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The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), an international expert organisation legally based in Switzerland as a non-profit foundation, works for the elimination of mines, explosive remnants of war and other explosive hazards, such as unsafe munitions stockpiles. The GICHD provides advice and capacity development support, undertakes applied research, disseminates knowledge and best practices and develops standards. In cooperation with its partners, the GICHD’s work enables national and local authorities in affected countries to effectively and efficiently plan, coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate safe mine action programmes, as well as to implement the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, the Convention on Cluster Munitions and other relevant instruments of international law. The GICHD follows the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence.
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INTRODUCTION

Danish Demining Group (DDG) first started mine clearance operations in Somaliland in 1999, to reduce the impact of mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) on affected communities. Between 1999 and 2008, DDG cleared approximately 1,400 km² of land and destroyed 91,000 items of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and 10,000 mines. In 2006, DDG phased out its mine clearance operations and in 2008, it initiated a Community Safety Programme (CSP). DDG has since implemented Community Safety Programmes in Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and Yemen. The purpose of this case study is to examine the rationale for DDG’s programming shift and the main components of the CSP and to learn lessons from DDG’s programming experience to date.

DDG’S COMMUNITY SAFETY PROGRAMME

Context
Somaliland is an unrecognised de facto sovereign state, formerly part of Somalia. It is internationally recognised as an autonomous region of Somalia. Since 1997, Somaliland has succeeded in maintaining peace in a conflict-prone and highly volatile environment. Despite the ongoing armed conflict between pro-government forces and the Islamist armed group al-Shabab in southern and central Somalia, Somaliland has maintained stability and is considered a beacon of hope in the Horn of Africa. Despite this, peace remains fragile, state capacity to address and prevent violence is weak, and security remains a key concern for both rural and urban communities.

Rational for shift in programme focus
In 2006, after seven years of implementing mine clearance in Somaliland, DDG decided to cease its clearance operations and focus on village-by-village clearance of UXO. This decision was based on several factors:

> DDG undertook a re-survey of several identified high and medium impacted communities in 2008, which confirmed that mines were not having as serious an impact on communities as previously believed. As a result DDG believed that the funding received for mine clearance would be better spent on other activities.

> Although the majority of Somaliland’s minefields had been cleared, the private ownership of ERW was still a significant problem, causing many more deaths and injuries than landmines. In 2009, DDG and Small Arms Survey (SAS) determined that 12 per cent of households in Somaliland (approximately 70,000 households nationwide) held private stocks of ERW. In addition to posing an immediate threat to life and limbs due to the risk of accidents, these ERW also posed a risk to the fragile peace and stability in the region, “with 52 per cent of the owners claiming to keep their ERW with some sort of future violence in mind, whether it is (primarily) for protection of their community, clan, family or property - or for potential future offensive use.”

DDG took the decision, in 2007 to also address the issue of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) ownership and use based on DDG interaction with communities and several assessments and surveys conducted between 2007 and 2009, which found that:

> SALW ownership and use is deeply ingrained in Somali culture as a means of self-protection in the face of weak and dysfunctional state security institutions

> SALW were a significant problem resulting in far higher deaths and injuries compared to landmines and that many of the accidents were the result of irresponsible behaviour, eg unsafe storage of arms and ammunition
> in 2009, the Somaliland Mine Action Centre (SMAC) recorded 19 incidents involving 23 victims of mines and UXO. DDG survey estimated 7,500 accidents with SALW and more than 11,000 incidents of Armed Violence (threats made with, or shooting, SALW)

> an estimated 74 per cent of households owned firearms, averaging 1.27 small arms per owning household

> the total amount of privately owned small arms likely exceeded 550,000, the majority of which were unregulated, unregistered and stored in an unsafe manner

> the lack of safe storage left weapons vulnerable to theft, with 16 per cent of firearms owners claiming to have experienced theft of their small arms over a one year period, potentially arming more than 90,000 criminals with weapons and facilitating armed violence

> private ownership of firearms and (private) stockpiles of explosives were much bigger problems in terms of people’s perception of safety than the region’s remaining minefields. An intervention focused on changing people’s attitudes and behaviour regarding ERW and SALW would be more relevant and effective

> "Communities can be suspicious of interventions on sensitive issues and may need sensitizing to the safety concerns they are facing, including those related to SALW and ERW, before they will fully engage with organisations implementing community safety interventions. …(I)ntensive awareness-raising, advocacy and education may encourage people away from escalating disputes into armed violence, could limit the number of weapons available to criminals and convince the significant minority of people who think small arms are desirable and normal that this should not be the case."

> organisations working with traditional and religious leaders should also try to work with the police to improve coordination and cooperation in dispute resolution

DDG used these findings to design and pilot its Community Safety Programme (CSP) in 2008 in Daami, an Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camp on the outskirts of Hargeisa. In 2009, the programme expanded to Sheikh district. The findings also led DDG to initially focus the CSP on UXO collection, combined with community-level advocacy, firearms safety education and the distribution of safe storage devices. It was only later that DDG decided to include conflict management education and community-based policing to improve community capacity for conflict management and strengthen the relationship between communities and security providers.

Programme objectives
The overall aim of DDG’s Community Safety Programme in Somaliland is to increase the safety and security of local communities in order to facilitate peace and development within the country. The programme seeks to achieve the following key objectives:

1. Community safety is improved for approximately 25,000 beneficiaries in 12 communities is Somaliland

2. Community safety is maintained and further strengthened in previous target areas for approximately 35,000 beneficiaries

3. Safety is enhanced for 2 districts of Somaliland

4. The threats posed by explosive remnants of war are reduced for approximately 110,000 beneficiaries (assumed 10 ERW Advocacy workshops, each for 10 communities of average 200 households and 5.9 people per household)
COMMUNITY SAFETY METHODOLOGY

The CSP cycle in a given community typically takes between nine to 11 months. Some activities occur in parallel and others are sequential, in order to make the best use of teams and resources. DDG staff are organised in teams based on specific areas of expertise, eg Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD), education, community liaison, Safe Storage Devices. The following is an overview of the main phases and activities involved.

Community entry
When initiating community safety activities in a new community, DDG goes through a specific community entry process that involves the following steps: participatory needs assessment, community selection and engagement, household survey and community mapping, and kick-off advocacy workshop.

1. **Participatory needs assessment**: Districts are targeted and selected based on armed violence indicators from nation-wide research organised by DDG in 2008. DDG develops a proposed list of districts based on needs and other selection criteria, such as cooperation possibilities with Danish Refugee Council (DRC) or other development organisations, to enhance impact. DDG then discusses the list with the Ministry of Interior and selects the number of districts needed from the list. For example, DDG may pre-select five to six districts if they need three, and then together with the Ministry of Interior they select the three districts that also fit the Ministry’s priorities. For each target district, ten communities are proposed by the District Governor in which DDG may conduct participatory needs assessment (PNA). During these initial meetings DDG describes the community safety programme and process, and obtains the Governor’s feedback and approval. During the one-hour PNA session, community members identify their security needs. In focus groups, participants are divided according to sex and age. The PNA helps DDG identify which four communities meet DDG’s pre-defined selection criteria. The PNA also acts as part of the baseline study for the four target communities, providing benchmarks against which progress is measured during and after the implementation of programme activities.

