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MAP OF STUDY AREA

Map of Galkayo District: Adapted from UN OCHA 2012
DISTRICT PROFILE

Galkayo, one of the largest towns in southern and central Somalia, straddles the Federal Republic of Somalia in the middle, splitting the southern and central parts of the country. It is situated approximately 717 km north of the capital, Mogadishu and 230 km south of Garowe. Other large cities proximate to it include Hobyo (290 km south east) and Qardho (435 km north east).

Following the ouster of Siad Barre’s military regime in 1991, Galkayo suffered through several years of civil war as rival clans sought to establish their power, culminating in the splitting of the town in half with the northern part coming under the control of Puntland and the southern part falling under the Galmudug Administration. Despite the signing of a peace agreement (ceasefire) in 1993, the city has continued to experience sporadic outbreaks of violence as the political environment shifts. Another agreement was signed in 2011 in which the Puntland and Galmudug Administrations pledged to cooperate on security, economic and social issues. In 2011 - 12, the level of insecurity rose as clan fighting and violence broke out driven by the influx of undesirable elements such as Al-Shabaab militants and pirates fleeing military advance in the south. This contributed to an increase in assassinations and bombings as well as several instances of aid workers being kidnapped.

In addition, Galkayo hosts a sizable number of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) – UNHCR estimates as of 2012 were 9,863 families or 59,178 people. There are 21 IDP camps within the district and conditions within those camps range from barely optimum to absolutely deplorable, especially when the state of security imperils the delivery of aid and food assistance, as was the case in early 2012 when many NGOs suspended work in the district citing safety concerns.

Administratively, the town (Northern Galkayo) is run by a local council which, after having been suspended in 2013 due to political instability and violence, was re-established via a presidential decree in April 2014. The council comprises councillors who are selected through a participatory process and then vetted by a selection committee. Upon appointment, the councillors are tasked with the election of a Mayor and Deputy Mayor. With a reformed council in place, the local authorities could take part in development projects earmarked for Somali cities and towns, such as the UN’s Joint Programme on Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery (JPLG).
SCOPE

The District Conflict and Security Assessment is designed to gather people’s perceptions regarding service providers and accessibility and effectiveness of the services they provide. Information is gathered according to four progress indicators relating to service provision: justice, governance, security and conflict. While a district may contain a major urban settlement (main town) and a number of smaller surrounding villages, it is the unfortunate reality that the type of public services this assessment is aiming to measure are concentrated only within the main town of the district, while at the village level they are either inadequate or completely absent. Keeping this in mind this assessment was designed and carried out in the major urban settlement of the district; the GALKAYO town. It is also worth mentioning that this report was conducted only in the northern part of Galkayo (Puntland) by the OCVP Garowe office.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Continual assessment of issues directly affecting the community’s safety and security is critical for effective evidence-based programming, informed decision making and measuring the impact of related programmatic interventions. It enables a better understanding of what works and does not work at the community level. With this in mind, the district level assessments map out and provide a better understanding of issues that affect targeted communities across the Somali regions. By using key indicators for selected thematic areas, this report provides an assessment on the state of governance, justice, and security as well as conflict and violence in Galkayo District. This assessment was conducted in the Galkayo District from January 18 to 22, 2015.

The following summarises the key findings of the assessment:

Security providers

The police, working under the Ministry of Security and Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR), was observed to be moderately operational. In addition to the Central Police Station in the Garsoor Sub-division, two other police stations were also in existence, but this level of deployment, in conjunction with the number of police officers in employment, was seen as being insufficient. To mitigate the resource deficiencies, the police work in coordination with traditional elders and the local government. As the face of government security provision and therefore the perceived legitimate authority, the police were the most preferred provider for reporting cases involving civil matters, petty crime or serious crime. Accordingly, the police was also the most trusted security provider to respond to crime and violence. Their speed of response was cited as the most likely reason for such trust. In addition, most respondents indicated that they had high or fairly high levels of trust in the police.

Justice providers

As a result of its status as the administrative capital of the region of Mudug in Puntland, Galkayo has a Court of Appeal, which also acts as a Regional Court, in addition to the District court. Awareness of the existence of any courts was however, low among the household survey respondents, particularly the IDPs. Traditional elders are arguably the most active justice providers in Galkayo; most of the respondents who had engaged any of the justice providers in the 12-month period prior to the assessment had engaged elders. A majority of respondents also felt that religious leaders were bound to be fair in their judgement and therefore mentioned them as their choice for most trustworthy provider. While respondents expressed a fairly high level of confidence in the courts, approximately one in every five stated outright that they had no confidence in the courts.

Governance providers

The Local council in Galkayo has been in operation since April of 2014 when it was re-established by presidential decree. It consists of 27 councillors, nominated by traditional elders and vetted by a selection committee appointed by the president. Awareness of the existence of the council was high in all subdivisions except Israa but the awareness of services provided by the council was comparatively lower across the board. The local council is actively involved in the provision of security in conjunction with the police and informal sector actors; it was stated that a sizable portion of the annual budget is taken up by this involvement. Apart from security, the council is involved in numerous infrastructure projects, with the support of JPLG and International Labour Organisation (ILO).

Conflict and violence

The degree of coordination observed between security providers has contributed to incremental stability. While safety levels are higher relative to the turmoil of past years, qualitative discussions pointed to
frequent assassinations and acts of terrorism occurring within the city. In the household survey however, only a small portion of respondents stated that they had witnessed conflict between groups or clans in the 12-month period preceding the assessment. Family disputes were stated as the most common causes of those conflicts. There were also reports among the qualitative discussions about the proliferation of small arms and the porosity of the district’s borders being potential drivers of conflict and insecurity.
1. METHODOLOGY

1.1. Overview

As part of its continual assessment of issues directly affecting community security and safety, OCVP conducted an extensive collection of primary data in GALKAYO District - the capital of the central Mudug region of Somalia.

In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the thematic areas under investigation, a mixed-method approach was employed to allow the research team to triangulate information uncovered in both the data collection and subsequent analysis phase. The household survey, together with the Focus Group Discussions, aimed at obtaining a representative picture of the target populations’ perceptions regarding the thematic areas under exploration. Key Informant Interviews were then used to probe deeper into, and cross-validate issues that emerged.

The quantitative data was analysed by the OCVP Research and Analysis team using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22, after it had been collected using smart tablets that were running ODK Collect – an open source mobile data collection tool. The qualitative data was subjected to thematic analysis, using a largely deductive approach (qualitative research being a smaller component of a larger quantitative study). The main themes of coding were developed before the mission, in line with the questions, but further coding was done during analysis.

