



ANTICIPATORY ACTION: REPORT 12

December 2020 ~ Week 12

The primary objective of this project has been to strengthen service delivery through anticipatory protection monitoring and response management. Existing datasets, including the Somalia Protection Monitoring System (SPSMS) and PRMN, the analysis has identified blind spots in service provision where exclusionary practices, or cases of extortion and/or exploitation have been reported by interviewees, focus group participants, and survey respondents. In addition to an outline of the methods and reports developed in this project, this final report also provides a brief overview of some of the key findings which could be used to guide future policies and practices.

Methods

Independent monitors were recruited to conduct interviews, facilitate focus group discussions (FGDs), and administer satisfaction perception surveys to beneficiaries in a range of settlements in various districts throughout Somalia.

Surveys

The surveys were administered to 244 individuals in total. Where it has been recorded by independent monitors, the disaggregated data collected from these surveys has been summarised in the table below.

| Age | | | Gender | | Disability | | | Education | | | |
|-------|-------|-----|--------|--------|------------|-----|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| 18-24 | 25-59 | 60+ | Male | Female | Yes | No | None | Primary | Secondary | Religious | Other |
| 72 | 114 | 30 | 54 | 162 | 99 | 117 | 131 | 27 | 17 | 23 | 18 |

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with 207 individuals, and demographic data was collected where it was volunteered by interviewees. Independent monitors asked two types of questions: those relating to exclusion or inaccessibility, and those concerning extortion or exploitation. Views, experiences, and perceptions were expressed in response to questions investigating who is commonly affected by these practices, who perpetrates them, and what other agencies or community members are doing to tackle these problems from the bottom up.

Most commonly, interviews have revealed that some groups are disproportionately affected; including women, children, older persons, people with disabilities, and members of certain clans. Interviewees also reported mixed perceptions of existing efforts (e.g., through NGOs) to tackle or prevent these issues; with many attesting that nothing is being done, whilst others commonly described awareness-raising activities. Depending on which of these perspectives an interviewee held, the suggestions for anticipatory action included either raising awareness where NGOs were perceived to be doing nothing, or providing legal support or building local capacity where NGOs were already raising awareness. This knowledge of what affected populations consider to be the most appropriate next steps perhaps highlights the value of adopting an inclusive approach.

Focus groups

Independent monitors facilitated a total 183 groups, with a range of 4-12 participants per group. These discussions focused on four central questions to assess to what extent beneficiaries are involved in programme design and humanitarian decision-making, in addition to what extent they are consulted during project implementation. Finally, facilitators asked participants to identify which services fall short of Do No Harm (DNH) following a short definition of the principle.

FGD participants held mixed views regarding the extent to which they are included during implementation. Overall, however, most participants reported limited opportunities to be included in design and/or decision-making forums; with a number saying that they were unsure what the term 'programme design' refers to. These interviewees appear to have also expressed an interest in knowing what it is and developing the capacity to be involved.

Reporting

A series of 12 distinct reports have been produced as part of the AA project, including this final overview of the methods and reporting mechanisms. The reports have been produced on a weekly basis using the data collected using the methods outlined above in addition to SPMS data. Within the limits of cross-linguistic data collection and analysis, the methods have captured useful preliminary findings that can be incorporated in future planning or future research worth further investigation.

Reports 1-4

There are trends in the first four reports which speak to some issues that were recurring as the analysis was ongoing, including the finding that agency staff and authority figures are often perceived to exclude certain groups or individuals from services. Indeed, this potentially indicates an implementation or distribution problem. Likewise, these reports also refer to the common perception that beneficiaries are not involved in programme design or decision-making, including those who believe that their involvement during implementation is rather often limited to the physical receipt of aid. Having said that, others acknowledged that organisations do sometimes administer surveys prior to the design phase or during a final project evaluation, perhaps indicating the need for more participatory approaches.

Reports 5-7

The next three reports apply a regional lens to the data collected up to the point of reporting. Key findings in south and central Somalia, for example, indicate that decisions are generally made by external actors in locations inaccessible to beneficiaries. In addition, competition for resources (driven by insufficient availability of aid) exacerbates community tensions and conflicts according to FGD participants in Puntland, whilst interviewees and FGD participants in Jubaland suggest that greater collaboration with local authorities is needed to mitigate many of the problems they discussed.

Reports 8-11

These reports draw exclusively on data which refers to the experiences of four groups in particular: namely, (i) clan members, (ii) adults and children affected by exploitation, (iii) people with disabilities, and (iv) older persons. Trends emerged both within and between these groups, speaking to the fragile context within which the findings in these reports should be considered.