2. **Community selection and engagement**: DDG returns to the Mayor/Governor for further consultations about the four communities selected. DDG then returns to the ten communities and explains the rationale for why they were or were not selected. DDG provides the four selected communities with further information on how they will work with them. DDG also informs the elders and religious leaders in each of the four communities.

3. **Household survey and community mapping**: DDG undertakes a household survey in each of the four communities using a sample of households. The survey asks questions based on the CSP’s five areas of intervention, ie EOD, Community Safety Planning, Education, Safe Storage Devices and Community Policing Partnerships. The household surveys serve as the main baseline against which impact is measured. Focus group discussions and key informant interviews are also used to triangulate data. DDG also collects information to profile and map each community in order to, among other things, document whether any organisations are supporting the community (or have in the past) and in what form.

4. **Kick-off advocacy workshop**: In association with community leaders, DDG selects 15 people representing all sections of the community in each of the four target communities (60 in total) and organises a large advocacy workshop. This involves all of DDG’s teams (EOD, Community Liaison, Education, Safe Storage Devices, Community Policing Partnerships). The advocacy workshop provides an overview of all DDG activities. If the workshop takes place close to previous target communities, DDG will invite representatives from those communities to participate in the workshop to explain the programme from the beneficiary’s perspective. In an effort to obtain buy-in and encourage active community participation, DDG asks participants to sign a declaration of commitment to work with DDG.
Community safety planning

Once the communities are chosen and their commitment to DDG’s work is made clear, DDG begins implementation by working with each target community to develop a Community Safety Plan, and to establish a Community Safety Committee to implement the plan. The purpose of the plan is to allow a participatory process that enables each community to identify their community safety priorities and practical solutions. The process involves a six-day community level workshop with approximately 25 participants, facilitated by DDG’s Somali Community Liaison (CL) team. Participants are selected by community leaders based on criteria provided by DDG to help ensure representation and diversity.

During the first four days of the workshop, participants identify their community safety vision and needs. They then identify the obstacles for achieving their vision as well as brainstorm on solutions to reach the vision. They nominate approximately nine members who form a Community Safety Committee (CSC). The CSC is responsible for taking all of the ideas and analysis and developing an actual plan for implementation. It is also responsible for mobilising the community and implementing the plan, and tends to consist of teachers, elders, youth and women. The CSC spends the last two days of the workshop developing the plan, which typically focuses on a mix of direct (collecting ERW, firearms safety education, etc) and indirect (water, land, health) safety interventions. The plan outlines their vision, specific activities, people to do the activities, the community’s role/contribution and the timeframe. If an activity falls outside of DDG’s mandate, e.g. livelihood activity, this is noted and other organisations are identified for potential support.

DDG provides small amounts of funding to assist with the implementation of some activities in the plan. DDG also provides the CSC with organisational development training, which includes fundraising and proposal writing to help them source funds, including for initiatives outside of DDG’s remit. For example, a community in Sheikh district identified that it needed a small bridge. They used the proposal writing training and applied to the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), DDG’s sister organisation, for support, which was granted. Similarly, in Salahley district, communities contacted DRC to assist with water distribution as they were facing a severe water shortage as a result of drought. DDG recognises that the CSCs will not have the capacity to develop complex proposals aimed at bilateral donors (based outside Somaliland), as this requires significant capacity and experience. However, they work with CSCs to develop basic proposals, which they can use to target international Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) based in Somaliland. DDG staff also assist in editing and preparing the proposals in English.

Once the CSC has been formed, a plan is in place and organisational development training has been provided, the CL team moves to the next community to implement the same process. DDG uses Community Safety Committees and trains community volunteers to sustain advocacy and education efforts in order to create sustainable behaviour change.

Education

DDG’s education team arrives in the community once the CSC has been established to deliver Conflict Management Education (CME), Firearms Safety Education (FSE), and Mine Risk Education (MRE), which target everyone. The education/awareness-raising phase takes approximately 36 days.

Firearms safety education, mine risk education and conflict management education training are all delivered by DDG’s education teams. The teams then identify community volunteers, train them and support them to provide training to community members and neighbouring communities. In 2011, three teams of two people delivered FSE, MRE and CME in 12 communities. DDG has developed, tested and adapted its education materials over time based on feedback from participants and its education teams. Often the
Community volunteers selected for the FSE and MRE workshops are people with vested interests in raising awareness about safety in their community. For example, some are victims or family members of victims and have first-hand experience of the dangers and risks posed by UXO and SALW.

**Conflict management education**

In Somali culture, communities typically look to clan elders to resolve conflicts. As a result, community members tend to lack the skills and confidence to try to resolve conflicts themselves. DDG’s conflict management education (CME) seeks to strengthen the capacity of communities to manage conflicts. CME targets men, women and male and female youth, and in future will also target the police. DDG acknowledges that CME is unlikely to resolve large scale clan conflicts. However, it can and is being used to address smaller scale conflicts, to such an extent that elders have noticed that fewer conflicts are referred to them for resolution. It should be noted that small scale conflicts, when left unresolved, may escalate into wider and more intractable conflicts that can be long-lasting.

DDG believes that the building of a safe society largely depends on the people forming in that same society. Improving safety must, therefore, partly be based on empowering individuals for non-violent conflict management and consensus building while simultaneously building on existing formal and informal judicial systems to resolve problems.

DDG’s conflict management and mitigation work aims to change beneficiaries’ mindset from reactive to proactive, where people begin to take responsibility for preventing and managing conflicts constructively. DDG tries to build capacity for conflict management within a wider spectrum of society, including women and other under-represented groups, to enable them to build consensus, manage small scale interpersonal conflicts and increasingly claim their rights and representation in conflict resolution within their local context.

Although CME training is also aimed at men and women, it specifically targets youth. Women and men are trained separately to enable all participants to feel comfortable about expressing themselves. CME covers the following topics in four half-day sessions:

- what is conflict, different types, how it starts
- anger, anger management, communication
- circular questions – teaching participants to ask the right questions to resolve conflict
- consensus building, reconciliation, the differences between dialogue and discussion

These sessions are normally interspersed with days off to allow the participants to reflect on what they are learning.

DDG initially hired international and local consultants to provide advice on CME, and then recruited new staff to deliver CME. Although they initially tried to find individuals with prior conflict resolution experience, they found that previous experience was not important. Motivation and team spirit were vital. The education teams deliver training in CME, as well as firearms safety education and mine risk education. They also train teachers as community volunteers for CME.

Out of all of the components of the Community Safety Programme, CME has received the most positive feedback from communities in Somaliland. This is interesting given that it is completely unrelated to DDG’s mine action work in Somaliland and is a new area of work. Based on the positive response, DDG has adapted its CME materials and is delivering CME in South Sudan, Somalia, Uganda and Yemen.
Firearms safety education

The joint DDG-SAS 2009 survey found that irresponsible handling and unsafe storage of SALW were key factors in SALW-related accidents and deaths. DDG therefore delivers firearms safety education (FSE) to target SALW owners (typically men, heads of household), their wives (who can influence and educate their husbands), children (to emphasise not to touch SALW) and young males (a high risk group). Using their own awareness raising materials, DDG delivers one-hour FSE sessions at community level that focus on the different types of SALW and their risks, and also train community volunteers in FSE. In some instances, FSE has been combined with MRE, but typically these sessions are delivered separately to prevent information overload.