1.2. Sampling Methodology

A sampling formula\(^1\) was employed in order to determine a representative sample size for the district. The study took into account certain statistical parameters such as the level of confidence desired (95%), sample design effect (1.5), margin of error (+ or − 8%) and the assumption that some security correlations of (0.3) existed within the sub-divisions. The p-value of 0.3 in the formula assumes a security correlation above a random normal distribution of 0.5 within the district clusters (sub-division). This is a reasonable assumption based on the topic of the survey – respondents within the districts are likely to exhibit a correlational relationship between their perceptions and the surrounding security environment. This is further backed by OCVP’s past experience in which individuals from the same area tend to exhibit similar perceptions on security, justice, governance and conflict and violence.

A prospective sample size of 190 respondents was derived from the calculation detailed above. The final sample comprised 197 respondents, due to oversampling.

1.3. Household Survey

A face-to-face quantitative survey was conducted in which questions relating to personal demographics, security, justice, governance provision and conflict and violence were asked of respondents from randomly selected households. OCVP’s two trained data enumerators and two local supporters (with local acquaintances and knowledge on delineations between sub-divisions), completed a total of 197 interviews with respondents in Garsoor, Horumar, Israa and Siinay sub-divisions from January 18 to 22, 2015. Respondents were also interviewed from sampled IDP camps. All sampled sub-divisions and IDPs were located in the northern region of Galkayo.

Discussions with a representative of the local government in Galkayo regarding the demography of the town helped the team to select the four sub-divisions of Garsoor, Isaac, and Horumar and Siinaay. In addition, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) were sampled from two IDP settlements (Tawakal and Halabookhad).

The team employed Systematic Random Sampling (SRS) where enumerators randomly selected every 5th household after a random start point and interviewed one respondent above 18 years old in each selected household. Furthermore, in the absence of gender proportion statistics, the researchers aimed at an equal representation of

\(^1\) See Annex 6.1
both genders. Moreover, the number of questionnaires administered in the different subdivisions was proportional to the size of the subdivision.

Garsoor had the highest number of interviewees among all, totalling 58 respondents, 34 male and 24 females, while Isaac village comprised the second highest number of respondents with sum of 50, (28 females and 22 males). Siinaay held only 23 respondents (12 females and 11 males) while Horumar contained 17 male and 10 females. Together, the two IDP settlements' respondents made up 39 with 21 and 18 female and male respondents respectively (Table 1).

Table 1: Distribution of respondents within sub-divisions by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Sub-division</th>
<th>Gender (Number of respondents)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garsoor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horumar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siinaay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. Focus Group Discussions

The second research tool (qualitative) utilised was a series of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) aimed at capturing participants’ perception on security and justice providers (formal and informal), governance providers and the dynamics and experiences of conflict and violence. The FGDs were conducted on the 18th and 19th of January 2015 at the Golden Hotel Conference hall. Each discussion group lasted for about an hour.

A total of six groups were involved in the FGDs: women, elders and religious leaders (in one group), youth (male and female in one group), justice providers (formal and informal), IDPs and governance providers (formal). Each group consisted of 10 participants, with the exception of two groups (justice and governance providers) composed of eight participants. (See Table 2.) A local organiser assisted in the recruitment of the participants based on clan-lines, geographic coverage, social class, gender and age group (as well as profession in the case of justice and governance providers).

Table 2: Distribution of focus group participants by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders/Religious Leaders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Providers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Providers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. Key Informant Interviews

The third method utilised for data collection was personal interviews with key informants who possessed experiential knowledge on the themes under investigation. The aim was to go deeper into the subject areas and cross-validate the issues raised in the FGDs.

The interviews were conducted between January 19 and 20, 2015 at the respective offices of the interviewees. A convenient venue was selected for those who did not have offices. Each interview lasted for about half an hour. Six key informants were interviewed, including: Regional Police Commissioner, Local Government Director of Social Affairs, Regional Court Prosecutor, Halabookhad IDP Chairperson, Key Traditional Chairperson and the Deputy Governor.

A local organiser assisted in the scheduling of the interviews which were then conducted by OCVP of information obtained using the previous composition, and (ii) sufficient information about some of the thematic areas was not being captured. Consequently, the governance providers’ and justice providers’ groups were scrapped and the religious leaders’ and traditional elders’ groups were merged into one group.
researchers. Interviews began with questions that were tailored to the interviewee and then generally cut-across the thematic areas of governance, justice, security, and conflict and violence. Table 3 below details a list of the key informants.

**Table 3: Participants in key informant interviews by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Police Commander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Director of Social Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Court prosecutor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halabookhad IDP Chairperson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Traditional Elder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Governor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

In the absence of statistics as to the actual gender disaggregation in the district, a gender balance had been emphasised to allow a clear depiction of the differences in experiences, views and insights between the two genders throughout the report. To this end, the male respondents made up 52% of the sample (102 respondents) vs. 48% (95 respondents) females (Fig. 1).

Figure 1: Respondents by gender

![Respondents by gender](image)

(\(n=197\))

Regarding the respondents' age groups; those in their 20s represented the highest percentage of the entire sample, being 36% (24% male and 12% female) followed by 19% in their 30s (7% male, 12% female). Respondents in their forties made up 14% (11% female, 3% male) as did those below 20 years of age\(^3\) (11% male, 3% female). Respondents above fifty years of age accounted for 17% (10% female, 7% male) as seen in (Fig.2).

Figure 2: Age distribution of the respondents by gender

![Age distribution of the respondents by gender](image)

Approximately three in every five respondents (59%) were married, slightly less than a third (32%) were single and those who were divorced or widowed made up 4% each (Fig. 3).

Figure 3: Marital status of the respondents

![Marital status of the respondents](image)

\(^3\) But above 18 years of age
Two thirds of the respondents (66%) stated that they had received some kind of formal education (primary school level through to tertiary level), with those stating that they had attained secondary level education making up slightly more than a quarter (27%) of the entire sample. Those with intermediate education formed slightly less than a quarter 23% of the sample. Respondents who had attained primary school education made up 9% of the sample, those with tertiary education made up 7% and those had attended Quranic Madarasa formed 18%. Respondents stating that they had never been educated made up 15% of the sample while 1% had been self-schooled (Fig. 4).

