














Ethiopia: Site Assessment Durable Solutions Index

Based on Round 21
Site Assessment Data

Data collection:
1–29 February 2020

Round 4 | 6 May 2020

Site Name	Elmahan	Semen	Hawelti	Halgan	Burgab	Bello	Dedesa	Jirma	Bereda Bello	Meda Jalela	
Region	Somali	Tigray	Tigray	Somali	Somali	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	
Cause of Displacement	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	
Number of IDPs	33,985	7,177	4,608	6,608	12,115	6,446	7,426	7,372	3,128	1,746	
Physical Safety 	1. Long term safety and security	10.0	9.4	9.4	10.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.0
	2. Adequate standard of living	5.8	6.8	7.8	5.3	5.3	4.0	4.5	5.8	4.8	4.0
Material Safety 	3. Employment and livelihoods	3.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	4.0	5.2	5.6	4.0	4.0
	4. Housing, land and property	6.7	10.0	10.0	8.7	6.7	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Legal Safety 	5. Documenta-tion	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0

Objective














The purpose of the DTM Ethiopia Durable Solutions Index is to determine a benchmark and implement subsequent monitoring to explore and measure the progress of IDP populations towards overcoming displacement-related vulnerabilities by examining specific criteria outlined within the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons.

¹ Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), 2010. *IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons*. Available at: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc_framework_on_durable_solutions_for_idps_april_2010.pdf.

Changes Since the Previous Round

The same 10 sites are chosen from round to round so that trends regarding durable solutions can be mapped out. As such, kindly note that the initial selection criteria only applied to the first edition of this report.²

The previous Durable Solutions Index Report was based on round 20's Site Assessment data which was collected from 1 November to 12 December 2019. This round's report is based on round 21's Site Assessment data which was collected from 1 February to 12 March 2020. The matrix below depicts changes to the same 10 sites since the previous round:

Site Name	Elmahan	Semen	Hawelti	Halgan	Burgab	Bello	Dedesa	Jirma	Bereda Bello	Meda Jalela	
Region	Somali	Tigray	Tigray	Somali	Somali	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	Oromia	
Cause of Displacement	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Conflict 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	Drought 	
Number of IDPs	-1,218	-925	-2,748	-1,669	-2,660	0	+670	-892	+722	+248	
Physical Safety 	1. Long term safety and security	0.0	-0.6	-0.6	0.0	0.0	+4.3	-5.0	0.0	-1.4	+0.6
Material Safety 	2. Adequate standard of living	+3.5	-1.0	0.0	+0.8	+0.8	-2.3	-1.5	0.0	-1.5	-1.3
	3. Employment and livelihoods	+3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	+1.2	+1.6	-1.6	+0.8
	4. Housing, land and property	0.0	0.0	0.0	+2.0	+1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Legal Safety 	5. Documenta-tion	+10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-10.0	-10.0	-10.0	0.0	-10.0	-10.0

² The first edition of the Durable Solutions Index Report was based on round 18 Site Assessment data which was collected from 1 to 30 July 2019.

Background

The DTM Ethiopia Durable Solutions Index (DSI) is an analytical framework for quantifying the progress of IDPs towards overcoming specific vulnerabilities related to reaching durable solutions in Ethiopia. The index matches data collected by the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)'s Site Assessment against the 5 core criteria of the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons to determine the extent to which a durable solution has been achieved.¹

Site Assessment is IOM's tool for collecting data on the number and location of IDPs, along with their multisectoral needs. The information is collected through key informant interviews, focus group discussions and direct observation. Site Assessment is conducted every 3 months.

According to the IASC Framework, a durable solution is achieved when "internally displaced persons (IDPs) no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination on account of their displacement". These 5 core criteria include long term safety, security and freedom of movement; adequate standard of living; access to livelihoods and employment; restoration of housing, land and property; and access to documentation.