Safe storage devices

Disarmament in the Somaliland context is not possible, given high SALW ownership rates, general perceptions of insecurity among communities and mistrust of security providers, particularly the police. Instead of disarming targeted communities, DDG respects the perceived rights of individuals and communities to self-protection through gun ownership and, instead, focuses on trying to promote the safe storage of SALW in homes. DDG initially proposed the idea of community armouries. However, community leaders immediately rejected this concept. DDG has, therefore, developed devices that enable households to, they themselves, safely store their own SALW.

Once the education teams have left a community, the Safe Storage Device (SSD) team (two people and a driver) install the SSDs. Their period of work in a community is dependent on the local demand. FSE volunteers work with the SSD teams. The volunteers, identified during the education phase, help the SSD teams identify who has SALW and who has requested an SSD to be installed. Approximately 400-500 SSDs are installed per community. The SSD team returns to the community at a later date to conduct Quality Assurance (QA) and check whether the installation has been done properly. Demand for SSDs is high, particularly on the return QA visit, as more people in the community are aware of them.

An SSD consists of a metal clamp that is secured on to a small arm, often an AK-47, and locked with a padlock. The SSDs were originally secured to the floor or wall of a home with a metal rod and/or chain. However, based on community feedback, the use of metal rods will be phased out, and a chain will either be attached to the wall or floor of a house
with a bridge-shaped metal bracket, or the chain secured round a wooden pillar of the traditional house. SSD teams install the devices and show SALW owners how to empty their guns of ammunition and store them safely. Communities have welcomed the installation of the SSDs as they help keep children safe, prevent thefts of SALW, and put in place a physical barrier that helps decrease impulse killings.

The SSDs are made locally in workshops selected by competitive tender. This helps to keep skills and employment within the communities. SSDs are made in three workshops in different parts of Somaliland. The workshop in Hargeisa is staffed by ex-deminers from DDG’s former mine clearance programme. All workshops were selected based on quality and price through an official tender process.

Community-police partnerships

The police force in Somaliland currently consists of a mix of trained officers from Siad Barre’s regime and former clan militia members. Approximately 30-40 per cent of the police force is illiterate. They are based in roughly 40-50 police stations with very basic facilities, and often no communications, transport or fuel. The relationship between the police and communities is poor. Mutual mistrust, limited capacity and corruption are common.

In 2007, the DRC initiated a Community-Based Policing (CBP) pilot project in Burao. Five other cities were subsequently included. The DRC approach involves selecting communities located near police stations in urban areas and forming a group of community volunteers who represent different groups within the community. This group acts as a liaison between the community and the police. They are also given the power to adjudicate in local customary cases, while serious crimes or disputes are referred directly to the police. DRC has had mixed results and plans to phase out its CBP activities.

Through its initial experience with the CSP, DDG found that, in rural areas, police support and visibility were inadequate, and that police were generally mistrusted and viewed as corrupt. DDG therefore introduced its own community-police partnership component to increase trust between communities and the police.

Once DDG’s education teams have completed activities in a community, the CL team returns to deliver a Community-Police Partnership workshop for the four communities originally selected in the district. DDG selects 15 people from each community and a further 20 at district level – for a total of 65 participants for a three day kick off workshop. The District Police Commissioner participates as well as other officers. During the workshop they explain what community-police partnerships are, and allow both the community and the police to express how they see the other side and explain their own position. On the last day, community members and the police are asked to sign a declaration committing them to work together. DDG then goes to each community for three days, where they facilitate a discussion with the community and the police about community-police relations. This results in a community level declaration (this community will already have a Community Safety Plan). 25 people in the community are trained on community policing, along with the local police. They then select members to form a Community- Police Partnerships Committee, consisting of nine people, which develops a community policing plan. The plan identifies practical ways of improving police-community relations and coordination; for example, the community provides fuel to the police, helps construct police posts, mobilises community members and gives the police tips and information on crimes.
“Unlocking” the community: Community-Police Partnerships in Baligubadle district

Baligubadle district covers 17 communities, and used to have ten police officers based at district level and no officers at community level. The police in Baligubadle district found it difficult to encourage communities to cooperate with them. People felt that the police were corrupt and they mistrusted them. Despite the high number of conflicts and crimes in the area, police capacity and resources are insufficient. When trying to capture criminals, local communities tended to be uncooperative. DDG’s efforts to establish a community policing committee improved the situation. Following the establishment of the community policing committee, the community was encouraged to build a police station at community level, and supply the police with meals. As a result, two police officers are now based at community level and it has made a difference. The police have found it easier to find criminals based on tips provided from the communities. The communities also provide the police with emergency fuel and funds. The police now rely on the communities to gain information to solve crimes. For example, when a land-related conflict took place, the community-police partnership committee members told the police what they had witnessed, which helped the police make arrests.

DDG acknowledges that the community-police partnerships component of the CSP is the most underdeveloped aspect. Initial community policing attempts were not successful, in part due to lack of police capacity to service rural areas and limited involvement of the police in the process. DDG now works with both the community and police. In some target areas, the relationship between the community and the police has improved, whereas in others, the community-police partnership committees no longer function. DDG would like to link the community policing committees to the police reform process at national level, but has encountered problems due to poor coordination in relation to police reform more generally. The work of organisations like DDG and DRC on community policing has not been well coordinated at the national or regional level, yet there is a recognised need to build trust between the police and communities, and ensure that the police operate according to democratic policing principles.

Explosive Ordnance Disposal, MRE and advocacy

Based on the findings of the 2009 survey and past MRE efforts, DDG felt that a community-based approach, focused on changing behaviour, was needed to convince communities to hand over their ERW for destruction. In 2008, DDG initiated a 21 month pilot project, the Village Stockpile Disposal Initiative, with local NGO Hornpeace. It took a two tiered approach: mobile teams conducting village by village clearance of ERW, and advocacy workshops with community leaders and elders to convince them to encourage their communities to hand over private or communally-owned stockpiles of ERW. The approach is rooted in the belief that people need to realise that ERW is a threat to their safety and does not protect them; they want to make their homes and community safe but they need to be presented with easy solutions in order for there to be a high probability of success.

At some point during the community safety process, when community safety plans are developed, DDG’s mobile explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) team visits the community to collect and destroy ERW, deliver MRE and encourage communities to hand over ERW (unexploded ordnance and abandoned explosive ordnance). DDG begins by bringing influential community leaders, elders, representatives of women and youth, and known ERW owners for a three day advocacy workshop focused on the risks of ERW, particularly for children.
At this advocacy workshop, DDG encourages participants to hand over their private stockpiles of ERW, and to sign a declaration of support which states that they recognise private ownership of ERW is a problem, and that they are committed to handing over ERW and convincing their community members to do the same. “To kill the snake, you must cut off its head” is a proverb used by an EOD team member to explain the rationale for targeting community leaders. DDG asks community leaders to lead by example; by handing over their own stockpiles, they convince the rest of the community to do the same.