Men were more likely than women to have received tertiary education, with 12% of men having done so compared to 2% of the women. Male respondents were also more likely to have attained secondary school education at 38% compared to 16% for the women. The proportion of men having received intermediate school education was equal to that of women with the same level of education at 23% as was that of those who had never self schooled at 1% each. At 23%, women were more likely than men (8%) never to have been educated and slightly more likely at 21% than men (15%) were in Quranic Madarasa. They were also more likely to have primary school education than men were at 14% compared to 4% for the men (Fig. 5).
Figure 5: Respondents’ education levels (by gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never educated</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quranic Madarass</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self schooled</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=197)
3. GOVERNANCE, JUSTICE AND SECURITY PROVIDERS

3.1. SECURITY PROVIDERS

In the course of the last two decades, governments of states emerging from conflict situations and their partners in the international community have acknowledged the importance of considering the security – development nexus in the formulation of policies and the planning of strategic approaches to recovery and statebuilding.4

Puntland, being relatively further along the path of recovery but still a constituent component of the younger Federal Republic of Somalia, is at a point where it must safeguard this nexus to consolidate gains made since the establishment of the federated state on the one hand and contribute to the vision of a stable and peaceful Somalia on the other. Galkayo has played a critical role in paving the way for progress on that front by hosting the Galkayo Meeting of Principals, one of the meetings that were pivotal to a successful transition.5 Galkayo is also an indicative illustration of the challenges and opportunities that the nascent delineation of regional administrations of the federal republic presents, considering the historically tumultuous past leading to the division of the regional capital and the concomitant political and security tensions.

Reflecting on this precarious position, traditional elders who participated in a focus group discussion opined that Galkayo tends to suffer from incidences of insecurity more often than other regions of Puntland. They were of the opinion that the division of the town into two “rival” political entities incites political conflicts and disputes over resources and the dissimilar nature of its inhabitants precipitates acts of violence such as assassinations, rape and revenge killings.6 In addition to political instability and interpersonal violence, piracy and clan militia were also mentioned as common drivers of insecurity.7

As with other districts in Puntland, the provision of security in Puntland is the domain of the police under the stewardship of the Ministry of Security and Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR). There are three police stations in Galkayo, the Central Police Station, Miir Sub-Police Station in the Horumar sub-division and Galey Sub-Police Station in Garsoor.8 A number of security agencies, such as the Puntland Intelligence Services (PIS), cooperate with the police to gather information and intelligence for the prevention of crime and violence. The local government also provides assistance, mainly of a logistical nature where the police may require it. Additionally, due their influence and level of involvement in the society, traditional elders also collaborate with the police on security issues.9

This section assesses the level of deployment of the security providers in Galkayo along with the perceptions held by the general public towards matters of security such as the performance of providers and levels of trust in the security providers. The section also highlights numerous challenges faced by the police as the formal security provider.

---

4 One of the formative formulations of this nexus was put forth as follows: “the security of states and the security of people should be seen as mutually reinforcing, suggesting that unmet social, political and economic needs may provoke popular unrest and opposition to governments, ultimately making them more vulnerable to internal and external threats.”. See OECD, DAC, Security Issues and Development Cooperation: A Conceptual Framework for Enhancing Policy Coherence, DAC Journal Vol.2 No.3 (2001) p. 42.

5 Along with other meetings of major stakeholder that followed the 2011 Kampala Accord such as those in Mogadishu, Garowe and Addis Ababa, the Galkayo meeting helped to set priorities for the transition process. See Atta-Asamoah, Long Walk to Restoration: Lessons from Somalia’s Transition Process, Institute for Security Studies Situation Report (2013) p. 5.

6 Traditional elders and religious leaders, Focus Group Discussion, 20th January 2015

7 Galkayo Women, Focus Group Discussion, 19th January 2015

8 Ibid

9 Mudug Regional Police Commander, Key Informant Interview, 22nd January, 2015
3.1.1. Level of Deployment

Despite the presence of police stations in two of the targeted sub-divisions in addition to the Central Police Station, more than one-half (56%) of the respondents reported that they were not aware of police presence, 38% were aware and 6% said they did not know whether the police were present or not (Fig. 6). The Deputy Governor of the Mudug Region stated that the number of police stations and police officers was not adequate for the population of Galkayo and that this had an adverse effect on the ability of the police to respond effectively to crimes.\(^\text{10}\) IDPs in particular, complained about the lack of access to police services, stating:

*We do not have a police station in our camps, and it takes a long time for the police to be deployed whenever there is a security threat.*\(^\text{11}\)

**Figure 6: Respondents’ awareness of police presence**

Among the male respondents, 42% were aware of police presence and 63% were not, while among the female respondents, a third (33%) were aware compared to 60% who were not. The respondents who claimed that they did not know made up 5% of the men and 7% of the women.

![Graph showing respondents' awareness of police presence by gender](image)

The highest levels of awareness (73%) were observed in Horumar Sub-division, followed by Siinaay (43%) and Garsoor (41%). In Israa, only 22% of the respondents were aware of police presence while among the IDPs, 26% were aware (Fig. 8).

**Figure 8: Respondents’ awareness of police presence by sub-divisions**

More than one third (35%) of the respondents who had indicated an awareness of police presence went on to state that they knew of only one station, 28% were aware of two and 18% were aware of all three. Those who said that they did not know how many police stations are in Galkayo made up 14% while some respondents thought there were four or five stations (5%) (Fig. 9).

---

\(^{10}\) Deputy Governor of Mudug Region, Key Informant Interview, 20\textsuperscript{th} January 2015

\(^{11}\) Galkayo IDPs, Focus Group Discussion, 19\textsuperscript{th} January 2015
When respondents who were aware of the police presence were asked about the distance to the closest station from their homesteads, almost three quarters (73%) said that it was under an hour’s walking distance away. Respondents stating that the closest station was under two hours away made up 14%, those stating under 3 hours formed 3%, and 11% did not know (Fig. 10). In addition, almost nine out of every ten (89%) of those who lived in Horumar, seven in ten (70%) of those in Garsoor, 64% of those in Israac, 80% of those in Siinaay and 50% among the IDPs were less than an hour away from the nearest police station (Fig. 11).

The IDPs in particular, expressed concerns about the distance of the camps to the police stations, stating that offenders often flee crime scenes long before the police arrive.12

12 IDPs’ FGD, Op. Cit
3.1.2. Preference of the Security Providers

This sub-section of the report looks closely at the providers that respondents reported as the most likely avenue for reporting incidences of civil disputes, petty crimes and serious crimes.