For analytical purposes, these 5 criteria are further categorized into physical, material and legal safety as recommended by the Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS).²

Methodology

This index evaluates the progress of IDPs towards overcoming displacement-related vulnerabilities in 10 selected sites in Ethiopia. The same 10 sites are being evaluated this round as they were in the previous round, where the initial site selection criteria were as follows:

- 5 sites hosting conflict-affected IDPs and 5 sites hosting climate-affected IDPs for cross comparative purposes.
- The site type is host community.

- A site where the majority of the displaced population prefer to locally integrate.
- A site with protracted displacement: where the site has been opened for at least over 1 year.
- A site with a sizeable displacement caseload: in the events where several sites meet the 4 criteria above, the site with the largest displacement caseload is prioritized.

This composite index is made up of 24 indicators from the DTM Site Assessment and treated as sub-criteria in measuring the 5 core criteria of the IASC Framework. Answers are weighed on a scale of 0 to 5.

A pass (5)/no pass (0) approach is applied for indicators with binary variables. For example, if IDPs have access to a healthy facility, this sub-criteria receives a score of 5, and if they do not have access to a health facility, this sub-criteria receives a score of 0. On the other hand, indicators with polychotomous variables are applied for indicators with more than 2 possible answers. For instance, the percentage of households in the site who currently have a source of income is weighed based on percentage brackets whereby 0% is 0, 1-20% = 1, 21-40% = 2, 41-60% = 3, 61-80% = 4, 81-100% = 5. To view the full scoring system, kindly refer to Annex 1.

Each criteria is the average of the sum of all the sub-criteria categorized under it.³ For example, the calculation for the first criteria of long term safety and security is the average of all 7 sub-criteria under it. If the indicator for security incidents is 5, whether women feel safe is 0, whether men feel safe is 5, whether boys feel safe is 5, whether girls feel safe is 0, the relationship amongst IDPs is 3 and the relationship between IDPs with host communities is 0, then the initial score for the criteria of long term safety and security is 2.6.

The score for each criteria is then multiplied by 2 to get a final score which ranges on a scale of 0 to 10. Thus, in the example of measuring the criteria for long term safety and security, the final calculation and score is $2.6 \times 2 = 5.2$.

² Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS), 2016. *Review of Durable Solutions Initiatives in East and Horn of Africa*. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/somalia/review-durable-solutions-initiatives-east-and-horn-africa-good-practices-challenges>.

³ However, indicators where the answer is unknown are not factored into the average score of the criteria.



Limitations

This composite index has several limitations, but are not limited to the following:

- Data was sourced from DTM's Site Assessment using key informants and was not obtained through household-level surveys. As such, additional assessments conducted at household-level are encouraged.
- The indicators used to calculate the scores are not exhaustive and should be supplemented with other data sources to ensure the robustness of the calculations where possible. For example, as there is only one indicator in the Site Assessment relevant to the criteria of documentation, a score of 10 should not be interpreted as all IDPs necessarily having access to documentation.

- Findings are at best only able to capture a snapshot of IDPs' progress towards overcoming displacement related vulnerabilities achieving durable solutions as of the time of data collection and may not be able to capture the dynamic changes in IDPs' conditions by the time of reporting.
- In line with the methodology of the Site Assessment, questions asked are applied to the majority of the target population and thus may not represent the accessibility of all IDPs. For instance, the indicator 'on average, how long do IDPs queue for water?' applies to the majority of IDPs. This means that while the answer may be 16-30 minutes, there may well be several IDPs who queue for more than 60 minutes, and the data should be understood with such caveats.

“Displaced women and children are seen fetching water near a displacement site in Tigray region, Ethiopia.”