On the morning of the final day of the advocacy workshop, DDG’s EOD team destroys ERW a safe distance from the workshop but close enough to enable participants to see and hear the explosion. The purpose of the live demolition at this time is to reinforce messages regarding the risks that ERW pose, and mobilise community leaders to take action. The workshop messages are reinforced with the distribution of pamphlets and the installation of signboards with MRE messages and contact numbers for DDG’s mobile EOD teams. The mobile EOD team then schedules visits to the communities in the following days and weeks. During these visits, community leaders and elders hand over their own stockpiles to the mobile EOD team, and in doing so, encourage other community members to do the same. The combination of MRE, a live demolition of ERW and the focus on involving community leaders has helped DDG convince communities of the dangers and risks of ERW, and mobilise them to take action. DDG has received several requests from community leaders in neighbouring communities to conduct similar workshops, and as a result DDG has also included these communities.

Community follow up

Once these activities have taken place, DDG’s community liaison teams return to the communities to follow up on specific requests for advice or information and increase the capacity of the community to manage their community safety within the structure of the national government. The time frame is the nine to 12 months directly after the main implementation of activities described above. DDG recognises that this has been a weak point of the programme and is improving the follow up process.

E V O L U T I O N  I N  P R O G R A M M I N G

The CSP uses a participatory, community-driven approach. The programme was initially piloted in 2008 over a 21-month period in Daami, an IDP camp located in Gacan Libaax district of Hargeisa, with an estimated population of 4,000 - 4,500 households. The pilot was later extended to six communities in Sheikh district, located 155 km north east of Hargeisa. These different locations and community types gave DDG the opportunity to assess how the programme functioned in different settings, where the programme could be successfully implemented and what, if any, adaption would be needed to address the range of security issues. Since then the programme has expanded steadily.

The following is a timeline of the CSP’s implementation, including plans for scaling the programme up to district level:

> 2008 | initiated in Daami

> 2009 | the pilot was expanded to a full programme, and included Sheikh district (Togdheer region); seven communities in total were supported

> 2010 | three additional districts were included: Baligubadle (Maroodi Jeex region), Odwenie (Togdheer region), Las’canood (Sool region); 12 communities were added; in total the programme was implemented in 19 communities

> 2011 | additional communities from Odwenie were included, plus two new districts, Salahaley (Maroodi Jeex region) and Ainabo (Sool region). Full implementation in 12 communities, follow up with reduced interaction in 12 communities, and follow up in the initial seven communities in Daami and Sheikh
> 2012 | expanded from community-level engagement to district-level in three districts – Burao, Odwenie, Garowe
> 2013 | a further ten districts to be included
> 2014 | the programme will cover 18 districts in total, in addition to community-level engagement

**IMPACT MONITORING**

In 2009, DDG published a Manual on Impact Monitoring for staff involved in its mine action programmes, which is being adapted and used by DDG’s Armed Violence Reduction (AVR) programmes. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a key component of the CSP in Somaliland, although DDG acknowledges that it needs to be strengthened. M&E takes place during the following stages of the programme:

> Participatory Needs Assessment and baseline survey (during the community entry phase)
> ongoing monitoring, which involves a mix of staff and volunteer reporting and monitoring visits by national and international managers
> Participatory Impact Assessment, which takes place once the nine month CSP cycle has concluded; the M&E team uses household questionnaires, focus group discussions and interviews with key informants

DDG uses M&E to determine whether:

> planned activities have taken place
> changes have taken place in terms of actual and perceived levels of security/insecurity
> changes have occurred in the levels of violence and in the attitudes of the local population during the implementation of the programme
> improvements and adjustments to the programme are needed

DDG also uses the following monitoring tools to regularly monitor activities and track progress:

> **Conflict Management Skills Usage Monitor**: a monitoring form filled out by CME participants to indicate which CME skills are most used and applied to solve conflicts. Education teams select five active participants from each CME training programme and ask them to fill in this form on a monthly basis.
> **The Community Safety Plan implementation form**: used by Community Safety Committees to record activities, in order to track whether communities are implementing their Community Safety Plan.
> **Household Record for Violence and Crimes**: community volunteers record violent incidents and crimes to see if the level of crime and violence decreases over the course of DDG’s intervention. To date DDG has encountered problems motivating community volunteers to fill in these forms.
> **Benchmark tool**: an internal progress monitoring tool used throughout the project cycle to assess monthly output activities in target areas and their progress towards the objectives set in the Log Frame. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) team updates the benchmarks with data submitted by field staff every month.21
The data that DDG teams collect is entered and stored in SPSS, a commonly-used software package for statistical analysis, which the Impact Monitoring teams use to analyse the data. The data collected through the ERW collection and destruction work, e.g., the number of pieces of UXO collected and destroyed, location found, date of destruction, etc., is stored in paper form and in Excel spreadsheets. The data is sent to the Somaliland Mine Action Centre on a monthly basis. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is not used, however, the Somalia Community Safety Programme plans to develop a web-based system to link DDG's Community Safety Programme to locations using GIS and Google Earth.

Participatory Impact Assessment
Approximately three to six months after the nine month cycle of programme implementation in a community is complete, DDG’s M&E, CL and education teams return to the community to monitor progress. DDG teams conduct follow-up household surveys, which ask the same questions that were asked during the baseline household survey undertaken during the community entry process. The questionnaires are supplemented with focus group discussions and interviews with authorities, CSC members, and the police for triangulation. They help DDG to find out what worked well, how to improve the programme, changes that have taken place in the community and more. DDG then compares the data against the baseline and the activities undertaken during the project cycle and analyses it. As it is difficult to isolate the impact of changes in levels of armed violence and community safety and attribute them solely to DDG’s programme, DDG uses key informant interviews to assess whether changes can be attributed to DDG or other factors.

Prior to 2010, DDG used detailed questionnaires to undertake the baseline. But now, with the release of DDG’s Impact Monitoring (IM) manual, the questions asked are more general to enable communities to give feedback in their own words. IM helps DDG keep track of activities, identify weaknesses, improve performance against targets, and clarify what DDG plans to do and the indicators that the programme will achieve.

DDG acknowledges that apart from the six month IM visit, longer-term impact monitoring is needed. Returning 12 months to two years later to look at the medium-term impact of its programming would be useful. A three to six month visit after the completion of activities is often too short a period to expect significant change in perceptions of safety, etc.

During impact monitoring visits, DDG teams also check to see how the community volunteers are doing, and they interview different leaders and community representatives to get feedback on the impact of the training previously delivered. They also do outreach to neighbouring communities. During the follow-up, community volunteers are trained in FSE, MRE, and CME to enable them to deliver refresher training.
QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Quality management is carried out through daily contact with field staff, field visits and written reports. In addition, DDG’s impact monitoring team monitor on-going inputs and outputs, end-line outputs and the impact of DDG’s activities. The achievement of quality and adherence to standards is monitored through reports made by field staff, beneficiaries (e.g., community members are asked to monitor their community for issues such as the number of incidents of violence; workshop participants are asked to monitor when they apply what they have learned during the training), M&E reporting and field visits undertaken by DDG management.

All staff are responsible for quality and all staff receive regular refresher training at least once a year. Regular checks are also made by DDG staff based in Nairobi. DDG has Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in place for finance, logistics and administration of the Community Safety Programme, as well as for security issues which includes communication and travel. These are all laid on in the DRC Operational Handbook, which the management team monitors closely. In addition to the DRC Operational Handbook, DDG has developed a Community Safety Handbook.