3.1.2.1. Civil Matters

For civil matters such as those pertaining to family and business disputes, trespass or personal law, the police were the most preferred for reporting, having been mentioned by 39% of the entire sample. Traditional elders were second at 28% and the local authority was third at 19%. Courts and religious leaders were mentioned by 6% and 3% of the respondents respectively. Of the 2% (n = 3) reporting that they would opt for ‘other’ options, two stated that they would prefer to handle civil matters by themselves, and one would report to the village head (Fig. 12).

In terms of gender disaggregation, the most notable disparities were a higher likelihood of men to opt for traditional leaders (39%) than women (16%) and a higher likelihood of women to opt for the local authority at 26% compared to 12% for the men (Fig. 13).

3.1.2.2. Petty Crimes

Almost equal proportions pointed out the police and the traditional elders (38%: police and 37%: traditional elders) when they were asked who they would most likely contact when reporting petty crimes such as mobile snatching or household violence. One in ten respondents (10%) would report to the local authority while 7% and 3% would report to religious leaders and the court respectively. Other options (1%) mentioned included reporting to members of the community (Fig. 14).

When disaggregated by gender, it was observed that a greater proportion of men than that of women (44% to 29%) had mentioned traditional elders, while a greater proportion of women than that of men (18% to 2%) had mentioned the local
authority. It was also noted that men (11%) were more likely to opt for religious leaders when reporting petty crimes than women were, at 3% (Fig. 15).

**Figure 15: Respondents' preference of reporting petty crimes by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional elder</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leader</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=106)

### 3.1.2.3. Serious Crimes

It the event of serious crimes, just over one half (51%) said they would report to the police, followed by 21% who said they would report to traditional elders, 11% who would report to the local authority and 9% who would opt for the court (Fig. 16).

**Figure 16: Respondents preference of reporting on serious crimes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting preference- serious crimes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional elder</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leader</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=106)

Upon gender disaggregation, it was observed that female respondents indicated a slightly higher likelihood of opting to report serious crimes to the police than that of men doing so (53%: women compared to 49%: men). Females also indicated a greater preference for reporting to the local authority (16% women vs. 7% men). Men however indicated a greater preference for reporting to traditional elders than women (27%: men vs. 15%: women), see figure 17.

**Figure 17: Respondents' preference of reporting on serious crimes by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional elder</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leader</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.3. Level of Trust in Security Providers (formal and informal)

The trend observed in relation to reporting preference was maintained when the respondents were asked whom among the various security providers they trust the most to respond to crime and violence. More than one third (38%) of the respondents said that they trust the police most. Traditional elders were the second most trusted provider, having been pointed out by 28% of the entire sample and religious leaders at 20%, were the third (Fig. 18).
Upon gender disaggregation, larger portions of women appeared to mention the police (44%) and local authorities (13%) than their male counterparts (31%; police and 7%; local authority). Overall, men were more likely to state that their most trusted security provider is an informal security provider (traditional elders or religious leaders) than the women were. Traditional elders were stated by 35% of the men compared to 20% of the women while religious leaders were stated by 24% of the men compared to 16% of the women (Fig. 19).

Figure 18: Most trusted security provider in responding to crime and violence

Figure 19: Most trusted security provider in responding to crime and violence by gender

It was further enquired of the respondents what reason they could ascribe to the trust of the security provider they had stated. Trust in police was most frequently attributed to their fast response (59%). For traditional elders, the two most commonly cited reasons were unbiased enforcement and respect at 33% each, while most respondents who said that they trust religious leaders the most had been influenced by their lack of bias (59%). Table 4 below gives a full break down of the reasons for trust in security providers.

Table 4: Respondents’ reasons for choice of most trusted security provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for trust of security provider</th>
<th>Most trusted security provider in responding to crime and violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast response</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased enforcement</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are respected</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the level of trust towards the police in responding to crime and violence was high, a cumulative 62% of the respondents had felt trustful (31%; fairly high and 31%; very high). Respondents who had ‘fairly low’ trust made up 17% and those who had ‘very low’ trust made up 16% of the sample (Fig. 20).

Figure 20: Respondents’ level of trust in Police

Upon further investigation along gender lines, slight variations were observed. While the likelihood of respondents expressing high levels of trust was higher than the likelihood of expressing low levels within both genders, women were marginally more
likely to express trust than men were (37%: very high and 33%: fairly high compared to 26%:very high and 30% fairly high for the men). Conversely, at 22% for fairly low and 19% for very low levels of trust, men were more likely than women were (12%: fairly low and 14%: very low) to have negative perceptions regarding the level of trust in the police (Fig. 21).

Figure 21: Respondents' level of trust in the police by gender

![Graph showing the percentage of respondents at different levels of trust by gender.]

The highest levels of trust were witnessed in Horumar Sub-division (52%: very high and 37%: fairly high) while the lowest levels of trust were witnessed in Garsoor Sub-division (26%: fairly low and 23%: very low). In Silnay, more than two thirds of the respondents (69%) had either ‘very high’ or ‘fairly high’ trust in the police. In Isaac, household participants with either very high or ‘fairly high’ trust in the police made up 60% of those sampled there, while among the IDPs, 28% expressed ‘very high’ levels of trust and 41% expressed ‘fairly high’ levels of trust (Fig. 22).

Figure 22: Respondents' level of trust in the police by sub-division

![Graph showing the level of trust in the police by sub-division.]

3.1.4. Police Performance

While the police were said to have limited resources in terms of their logistical capacity, which included the lack of a secure uninterrupted means of communication,\(^\text{13}\), it was observed that they had made efforts to mitigate those shortcomings by collaborating with traditional elders, who through clan networks have access to the community.\(^\text{14}\)

In addition, the police also receive support from the local government in the form of supplemental manpower from the municipality troops who assist in city patrols.\(^\text{15}\)

Almost one half of the respondents (47%) felt that the performance of the police had improved in the last 12 months preceding this assessment, slightly more than a quarter (27%) felt there had been no change while 11% felt that it had declined (Fig. 23).

---

\(^\text{13}\) Galkayo Youth, Focus Group Discussion, 19\(^{th}\) January 2015

\(^\text{14}\) Galkayo Elders/Religious Leaders, Focus Group Discussion, 20\(^{th}\) January 2015

\(^\text{15}\) Governance Providers, Focus Group Discussion, 21\(^{st}\) January 2015
In Horumar, almost eight in every ten respondents (78%) felt the police performance had improved, a clear distinction from Garsoor, Isaac and Siinaay where less than one-half of respondents (38%, 42% and 48% respectively) held the same view. Among the IDPs, 46% felt that there had been an improvement in the performance of the police over the 12 months preceding the assessment (Fig. 24).

