostilities, in compliance with International Humanitarian Law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons and cease the use of migrants and refugees to carry out attacks.
   c. Guarantee aid workers safe access to ensure the delivery of lifesaving assistance to the hundreds of thousands of people who continue to suffer from the impact of the violence.
3. The UN Security Council should adopt a resolution calling for the protection of civilians and accountability for serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law. Member States should desist from exercising their veto powers to block resolutions intended to ensure compliance with international law.
4. Donors to urgently provide funding to the protection actors to support humanitarian coordination, protection response activities, and to ensure accountability to the affected populations. In line with a conflict-sensitive approach, special attention should be given to supporting the response in under-resourced areas, including areas outside of Tripoli, to avoid the perception of political bias of assistance provided only to areas aligned with one party to the conflict, or to avoid further divisions within the Libyan society.
5. European Union must address policies that have been harmful to the management of migration, including the withdrawal of search and rescue missions along the Mediterranean Sea which further restrict the ability of all persons in Libya to flee to safety, instead:
   a. Promote safe and legal routes for migrants and refugees;
   b. Increase EU member States-supported SAR capacity in the Central Mediterranean. Any person rescued at sea must be - without delay - authorized to disembark to a safe port as required by international law;
   c. Review policies that prevent NGOs from conducting lifesaving humanitarian operations at sea;
   d. Make support for detention centers in Libya conditional based on adherence with human rights standards and international law / due diligence.
   e. Finally, Governments must commit to increase resettlement places and expedite humanitarian evacuation of those held in detention centres to a safe place outside of Libya where protection and medical needs of refugees and migrants can be assessed and addressed.
6. International community (UN, governments, INGOs and NGOs) must increase coordination to overcome the challenges facing host communities and the displaced, in line with the scale and complexity of the crisis, including cross-border cooperation. The needs of all refugees and internally displaced persons must be fully and consistently provided for regardless of registration status, in line with principles identified in the 1951 UN Refugee Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

To humanitarian partners:

1. Prioritise assistance to people and groups on the basis of need and not nationalities, including:
a. Provide shelter for all based on the principle of non-discrimination, especially for displaced single women and migrants, with an aim to ensure access to essential services and provide protection from violence, abuse and exploitation.

b. Prioritise the immediate provision of adequate and quality health and protection services, especially in collective shelters, spontaneous sites, health facilities and schools. Safe shelters, food and cash (for rent and other basic needs) should also be supported based on the priorities identified.

c. Scale up information provision services and outreach to affected population to avert disease outbreaks and negative coping mechanisms.

2. Humanitarian actors who are implementing shelter and rehabilitation shall ensure that “safe” separate living areas for groups such as women, people with disabilities and children and include: a safe central location within the residential area such as near families; lighting of entry point to the building; higher windows that cannot be looked into; lockable doors; and water and sanitation facilities in close proximity. All decisions on design of the services in the shelter should be taken in consultation with the relevant groups and in line with protection mainstreaming principles.


4. Prioritise prevention of all forms of sexual violence against Libyan and non-Libyan women, making full use of the Guidelines for Integrating Gender Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action and in compliance with the ‘zero tolerance’ policy on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, as well as International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law.

5. Provide psychosocial care, such as psychological first aid, safe areas to play, interact and engage in group work for women and children who have been displaced and exposed to traumatic events, especially for migrant and refugee women, and groups otherwise identified by the assessment as being at higher risk of exclusion.

6. Strengthen timely access to confidential care and treatment of gender-based violence survivors including access to clinical management of rape, emergency GBV case management and Sexual and reproductive health services.

7. Based on reported displacement patterns outside of Tripoli, protection actors should advocate for the provision of assistance in these under-resourced areas.

8. Protection actors to continue protection monitoring activities in order to collect data for analysis and deeper understanding of protection issues and to identify persons with specific needs.

9. Advocate for the establishment of family linkage activities in order to follow-up on family separation issues and reported missing persons.

To parties involved in the conflict:

1. The physical safety of civilians is threatened by indiscriminate attacks and shelling in dense urban areas: all parties to the conflict shall not target and take immediate measures to ensure the protection of civilians, civilian objects or humanitarian responders.

2. All parties to the conflict to commit a humanitarian truce or ceasefire to allow delivery of humanitarian aid and to ensure the freedom of movement;
3. Ensure the safe and unrestricted access of all population groups affected by the fighting and displacement, including Libyans and non-Libyans, to access collective shelters without discrimination where they can enjoy safety, freedom of movement and access life-saving and essential services.

4. Facilitate access for humanitarian actors and service providers to mobilize assistance to conflict-affected households both within Tripoli and to the surrounding areas which are receiving increasing numbers of displaced populations.

5. Facilitate immediate release of refugees and migrants being held in detention centres so they can be moved to safer locations.

6. Hold accountable militants involved in perpetrating any forms of sexual violence against civilians.

--End of Report -- - -

For more information, Please contact the protection sector coordinator in Libya, Yasin Abbas at abbsy@unhcr.org