Community Safety Handbook

In 2009, DDG produced a Community Safety Handbook for staff involved in implementing Community Safety Programmes. The Handbook, revised in 2010, provides operational guidance on how to implement different components of the Community Safety Programme. Its overall purpose is to provide comprehensive guidance on the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of DDG’s community safety projects. The handbook is structured as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTS</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PART 1 Planning | Introduction  
The Community Safety Approach  
Training of Community Safety Staff  
Selection of Target Areas and Communities  
Community Entry |
| PART 2 Preparation for Implementation | Mobilising Community Leaders for Advocacy Efforts  
Capacity Building of Community Safety Committees |
| PART 3 Implementation of DDG Interventions | Firearm Safety Education  
Safe Storage Devices for Firearms  
Risk Education  
Ammunition Disposal  
Conflict Management Education  
Community Based Policing |
| PART 4 Monitoring, evaluation and oversight | Monitoring & Evaluation Framework  
Impact Assessment Framework  
Beneficiary Complaint Mechanism  
Humanitarian Accountability Partnership Certification  
Administrating Local Partnerships |
Each chapter contains relevant tools, questionnaires and materials. The Handbook provides standards for overall activities, for example the installation of a Safe Storage Device onto a gun, or minimum criteria for selecting a Community Policing Committee.

**Humanitarian Accountability Principles (HAP) Certification**

The Humanitarian Accountability Principles are a set of agreed international standards which organisations can use to measure their accountability to beneficiaries, partners and donors. HAP certification is achieved through an independent audit of an organisation’s processes and practices. DDG is certified by HAP as part of DRC, and is therefore compliant with HAP principles and standards.

In 2010, DDG Somaliland undertook a HAP self-assessment which found that although DDG was adhering to HAP standards, there were some areas where improvement was needed, eg systematising of accountability frameworks and quality management systems. DDG Somaliland acknowledges that no formal Quality Management System is in place. However, many of the elements that would make up such a system are being implemented. The HAP assessment recommended that DDG Somaliland formulate an Accountability Framework and Quality Management System that brings together existing free-standing procedures to improve overall accountability and meet HAP standards.

The HAP assessment concluded that “…DDG has proved itself to be accountable to its partners and beneficiaries but needs to develop its own internal frameworks to ensure that accountability systems are streamlined and link seamlessly together.” According to the April 2012 HAP progress report for DRC/DDG, the self-assessment reports conducted by DDG and DRC country programmes (like that conducted by DDG Somaliland in 2010) demonstrate that “… DRC HQ is working to monitor and evaluate the means to improve the quality of partnership with respect to the Principles of Accountability and Principles of Humanitarian Action.”

**RESULTS**

According to DDG’s own assessments, the CSP has met its targets and has contributed to improved safety and security for beneficiaries in target communities. For example, DDG cites the following results for its work in Las’canood, Odwenie and Baligubadle districts between April 2010 and March 2011:

> Following programme implementation, the perception of armed violence within target communities had declined from 32.8 per cent to 8.9 per cent, and the fear of becoming a victim of a violent crime had fallen from 28.7 per cent to 9.7 per cent.

> Following DDG’s delivery of FSE for community members and community volunteers and the installation of safe storage devices on privately owned firearms, the percentage of people involved in a firearm accident fell from 14.4 per cent to 2 per cent of the target population. Households threatened with firearms fell from 23.1 per cent to 4.5 per cent, and the percentage of households reporting firearm thefts fell from 12.2 per cent to 1.4 per cent.

> Following the training of 760 people in conflict management, and the training of a further 15,191 community volunteers, 86 per cent of respondents think their community has improved conflict management mechanisms in place compared to the year before DDG’s intervention.

> In terms of security provision, there was a 31 per cent increase in the level of community trust in the police following DDG’s intervention in the three districts, as well as a 31 per cent increase in the community rating of police accessibility.

> DDG’s efforts to address private stockpiles of ERW resulted in a reduction from 34 per cent to 8 per cent of the target population who are concerned about accidents with mines or ERW. 66 per cent of identified private owners of ERW were disarmed.
An evaluation commissioned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) in 2011 confirmed the programme’s achievements in meeting its overall objective of reducing armed violence and improving community safety in the targeted areas. The evaluation also recommended that the programme be expanded geographically, albeit with a few operational adjustments, such as the inclusion of gender-sensitive indicators in all surveys and in DDG’s monitoring and evaluation system as a whole.

MOVING FROM BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE TO INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE—DDG’S DISTRICT SAFETY PROGRAMME

In 2011, DDG began a new initiative to expand its community-driven participatory approach to armed violence reduction to the district level through the establishment and support of District Safety Committees (DSCs). This effort in three districts in Somaliland and Puntland is designed to complement and enhance ongoing efforts to empower individuals to reduce armed violence in their communities. The key shift is a new engagement with district wide leadership to sustainably institutionalise mechanisms that address collective safety needs, whereas the key drivers of change in the CSP focus on behavioural or attitudinal change on an individual level. DDG believes this two-tiered approach will create a lasting impact.

The DSCs are intended to be key coordinating bodies for safety and security issues in the district representing both government institutions and civil society, especially those groups without a voice in traditional Somali society. Through a collaborative process facilitated by DDG, the DSCs identify, prioritise and, where most appropriate, implement activities that positively address the most pressing safety and security issues within the district—embodied in the District Safety Plan (DSP). The District Safety Programme aims to promote locally identified safety needs as part of the district development planning process where safety issues had not been systematically considered in previous years. This is based on the belief that safety and security is integral to wider recovery and development processes.

The DSCs work in conjunction with the District Councils, as advisory bodies to the District Executive Committee, and focus on preventing conflict and crime through peace building, peace awareness and improving community safety. Examples include the creation of a gender desk in the local police department to address Gender-Based Violence, advocacy workshops to encourage use of the court/formal police system and improving inter-clan relations through youth engagement. DDG’s goals in the district programme are to:

> integrate the District Safety Plans into the district development framework
> formalise the relationship between the DSCs and the local and national government to ensure sustainability
> build the organisational and analytical capacity of the DSCs to effectively function as well as represent the safety needs of the district
> empower citizens to demand and expect responsive governance in the realm of safety and security

Furthermore, DDG aims to position the District Safety Plan at the centre of district safety priorities in the communities. Outside agencies as well as national institutions can then refer to the plan and look at supporting components of the plan to reduce violence and increase perceptions of safety. In the past, DSC members have tended to be town-based representatives and DDG is trying to ensure that both rural and urban communities are represented.
For the district project, DDG undertook a baseline assessment in all three districts, and recruited and trained a new team in October and November 2011. Implementation began in mid December. The process begins with representative leadership from the nearly all communities in the district participating in an initial district safety advocacy workshop. For example, in Odwenie, DDG started with a district advocacy workshop involving 90 members, comprised of all resident clans, religious leaders, elders, District Council members and the police, who were asked to sign a declaration of support. Subsequently, a six day district safety planning workshop took place, and resulted in the formation of the DSC and the District Safety Plan. In January, the 15 members of the DSC elected leadership roles, developed by-laws and a constitution and identified potential partners for implementation of the DSP. By the end of the month, the DSC had already started to implement the first activity of the DSP: mitigation of an intra-clan dispute involving the rape of a minor that had the potential to spill over into wider violence.