In summary, the existence of the two different administrations has had an adverse impact on the stability of security in Galkayo. Clan tensions and occasional animosity between the communities on the two different sides of the town as well as general mistrust are a constant threat to the stability of security in the regional capital. Occasionally, political feuds threaten to destabilise what little gains the security providers accumulate. Despite this, and in spite of the challenges they face with regard to resources, the police still manage to maintain acceptable levels of safety by working in concert with informal actors as well as the local government. To that end, the perception of the community towards the formal security provider is largely positive, with most residents considering them the first option for reporting incidences and the most trusted security provider.
3.2. JUSTICE PROVIDERS

In Puntland, as is the case with all Somali regions, the justice sector is characterised by both formal and informal actors. The informal components have been in existence since the pre-colonial era but gained prominence in the years following the fall of the Siad Barre regime and have remained active since the establishment of the federated state. The formal justice sector, while imbued with relatively more resources than the customary system, does not have the level of influence the informal mechanisms do and this necessitates interaction and coordination.

This section examines the deployment of justice providers in Galkayo, their performance and interaction as well as the perceptions and preferences of the community with regard to justice provision.

3.2.1. Level of deployment

Despite being a regional capital, Galkayo only has two courts, a District Court (for district-level cases) and a Court of Appeal (for region-level cases). The two courts are housed in the same building, along with the office of the prosecutor.16

Almost two thirds (64%) of household survey respondents were not aware of the presence of courts, 29% knew of the courts, and 7% stated that they did not know whether courts were present or did not give a response (Fig. 25).

The IDPs exhibited the least awareness of the presence of courts with just 13% of those interviewed in the survey indicating that they were aware. This lack of awareness was reiterated in the focus group discussion with IDPs where most of the participants stated that had never used the court and did not even know if it was present or functional.17 The Siinaay Sub-division had the highest level of awareness (61%). In Horumar 44% of the respondents were aware of the existence of courts while in Garsoor and Isaac those who were aware of the court’s presence were 28% and 22% respectively (Fig. 26).

---

16 Mudug Regional Prosecutor, Key Informant Interview, 22nd, January, 2015

17 Galkayo IDPs, FGD, Op. Cit
Among the general population in Galkayo, it appeared that familiarity with the distinction between the Court of Appeal and the District Court (which are housed in the same building) as separate entities was low. A little over eight respondents out of every ten (81%) who had been aware of court presence said that they knew of only one court (Fig. 27).

Figure 27: Respondents’ awareness of the number of courts

Among the respondents who were aware of the location of the court, 81% stated that it was less than an hour’s walking distance away, 14% said it was under two hours away and 5% were less than three hours away (Fig. 28).

Given that, the portion of respondents that were aware of the location of the court and therefore capable of speaking to spatial proximity was less than one third of the entire sample (see Fig. 25 above). The fact that relatively high portions of them indicated closeness to the court therefore
ought to be contextually qualified when drawing conclusions as to overall spatial accessibility in Galkayo.

### 3.2.2. Performance of the Justice Providers

Among the respondents interviewed in the household survey, the most commonly used justice provider in the 12-month period preceding the assessment had been traditional elders (19%) followed by religious leaders who had been used by 14% of the entire sample. Usage of the court was reported by only 6% of the respondents (Fig. 30).

**Figure 30: Usage of justice providers**

![Graph showing usage of justice providers with percentages](image)

Men had a higher likelihood of engaging any of the justice providers than women did. In the 12 months preceding the assessment, 24% of the men had used traditional elders, 17% had used religious leaders and 8% had used the court, this compared with 14% of the female respondents who had used traditional elders, 9% who had used religious leaders and 3% who had used the court (Fig. 31).

The preference for traditional elders was further highlighted in the qualitative discussions, with focus group participants pointing to their neutrality and awareness of the community’s practical challenges as reasons why most disputants turned to the elders for conflict resolution services.18

Further to that, it was reported that the role of the traditional elders in dispute resolution was so entrenched that their decision whether to execute a culprit or demand compensation was often carried out without interference from either the court or the government.19

**Figure 31: Usage of justice providers by gender**

![Graph showing usage of justice providers by gender](image)

Among the respondents who had used traditional elders, more than one half (54%) had cases related to household violence. For people who engaged religious leaders, the most common issue had also been household violence (32%) while among those who used the court, the most common cases involved land disputes (45%). Robbery was the second most prevalent issue in the court at 36% while at 22%, land disputes were the second most common issue among respondents who had used traditional elders.

---

18 *Traditional Elder, Key Informant Interview, 21st January 2015*

19 Deputy Governor, KII, Op. Cit
3.2.3. Perception of the Justice Providers

Religious leaders (Sheikhs) were pointed out by almost one half (46%) of the respondents as their choice for most trusted justice provider. Traditional elders were pointed out by 31% of the respondents while 16% said that the court was their most trusted justice provider (Fig. 32).

Figure 32: Respondents' choice of most trusted justice provider

The proportions of male and female respondents stating that they trusted religious leaders the most were almost equally high (47%: men and 44%: women). Trust in traditional leaders was however, more visibly higher among the men (37%) than among the women (21%) while trust in the court was, on the converse, higher among women at 21% compared with 11% of the men (Fig. 33).

Table 5: Issues referred to justice providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues referred to different justice providers</th>
<th>Justice providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dispute</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household violence</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all justice providers, the most cited reason for trust was fair judgment (61%: court, 34%: traditional elders and 82%: religious leaders). None of the respondents who cited the court as their most trusted justice provider gave either independence from politics or ease of access as their reason (Table 6).

Table 6: Reasons for trust of justice providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for trust of justice provider</th>
<th>Most trusted justice provider</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast decisions</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair judgement</td>
<td>Traditional elders</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence from politics</td>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less costly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of access</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional elders</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of confidence in the formal justice system were high, 42% of the respondents were very confident and 32% were fairly confident. Almost two out of every ten respondents (19%) however, stated that they were not confident in the formal justice system (Fig. 34).
Among those who were either ‘fairly confident’ or ‘very confident’, there were no major disparities regarding the gender proportions. However, men (25%) were twice as likely to have stated that they were not confident than women (12%) were (Fig. 35).

Slightly more than one third (36%) of the respondents went on to state that they felt that the performance of the court had improved in the 12-month period preceding the assessment. About one quarter (27%) thought there had been no change and 28% did not know whether there had been an improvement. A little less than one in every ten respondents (8%) felt that there had been a decline in performance (Fig. 36).