© IOM 2020

Annex 1 Durable Solutions Index Scoring System

	IASC Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Answers	Score	
Physical Safety	1. Long term safety and security	10.1.e.1 Security incidents are reported in the site?	Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 0, no = 5, unknown = n/a	
		10.3.a.3 Do women feel safe in the site?	Yes, no, unknown	No = 0, yes = 5, unknown = n/a	
		10.3.a.1 Do men feel safe in the site?	Yes, no, unknown	No = 0, yes = 5, unknown = n/a	
		10.3.a.8 Do girls feel safe in the site?	Yes, no, unknown	No = 0, yes = 5, unknown = n/a	
		10.3.a.3 Do boys feel safe in the site?	Yes, no, unknown	No = 0, yes = 5, unknown = n/a	
		10.2.n.1 Relationship amongst IDPs	Excellent, good, poor, unknown	Excellent = 5, good = 3, poor = 0, unknown = n/a	
		10.2.o.1 How is the relationship of IDPs with host communities?	Excellent, good, poor, unknown	Excellent = 5, good = 3, poor = 0, unknown = n/a	
Material Safety	2. Adequate standard of living	3.2.a.1 Percentage of households with access to electricity.	None, <25%, 25-50%, 51-75%, >75%, unknown	>75% = 5, 51-75% = 4, 25-50% = 2, <25% = 1, none = 0, unknown = n/a	
		4.1.a.1 Location of the site's main water distribution point (walking, one-way).	On-site (<20 minutes), on-site (>20 minutes), off-site (<20 minutes), off-site (>20 minutes), unknown	More than 20 mins = 0, less than 20 minutes = 5, unknown = n/a	
		4.1.c.2 On average, how long do IDPs queue for water?	No wait, <15 mins, 16-30minutes, 31-60 minutes, >60 minutes	No wait = 5, <15 mins = 4, 16-30minutes = 3, 31-60 minutes = 2, >60 minutes = 1	
		S1491. Average number of water jerrycans/buckets (20L) collected per household per day.	#	Using the SPHERE standard of 15 liters per person per day. If the standard is met = 5, if not = 0.	
		5.1.a.1 Is there access to food?	Yes on site, yes off site, no	Yes = 5, no = 0 (on-site or off-site is irrelevant here).	
		5.1.e.1 Do the IDPs on the site have access to a market?	Yes, no	Yes = 5, no = 0	
		7.2.a.1 Access to health facility?	Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 5, no = 0, unknown = n/a	
		S1527. Access to primary (formal or temporary) schools for children from displaced households?	Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 5, no = 0, unknown = n/a	
		3. Employment and livelihoods		9.2.a.1 Percentage of households in the site who currently have a source of income.	%
	9.2.i.1 Current access to income generating activities.			Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 5, no = 0, unknown = n/a
	9.3.a.2 Is there livestock on site?			Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 5, no = 0, unknown = n/a
	9.3.a.3 If yes, % of households owning livestock			%	Only calculated if the answer to the previous question is yes. 0% = 0, 1-20% = 1, 21-40% = 2, 41-60% = 3, 61-80% = 4, 81-100% = 5.
	9.3.a.4 Do IDPs have access to land for cultivation at or near the site?			Yes <25%, Yes 25-50%, Yes 51-75%, Yes >75%, no, unknown	No = 0, <25% = 1, 25-50% = 2, 51-75% = 4, >75% = 5, unknown = n/a
	4. Housing, land and property		3.8.p.7 Percentage of households living in standard temporary shelters or culturally inappropriate shelters?	None, <25%, 25-50%, 51-75%, >75%, unknown	None = 5, <25% = 4, 25-50% = 2, 51-75% = 1, >75% = 0, unknown = n/a
			3.8.p.8 Percentage of households living in shelters that are below standard	None, <25%, 25-50%, 51-75%, >75%, unknown	None = 5, <25% = 4, 25-50% = 2, 51-75% = 1, >75% = 0, unknown = n/a
S1489 Percentage of households living in overcrowded shelters			%	0% = 5, <25% = 4, 25-50% = 2, 51-75% = 1, >75% = 0	
Legal Safety	5. Documentation	10.1.f.1 Do the majority of people have ID cards or other documentation?	Yes, no, unknown	Yes = 5, no = 0, unknown = n/a	