The challenge ahead for the district program is to spur rural communities not directly engaged in the CSP to adopt their own Community Safety Plans and begin to combat the normalisation of violence that plagues many settlements. In 2011-12, DDG endeavours to build three sustainable DSCs while increasing the number to six in the next project cycle, contingent on funding.

COORDINATION WITH THE DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL
The Danish Refugee Council is implementing a Community Driven Recovery and Development (CDRD) programme in Somaliland. The programme is focused on strengthening local governance based on the recognition that capacity at local government level in Somaliland is weak. The approach is community-driven (where the community defines its own development priorities, establishes community based organisations [CBOs] and applies for and manages grants provided by DRC for local projects) as opposed to community-based (where support is provided to the community but the community does not take a leadership role). DRC works with local CBOs to help them establish committees and manage resources. The committees develop Community Action Plans, which require that the community contribute at least 20 per cent of the total, usually through in-kind support, ie labour, and they submit proposals to DRC for grants for a maximum of 15,000 USD. Local authorities endorse the CAPs, which are then reflected in District Development Plans.

DRC and DDG have developed a joint strategy to integrate the CDRD programme with DDG’s CSP, to strengthen the impact of their mutual interventions and improve linkages between community safety and development. Aspects of DRC’s CDRD programme could be better coordinated and harmonised with DDG’s Community Safety Programme in the communities and districts where both organisations are working. In 2012, DRC and DDG will look at how to improve coordination.
GENDER & DIVERSITY
DDG has not formalised efforts to mainstream gender into its Community Safety Programme. However, the Somaliland Programme informally uses the following approaches to promote gender and wider diversity:

> as part of the community entry process, the community profiles help DDG to identify what is available in the community and which groups are represented, which enables DDG plan how to promote diversity/representation

> baseline surveys collect sex and age disaggregated data, and both male and female heads of household are interviewed

> IDPs, pastoralists and different clans are consulted and involved in community safety activities. Gender balance is also considered when establishing committees, organising workshops, etc

> CME specifically targets women and trains them separately to provide an environment where they are comfortable with expressing themselves

> ERW advocacy workshops target men as well as women, who are used to influence their husbands

> when training community volunteers, both men and women are targeted

> the distribution of SSDs typically target men and youth who tend to be the main owners of SALW. Women are encouraged to convince their husbands to store their arms and ammunition safely

DONOR SUPPORT
DDG’s Community Safety Programme receives funding from several key donors. They include:

> Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA): SIDA funded DDG’s initial Community Safety Programme concept and maintained funding, which is channelled through their country programme and development assistance channels. SIDA is looking at opportunities for streamlining support with other donors, eg through joint evaluations.

> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (DANIDA) established a framework agreement with DDG in 2011 and is providing one year stabilisation funding for the Community Safety Programmes in Somalia and South Sudan. Funding is pledged until 2014 for Somalia.

> The Netherlands Embassy (Nairobi): the Netherlands has supported the CSP in Somalia through their stabilisation fund in 2010, and has pledged funding for 2012-14. In addition, the Netherlands is funding the Mine Action component under a specific Mine Action agreement.

> United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has provided support through the Rule of Law and Security Programme which has small grants (less than 150,000 USD) of three to six months duration.

> The UK Department for International Development (DfID) has provided funding for one year for district-level activities through the Somalia Governance and Peace-building Programme (GAPP). An extension is expected until 2014.

Of particular note is the fact that the channels used to fund the Community Safety Programme are not those used by the same donors to support mine action. Different funding channels/modalities are used – typically those in support of stabilisation and early recovery.
CHALLENGES AND LESSONS LEARNT

The following is a brief overview of some of the key lessons that DDG has learnt from implementing the CSP in Somaliland:

- Reducing armed violence in Somaliland hinges on attitudinal and behaviour change, which both take considerable time and effort, requiring an extensive approach that is community-driven. Awareness raising, education and reinforcement are essential.

- To have lasting impact, CSPs should be linked to socio-economic recovery/development programmes in order to provide communities with alternate livelihood opportunities and address key drivers of conflict. DDG’s links to DRC and its Community Driven Recovery and Development programme were advantageous and will be reinforced in future. Other links with DRC will be utilised as they become available and relevant.

- Having a long-term presence in communities helped DDG get community support and buy-in for its Community Safety Programme. DDG maintains that it has been able to work on sensitive security issues because communities know that DDG is committed to helping them. DDG’s EOD teams, for example, have been working in Somaliland since 1999 and are typically based in the community when they carry out EOD operations, which facilitates trust-building and community engagement.

- The surveys DDG carried out in 2007 and 2009 on community safety, as well as community feedback through the Participatory Needs Assessments, were vital for ensuring the Community Safety Programme was tailored to needs on the ground. The assessments helped DDG design a programme to fit local needs and context – a very different approach from most mine clearance programmes which typically use standard approaches and tools regardless of the socio-political context.

- DDG shifted into a new programming area, which was completely different in many ways from its mine clearance programmes. This has required constant review, adaptation and lesson learning to ensure the programme continued to meet community safety needs. DDG’s mandate of creating environments free from the threat of mines, UXO and SALW has remained the same. However, once SALW was added, the context and DDG’s approach became much more complex. It was no longer enough to focus primarily on the instruments of armed violence. DDG recognised that they also needed to address the agents and institutions to reduce the threat from SALW (see Armed Violence Lens).

- Ownership - In some communities, ownership of the Community Safety Plans has been problematic. Communities have tended to forget about their plans and focus on tangible activities. To some extent this is an understandable response, as in the eyes of the community the plan is simply a piece of paper. In future, DDG teams intend to take the plan and explain to communities that each activity they undertake relates specifically to what the community highlighted and requested in their plan.

- Although CSP staff have adapted the programme methodology to mainstream gender and diversity, these activities and processes should be made a requirement of programme implementation. Otherwise they risk being overlooked by staff who may not understand the value of gender and diversity-sensitive programming.
Community members in some areas have demanded remuneration for participation in CSP activities. DDG promotes volunteerism and community driven development and has had to explain that it is not part of DDG policy to pay community members for participation. When community liaison team members enter a community, they spend considerable time explaining this at the outset to avoid problems later on.

DDG has tried to promote sustainability of its interventions by training community volunteers to periodically provide refresher training and awareness-raising sessions in CME, firearms safety and MRE. However, keeping community volunteers motivated has proved challenging and the results have been mixed.