Conclusively, although the court was recognised as the legitimate justice provider, the traditional elders appeared to hold more sway and authority in practical terms. The religious leaders were seen as the most trustworthy justice provider because of the expectation that, since they operate under
Shari’ah law, their decisions were bound to be fair. Regarding gender considerations, women appeared to favour the formal justice system more than the men and a markedly larger portion of them cited the court as their most trusted justice provider.
3.3. GOVERNANCE PROVIDERS

Galkayo is the second largest city in Puntland. In total, 13 villages come under the administration of the local council.\(^{20}\) The local council comprises 27 councillors, (two of whom are female) who are nominated by traditional elders based on a clan quota system.

This section is aimed at assessing the awareness, performance, participation and perception of the local council as well as the challenges which it faces.

3.3.1. Level of deployment

Most respondents (60%) were aware of the presence of the local council. However, 30% thought there was no council while 9% did not know whether there is a local council or not (Fig. 38).

Figure 38: Respondents’ awareness of Local Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Local Council</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=197)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males indicated greater awareness of the local council, with 65% of the male respondents compared with 55% of the female respondents stating that they knew of the local council’s existence (Fig. 39).

Figure 39: Respondents’ awareness of Local Council, by gender

Levels of awareness were high across all subdivisions with the exception of Isaac where only three in every ten respondents (30%) stated that they were aware. Horumar had the highest level of awareness (85%). In Siinay and Garsoor, 78% and 60% of respondents respectively were aware, and more than two thirds (69%) of the IDPs knew of the local council’s existence (Fig. 40).

Figure 40: Respondents’ awareness of Local Council, by sub-division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of respondents aware within subdivisions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=197)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garsor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horumar</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siinay</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high levels of awareness did not extend to familiarity with the operations of the local council. More than one half (57%) of the respondents who

\(^{20}\) Deputy Mayor, KII, Op Cit
knew that there is a local council in Galkayo went on to state that they did not know what services it provides, while 37% stated that they were aware of such services (Fig. 41).

Figure 41: Respondents’ awareness of the services provided by the local council

Horumar stood out as the only sub-division where more than one-half of respondents were aware of services provided by the local council (57%) in contrast to 34% in Garsoor, 33% in Israac, 39% in Siinaay and 26% among the IDPs (Fig. 42).

Figure 42: Respondents’ awareness of services provided by the local council, by sub-division

The local council articulated the unique circumstances of the governance mechanism in undergoing post-conflict recovery as can be observed by the various ways in which it has had to rely on means that would not be considered conventional elsewhere to achieve its service delivery mandate. The Deputy Governor alluded to this state of affairs, stating:

*When the central government collapsed, most service provision was privatised or taken up by individual ministries. Now, there are still some gaps in service delivery. For example, the local government directly oversees sanitation services while the water and electricity services are under the control of private companies, sometimes with some measure of involvement from the council.*

3.3.2. Performance of the Local Government

3.3.2.1. Service Delivery

At least one in six respondents (16%) were aware that the council provides sanitation services, security provision was known to 10% of the respondents and health and infrastructure services were mentioned by 7% each (Fig. 43).

Figure 43: Respondents’ opinion regarding services provided by the local council

The local council articulated the unique circumstances of the governance mechanism in undergoing post-conflict recovery as can be observed by the various ways in which it has had to rely on means that would not be considered conventional elsewhere to achieve its service delivery mandate. The Deputy Governor alluded to this state of affairs, stating:

*When the central government collapsed, most service provision was privatised or taken up by individual ministries. Now, there are still some gaps in service delivery. For example, the local government directly oversees sanitation services while the water and electricity services are under the control of private companies, sometimes with some measure of involvement from the council.*
Government agencies and Ministries at state level administer health and education services.21

- **Sanitation**

Sanitation is one of most important services provided by local government, as assertively stated in the focus group discussion with governance providers. Under a public-private sector arrangement between a company known as Galkayo Sanitation Company and the local council, the company collects dry waste from all the households in the towns. Residents pay a nominal fee and the council subsidises the cost to the garbage collection company.22

- **Security**

The local council maintains a contingent of municipality troops, which it deploys for purposes of tax collection as well as coordinating with other security providers to contribute to the stability of security in the city. On most nights, as the participants in the governance providers’ focus group stated, the municipality troops and the police patrol the city. They receive the paramilitary police in situations of high security tension.23 It was further stated by the participants of the governance providers’ focus group discussion that these security cooperation endeavours take up 60% of the local council’s budget.24 The Deputy Governor further explained this prioritisation of security provision by the local government:

> Our local government works under a condition which compels [it] to be different from other regions due to the clan tensions and other political factors such as the operation of two different administrations (Puntland & Galmudug). Most of people in Galkayo are armed for security and safety purposes.25

- **Infrastructure**

The local council works with the United Nations Joint Programme on Local Governance and Decentralised Service Delivery (JPLG) on, among other issues, the development and maintenance of infrastructure. Through this partnership, the local council has developed three of the main roads in Galkayo town.26 Another infrastructure project in collaboration with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) covers two more roads.27

- **Water**

In another public-private sector arrangement, a company known as Galkayo Water Company (GALWA) provides water to the city of Galkayo. Participants in the governance providers’ focus group discussion said that UNICEF funds GALWA under the Puntland Water Policy, which is supervised by the Puntland State Agency for Water and Energy (PSAWEN).28

### 3.3.2.2. Consultative governance

Regarding the communication channels used by the Local Government to obtain feedback from community members and keep them updated, there are different levels of awareness and means to convey information. Among those mechanisms is a composition of committees in villages and subdivisions as well as use of the media to sensitise community members.29

Awareness of the existence of channels of communication was split almost half way (50%: No and 47%: Yes) between the respondents (Fig. 44).

---

21 *Deputy Governor of Mudug Region, Key Informant Interview, 20th January 2015*

22 *Governance providers, FGD, Op. Cit*

23 Ibid

24 Ibid

25 *Deputy Governor, KII, Op Cit*

26 *Halabookhad IDP Chairman, Key Informant Interview, 19th January 2015*

27 *Deputy Governor, KII, Op Cit*

28 *Governance providers, FGD, Op. Cit*

29 *Director of Social Affairs, Key Informant Interview, 22nd January 2015*
Once more, there was notably higher awareness of the existence of communication channels among respondents in Horumar (78%), than in Garsoor (31%), Isaac (47%), Sinaay (39%) or among the IDPs where 48% were aware (Fig. 45).

There was however, limited participation in local governance consultations. Only 16% of respondents who were aware of the council (i.e. 10% of all respondents) had participated in governance consultations over the 12-month period preceding the assessment (Fig. 46).

The Siinaay sub-division exhibited the lowest level of participation (6%) while Horumar, at 26%, had the highest level of participation, followed by Israac (20%), Garsoor (14%) and the IDP community (15%) as was observed with awareness of communication among those who knew of the council (Fig. 47).

The frequency of participation in the consultative meetings varied among respondents. When asked about the number of times that they had participated in government consultations in the last twelve months, 16% of the respondents reported...
once, 37% reported twice, 32% replied three times and the rest more than that (Fig. 48). Overall, those who had participated in government consultations did so an average of two times (mean : 2.47) in the past twelve months. 

(87%) stated that it is important to have elected representatives in local governance (Fig. 49).

**Figure 48: Frequency of participation in consultations**
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Participants in the traditional elders’ focus group discussion voiced concerns about the level of communication between the council and the community:

> Compared with previous administrations, the performance of local government has improved. Although they are not carrying out all mandated services; yet local government of Galkayo district collects garbage from the streets, households and even the corners of Galkayo town. Other essential needs are unachieved; for example health, education, water and electricity and they are in private hands. As we are all aware taxes are collected from all business holders, and nobody knows where his or her money goes. They are not yet accounted. As the nominating authorities (traditional elders) have the right to know how public revenue is spent.30

**3.3.3. Perception toward the Local Council**

Although traditional elders put the council in Galkayo in power through a process of nomination, when asked, almost nine out every ten respondents

---

30 Traditional Elders, Focus Group Discussion, 20th January 2015
Despite the fact that the local government is yet to sufficiently address community needs (as seen in Fig. 50), one half (52%) of the respondents believed that the performance of the local government had improved, while almost one quarter (22%) of respondents felt there had been no change in the local government performance over the past year. Only 6% of respondents felt that the performance of the council had declined during this period (Fig. 51).

Respondents in Horumar (83%) expressed the highest level of optimism about the year trend in the performance of the local council (Fig. 52).
Overall, the council had made headway towards achieving its mandate of service provision but had not been able to cover all areas with regard to the needs of the community. The exigent need for all stakeholders to cooperate towards ensuring security in the district had put a strain on the resources of the council and diverted attention from conventional service provision. Further to that, there may be a need for targeted outreach and communication.
4. CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE

Galkayo has historically witnessed high levels of violence and insecurity. While the perennial driver of conflict has been the animosity between the two major clans on the opposite sides of the divided town, geopolitical events and external factors have also had a destabilising effect. One those factors is the proximity of the relatively more conflict-prone south making it vulnerable to infiltration by fleeing militants displaced by military campaigns in southern Somalia. Emergent political feuds as the process towards federation draws close to conclusion may also have had a negative impact on the perception of safety and security.

The following section presents an account of respondents’ experience with crime and violence in their community, feedback on key measures in place for conflict resolution, and the perception of safety in the district.

4.1. Experience of conflict

More than one in every ten respondents (13%) stated that they had witnessed conflict between clans or other groups in the 12-month period preceding the assessment. The vast majority (86%) claimed they did not see conflicts between clans or groups. (Fig.53)

Experience with conflict was highest among respondents in the IDPs, where approximately one quarter of respondents (26%) stated that they had witnessed conflict in the past year. Approximately 17% and 15% of respondents in the Siinaay and Horumar sub-divisions respectively also stated that they had witnessed conflict during this time, while less than one in ten respondents in Garsoor (5%) and Israac (8%) reported similar experiences (Fig. 54).

Experience with conflict was higher among males, with 17% of male respondents compared with 9% of female respondents reporting that they had witnessed conflict between clans (Fig. 55).

Figure 53: Account of witnessing conflict between clans or groups

Figure 54: Account of witnessing conflict between clans or groups by sub-division

Figure 55: Account of witnessing conflict between clans or groups by gender
Those who had witnessed conflicts (n = 25) indicated that, within the last 12 months, they had witnessed an average of more than two conflicts (mean = 2.32). A cumulative 52% of them had witnessed either two (28%) or three (24%) conflicts while almost one-third (32%) had witnessed only one conflict (Fig. 56).

**Figure 56: Number of conflicts witnessed in the last 12 months**
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Family disputes were reported by 48% of the respondents to have been the cause of the conflict(s) they had witnessed. Revenge (16%), power/cultural struggles (16%), and resources (12%) were also among the reasons mentioned. ‘Other’ reasons were not specified (Fig. 57).

**Figure 57: Causes of observed conflicts between clans or groups**

![Bar chart showing percentage of conflicts caused by different reasons](image)

In the opinion of the Police Commander, the most prominent driver of conflict in Galkayo is the existence of politically divided administrations that do not collaborate on security matters. He posited

that this has resulted in a proliferation of incidences of crime and violence perpetrated by terrorist groups or as a result of clan conflicts.  

### 4.2. Experience of crime and violence

The majority of respondents (89%) indicated that they had not witnessed any crime or violence against someone outside of their household in the last twelve months. However, approximately one in ten respondents (11%) stated that they had such an experience (Fig. 58).

**Figure 58: Account of witnessing crime and violence against someone outside of the household**
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Isaack had the lowest level of experience of crime and violence as reported by 2% of those within that sub-division in contrast to a portion more than ten times as large (23%) among the IDPs. Garsoor, Horumar and Sinaay had 10%, 11% and 9% of their residents witnessing crime or violence in the 12-month period before the assessment (Fig. 59).

---

31 Regional Police Commander, KII, Op Cit
There was only a slight difference between the portion of men (12%) and women (9%) reporting witnessing crime or violence against someone outside the homestead (Fig. 60).

4.2.1. Proliferation of small arms

Qualitative interviewees and discussants pointed out that many civilians in Galkayo are armed for the purposes of personal protection in the face of the town’s unstable security environment. The porosity of the district’s borders was seen as not only a threat to the security of the community in Galkayo, but also as an avenue for the trafficking of illegal arms.33

4.3. Perception of Safety

In spite of the foregoing, close to one half (45%) of the respondents felt very safe and more than one quarter (28%) felt rather safe, 16% and 8% felt rather unsafe and very unsafe (Fig. 61).

Horumar had the largest portion of respondents (70%) feeling very safe among the sub-divisions and was second only to the portions of respondents among the IDPs (87%). It was also the only sub-division in Galkayo where none of the respondents reported feeling very unsafe (Fig. 62).

---

32 Galkayo Women, FGD, Op Cit

33 Traditional Elder, KII, Op cit
Among the sexes, minor differences were evident with regard to perception of safety. Slightly more males than females expressed positive perceptions of safety (47%: very safe compared with 43% for the women and 31%: rather safe compared with 25% for the female respondents). The women (12%) were conversely more likely to state that they felt very unsafe than the men (5%) were (Fig. 63).

Furthermore, 70% of respondents felt that it was safer than it had been the previous year, though 19% felt there had been no change and 7% felt that safety had decreased (Fig. 64).

Among the sub-divisions, respondents in Horumar were most likely to feel that there had been an improvement over the preceding year in terms of safety (93%), while respondents in Israac were most likely to state that there had been a decrease (Fig. 65).

By gender, the proportions of men and women expressing positive perceptions regarding the trend for safety over the past year were almost equal (69% to 72% : increased and 20% to 19% : no change). Among those who felt that there had been a decrease however, the portion of male respondents (10%) was greater than that of females (4%).
In summary, although the state of security and therefore levels of safety has improved compared with past levels of conflict and violence, a constantly changing political environment, competing interest at the federal level and historical clan animosity at the community level still remain issues of concern. The proliferation of small arms in such a situation, while serving as a deterrent for crime and victimisation, poses the danger of increased fatalities in the event of an outbreak of violent conflict.
5. CONCLUSION

Geopolitical instability, power struggles, inter clan animosity, the proliferation of small arms and infiltration of the district’s porous borders are all factors that play a part in destabilising the security of Galkayo. In addition to that, the police are severely under-resourced: lacking in equipment and personnel and limited in terms of their ability to cover the breadth of the district adequately in response to crime and violence. If political stability is achieved under the current federal approach, the negative effect of the external factors affecting Galkayo’s security and safety may be mitigated. There remains a need for cultural reform and community sensitisation to combat the high levels of distrust and animosity within the community; after which, there can be dialogue regarding the progressive disarmament of civilians.

As with the security sector, the formal justice system is still at a nascent stage of recovery and faces resource, personnel and logistic challenges. Out of necessity and due to their wide-ranging acceptability, traditional elders play a prominent role in the provision of justice, employing customary law and Islamic Shari’ah. As the formal justice institutions develop in terms of capacity and resources however, the extent to which the informal sectors practices conform to human rights standards will need to be investigated. Avenues for more formalised interaction between the informal and formal justice providers also ought to be discussed to ensure complementarity.

With regard to governance, the re-establishment of the local council in 2014 allowed the district to participate in development projects that are hoped to stimulate the economy and contribute to a raised level of employment. The council works with international development partners to accomplish its mandate with regard to the provision of services that would otherwise have been beyond its financial capabilities. There were calls for more transparency and communication with the public to ensure accountability. Public-private sector arrangements in service provision are in place with regard to the provision of electricity and water to the community. Health and education services are however, still handled by state-level ministries. Due to the unique situation of Galkayo, the local authority’s role is not limited to administrative functions, as it also maintains municipality troops who, in addition to ensuring the safe collection of taxes, also offer supplemental support to the police during patrols and security operations.
6. ANNEXES

6.1. Sample Size Formula

\[
\frac{z^2 (P) (1-P) (f)}{e^2}
\]

Where:
- \( z \) = confidence interval (95%)
- \( P \) = P-Value which assumed some security correlation within the cluster (0.3)
- \( f \) = is the sample design effect (1.5)
- \( e \) = the margin of error to be attained (+ or – 8%)
### 6.2. Glossary Of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Justice</td>
<td>People’s ability to solve disputes and reach adequate remedies for grievances, using formal or traditional justice systems. The justice process has qualitative dimensions, and it should be in accordance with human rights principles and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil case</td>
<td>Non-criminal cases relating to civil wrongs and disputes between individuals, including generally property, business, personal domestic problems, divorces and such types where ones constitutional and personal rights are breached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>The clan is a system characterised by a chain of paternal ancestors reaching back to a perceived founding ancestor whose name all members of the clan share for identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>State of disharmony between incompatible persons, ideas, or interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal case</td>
<td>An action, suit, or cause instituted to punish an infraction of the criminal laws of a country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Safety Committee</td>
<td>A representative body comprised of a broad cross section of civil society that acts in an advisory capacity to the local government in issues of community security and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Relates to the implementation of orders, decisions and settlements emerging from formal or informal adjudication. Enforcement bodies include police and prisons, and administrative bodies in particular cases. Traditional systems may also have specific mechanisms of enforcement. Enforcement systems are the key to ensuring accountability and minimise impunity, thus preventing further injustices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Justice System</td>
<td>A codified system of laws and court proceedings enforced by recognised actors of lawyers, police and justice officials. The formal justice system involves civil and criminal justice and includes formal state-based justice institutions and procedures, such as police, prosecution, courts (religious and secular) and custodial measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>“Gender” refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for men and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance provider</td>
<td>Formal institutions or Individuals that act, process, or possess the authority of governing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Justice System</td>
<td>Dispute resolution mechanisms falling outside the scope of the formal justice system. The term informal justice system is used here to draw a distinction between state-administered formal justice systems and non-state administered informal justice systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Provider</td>
<td>Formal or Informal Institutions or individuals that are responsible to provide fair and equitable treatment of all individuals under the law [customary, formal or Shari’ah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice System</td>
<td>Includes formal justice institutions and procedures, such as police, prosecution, courts and prisons, as well as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and other informal and traditional systems (e.g. a council of elders). The justice system includes coordination and other arrangements among its different components that influence overall outcomes on access to justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/water disputes</td>
<td>A state of debate or quarrel between/among persons, groups or communities over the property, the use, etc. of plots or swathes of land and water points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Those invested with formal power, especially a government or body of government officials at district level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Crimes</td>
<td>Criminal offense that is less serious than a serious crime and generally punishable by a monetary fine, forfeiture or a jail term of up to a year, or a combination of both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Provider</td>
<td>Formal or informal Institutions or individuals that are responsible for the protection of persons, dwellings, communities or the nation from harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Crimes</td>
<td>Criminal offense that is more serious than a petty crime and which can be punished by one or more years in prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, or deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xeer</td>
<td>A customary law system that has evolved from a basis of clan relations, with some influence of Islamic law (Shari’ah), that employs mediation and negotiation through the use of traditional elders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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