AVR FRAMEWORK
In 2010, DDG published an AVR framework in order to:

- Ensure that all of DDG’s AVR programmes follow a coherent approach to planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation, while also allowing for local variation
- Serve as a policy tool for conceptualising and designing new AVR initiatives

The AVR framework is based on DDG’s community safety programming experience in Somaliland and uses the Organization for Economic Coordination and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee’s Armed Violence Lens. This lens captures the main elements and levels that shape armed violence patterns, including the people affected by armed violence, the agents of violence, the instruments used for violence and the wider institutional/cultural environment that enables and/or protects against violence. Through this lens, DDG claims it can design its interventions comprehensively, taking into account the needs and perceptions of the individuals and communities affected, the drivers and agents of armed violence, the weapons used and the formal and informal institutions affected (see Figure 1). While mine action organisations like DDG have typically focused their programming primarily on dealing with the instruments of violence, eg mines and ERW, few have addressed institutions and agents involved in armed violence, and affected communities.
The AVR framework outlines DDG’s AVR intervention areas:

> building local institutions for safety
> building capacity for conflict management and peace
> addressing the threat posed by mines, ERW and SALW
> strengthening relationships between security providers and communities

It also outlines DDG’s entry criteria and exit strategy for all of its AVR programmes, and lists DDG’s operating principles and the different characteristics and objectives that programmes should adopt at the local, national and regional level.
CONCLUSION

DDG’s Community Safety Programme in Somaliland is one of the first programmes implemented by a mine/ERW operator which is dramatically different from a standard mine clearance programme. It is based on a community-driven, participatory methodology to promote community safety, which has evolved and adapted to local needs over time. It is a positive example of evidence-based programming: DDG designed the programme in response to the findings of several assessments and surveys conducted on community safety and security in Somaliland.

As with pilots and new programmes, there are areas that can be strengthened and the DDG team has proven receptive to suggestions that enhance the impact of their programme. Apart from expanding the programme to include district level activities, plans in 2012 include conducting a survey to assess the impact of the programme on livelihoods in target communities. Given the extent to which land and access to natural resources is a key driver of conflict in Somaliland, support will also be provided to ensure that the CSP is mainstreaming land rights and conflict sensitivity. In addition, DDG will conduct impact assessments on the more traditional spot EOD activities. This activity focuses on clearing privately owned domestically held stockpiles of ERW.
ENDNOTES

1. GICHD. External Assessment of DDG’s Humanitarian Mine Action Programme in Somaliland, Tim Lardner, Geneva, May 2008. This case study was written by Shamala Naidoo (GICHD) following a research mission to Somaliland in November 2011.

2. In 2008, DDG re-surveyed 48 communities with 115 Suspected Hazardous Areas (SHAs) associated by the Landmine Impact Survey. Eight were identified as high impact and 17 as medium impact, while 25 SHA (22%) were discredited by the resurvey. GICHD. External Assessment of DDG’s Humanitarian Mine Action Programme in Somaliland, Tim Lardner, Geneva, May 2008.


6. DDG and Small Arms Survey, Community Safety and Small Arms in Somaliland, 3.


10. Both the Somaliland and Puntland community safety teams work in four communities in roughly nine to 11 months. The Somaliland teams work in all four simultaneously during the same period, while the Puntland teams work in each community one at a time for a shorter period.

11. More in-depth community safety planning takes place later on.

12. See Annex for copy of the household questionnaire.

13. DDG provides selection criteria to the local mayor who then identifies participants.

14. DDG’s MRE activities are not described as these are typical of most mine clearance programmes.

15. To ensure that elders do not feel that their role in the community is being usurped or threatened, DDG consults community elders during the CME process.

16. Although in Sheikh district, DDG found that pastoralists were using an abandoned military facility to store their weapons so the idea of community armouries are an option they may try to explore in future (Interview with Karina Lynge, DDG Nairobi, 14 November 2011).

17. Interview with Udaya da Silva, Area Project Manager/SPU Advisor, Civilian Police Project, UNDP Somaliland, Hargeisa, 17 November 2011.

18. Interviews with Community Policing Committee members and police representative, Baligubadle district, Somaliland, 22 November 2011.

19. Interview with Karina Lynge, Nairobi, 14 November, 2011.

20. This will happen only if ERW has already been surrendered by the host community; usually it has.

21. The MRE pamphlets were developed jointly with Handicap International, Mines Advisory Group and the Somaliland and Puntland Mine Action Centres. Please see the Annex for a sample.


28. The Community Safety Plans do not feed into district development plans at present; work in the three new districts is being done through support from the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

29. Joint indicators for monitoring progress on implementing the community safety plans have not been developed largely due to low capacity and literacy levels within the communities.

## ANNEX 1 | KEY MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Siad Barre’s regime falls and Somaliland declares independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>Internal conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Stability returns to Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Somaliland Mine Action Centre established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>DRC begins operations in Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>DDG and Halo Trust begin mine clearance operations in Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>DDG begins village by village EOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>DRC begins conflict management programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>DRC begins Community Based Policing programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>DDG stops manual mine clearance and Battle Area Clearance (BAC) operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>DDG retains mobile EOD teams for Village by Village Clearance (VBVC) focused on removal and disposal of UXO and AXO, plus MRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>DDG pilots, with Haqsoor (later split and renamed Horn of Peace), Village Stockpile Disposal Initiative (VSDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>DDG/DRC undertake baseline survey of community attitudes towards SALW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>DDG ceases VBVC operations and continues with VSDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>DDG and SAS undertake survey on community safety and small arms in Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>DDG implements Community Safety Programme (VSDI is one component, but also takes place in communities where Community Safety Programme is not being implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>DDG Somaliland programmes focuses on Community Safety Programme and EOD Programme, linked but separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>DDG pilots CSP in two districts (the Daami IDP settlement in Hargeisa town and Sheik), which equals seven communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>CSP expands to three more districts, which equals 12 new communities in the districts of Baligubadle, Odwenie and Las’canood, four communities in each district, from April 2010 to January 2011. Loose contact was maintained with Daami and Sheik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to January 2011</td>
<td>Februare to December 2011. Contact was maintained with previous communities including Daami and Sheik. In mid 2010 expansion into Galkayo was started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Further 12 communities added, plus follow up in previous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>DDG expands to district level with staff recruitment and training. They were deployed late October / November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE (BASELINE & IMPACT ASSESSMENT)

I1  Report number: ____________________________
I2  District name: ____________________________
I3  Village Name: ____________________________
I4  Sex of Respondent:  
   1 = Female
   2 = Male
I5  How old are you? Write age in years in answer box | ____ |
I6  What is your occupation?  
   1 = Working (labourer)
   2 = Pastoralist
   3 = Farmer
   4 = Fisherman
   5 = Businessman/-woman
   6 = Government employee (incl. army & police)
   7 = Employee with LNGO, INGO, UN
   8 = Housewife
   9 = Student
   10 = Retired/disabled
   11 = Unemployed
   96 = Other
I7  On a scale of 0 to 4, how do you perceive your income situation? Write number in answer box | ____ |

SECURITY AND CRIME IN THE COMMUNITY
(77 for don’t know and 88 for refused to respond and 99 for not applicable)

S1  What is your main concern for your community?  
   1 = Healthcare
   2 = Water sanitation
   3 = Employment
   4 = Education
   5 = Security
   96 = Other
S2  Are there any threats towards safety and security in this village?  
   1 = Yes (→ continue to S3)
   2 = No (→ skip to S4. If 77 or 88, skip to S4)
S3  If yes, what is the three most serious types of safety and security threats that your village faces?  
   1 = State Threats | Internal insecurity in Somaliland
   2 = State Threats | External insecurity arising from other states
   3 = Inter-Communal Competition clan tensions, threats, etc
   4 = Threat from Gangs violence by internal community groups
   5 = Threats from Individuals violence perpetrated by individuals
   6 = Threats against Women rape, domestic violence
   7 = Threats against Minors child abuse, baby abandonment etc.
**ANNEX 2 | DDG SOMALILAND HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE**

**HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE (BASELINE & IMPACT ASSESSMENT)**

**SECURITY AND CRIME IN THE COMMUNITY**

(77 for don't know and 88 for refused to respond and 99 for not applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S3</th>
<th>If yes, what is the three most serious types of safety and security threats that your village faces?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N.B. Read out answers 1-10 &amp; allow for others or don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SALW/ERW/Mine Accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Threats from drugs/alcohol or khat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Natural threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S4 | Does armed violence or crime occur in your community?                                           |
|    | 1 = Yes                                                                                         |
|    | 2 = No                                                                                         |

| S5 | How is the level of armed violence in your community compared to one year ago?                  |
|    | 1 = Better                                                                                    |
|    | 2 = Same                                                                                      |
|    | 3 = Worse                                                                                      |

| S6 | Are you concerned that you or a member of your household may become the victim of a crime or violent encounter? |
|    | 1 = Yes                                                                                         |
|    | 2 = No                                                                                         |

| S7 | Have you or anyone in your household been the victim of a crime or violent encounter in the last year? |
|    | 1 = Better                                                                                    |
|    | 2 = Same                                                                                      |
|    | 3 = Worse                                                                                      |

**SECURITY PROVIDERS**

(77 for don't know and 88 for refused to respond and 99 for not applicable)

| P1 | Would you inform anyone if you saw or experienced violent crime?                                |
|    | 1 = Yes                                                                                         |
|    | 2 = No                                                                                         |

| P2 | If yes, who would you go to?                                                                    |
|    | 1 = Police                                                                                    |
|    | 2 = Religious leaders                                                                          |
|    | 3 = Traditional leaders (clan elders/aqils)                                                    |
|    | 4 = Nearest family                                                                             |
|    | 5 = Neighbours                                                                                |
|    | 6 = Friends                                                                                   |
|    | 7 = Military                                                                                  |
|    | 96 = Other                                                                                    |

| P3 | How are conflict management mechanisms functioning compared to a year ago?                    |
|    | 1 = Better                                                                                    |
|    | 2 = Same                                                                                      |
|    | 3 = Worse                                                                                      |

On a scale of 0 to 4, how do you perceive your income situation?

| P4 | Trust                                                                                         |
|    |                                                                                               |

| P5 | Efficiency (get the job done/create results)                                                  |
|    |                                                                                               |

| P6 | Accessibility (easy to find/access)                                                           |
|    |                                                                                               |

| P7 | Familiarity (are familiar with them)                                                          |
|    |                                                                                               |

| P8 | Transparency (open about what they do)                                                        |
|    |                                                                                               |
## Household Questionnaire (Baseline & Impact Assessment)

### Firearms and ERW

77 for don’t know and 88 for refused to respond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No</th>
<th>3 = Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 = Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong></td>
<td>Have you or anyone else in your household had an accident (unintended incident) with firearms within the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2</strong></td>
<td>Has anyone stolen a firearm from you or anyone in your household within the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3</strong></td>
<td>Have you or anyone else in your household had an accident (unintended incident) ERW/Mines within the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F4</strong></td>
<td>Have you or anyone else in your household been threatened or made to feel fearful by someone with a firearm within the last year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F5</strong></td>
<td>Do you consider how people store their firearms (e.g. locked up, tied up, out in the open) as important or unimportant to personal safety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F6</strong></td>
<td>Do you consider how people handle their firearms (e.g. magazine attached/unattached, bullets in chamber etc.) as important or unimportant to personal safety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F7</strong></td>
<td>How do you usually store your firearm(s)? (NB: Read out answers. One answer allowed for each firearm owned, up to a maximum of three answers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F8</strong></td>
<td>In storage, do you usually keep your firearm(s) loaded (with bullet in chamber and/or magazine attached)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 3 | DDG SOMALILAND PLANS FOR 2012 (LOG-FRAME)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL GOAL &amp; DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the peace, security and stabilisation of the fragile parts of Somaliland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT GOALS & OBJECTIVES

1. **Community safety is improved for approximately 25,000 beneficiaries in 12 communities in Somaliland**
   - 10% of target population report an improved security situation
   - DDG surveys and reports
   - The overall security situation remains stable and allows free access to beneficiaries and implementation of activities.
   - DDG continues to be able to recruit, train and retain the skilled staff needed for the programme.

2. **Community safety is maintained & further strengthened in previous target areas for approximately 35,000 beneficiaries**
   - Previously targeted populations report no reduction in levels of security.
   - DDG surveys and reports
   - There is no negative interference or actions from government or external actors.

3. **Safety is enhanced for 2 Districts of Somaliland**
   - 2 District Safety Committees are formed and implement at least 3 activities from their District Safety Plan
   - DDG surveys and reports
   - Communities continue to actively welcome the programme and remain fully engaged in the activities.

4. **The threats posed by explosive remnants of war are reduced for approximately 110,000 beneficiaries**
   - 75% of acknowledged private domestically held stockpiles are surrendered and demolished
   - Reports to SMAC on demolition records
   - (assumed 10 ERW Advocacy workshops, each for 10 communities of average 200 households and 5.9 people per household)
   - 100% of abandoned UXO are demolished
   - Reports to SMAC on demolition records

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL GOAL &amp; DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. LOCAL INSTITUTIONS FOR SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>Community Safety Plans are developed by all the targeted communities reflecting the needs of all sections of the local community.</td>
<td>Plans are made and printed in both Somali and English</td>
<td>Communities are willing and able to engage in developing their own safety plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Safety Committee is created in all the targeted communities.</td>
<td>DDG reports</td>
<td>Communities are willing and able to accept the safety services and activities that DDG can provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Community Safety Committees (CSC) receive training in committee management, community mobilisation, and fundraising</td>
<td>Participant’s records</td>
<td>Other development agencies remain in Somaliland and are open to approaches from communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 8 of the CSC implement minimum 1/3 of their planned activities</td>
<td>CSC implementation records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least half the CSCs have used the Community Safety Plan to approach other agencies to support implementation</td>
<td>CSC implementation records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least half the CSCs have mobilized the community to contribute to the CS Plan implementation</td>
<td>CSC implementation records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
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#### B. CONFLICT MANAGEMENT CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved conflict management and reduced number of recorded conflicts in</td>
<td>Participant records</td>
<td>Communities perceive the need for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the target areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>training and are willing to include it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 people receive conflict management education from DDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>in their Community Safety Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 community volunteer trainers are trained to help sustain the conflict</td>
<td>Participant records</td>
<td>Community volunteers remain actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management skills within the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>engaged for the benefit of their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 of the 40 trained volunteers educate their peers during the project</td>
<td>Volunteer’s training records</td>
<td>No negative external influences impact of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period in their community</td>
<td></td>
<td>levels of local conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% decrease in the perceived level of conflict within the targeted</td>
<td>DDG surveys and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of local community report that local conflict management has</td>
<td>DDG surveys and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved compared to baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. SMALL ARMS/LIGHT WEAPONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of reported accidents, threats and thefts involving small</td>
<td>Installation records</td>
<td>Firearms owners remain keen to use safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arms light weapons in targeted communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>storage devices for their weapons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 firearm owners have a safe storage device fitted to their weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient funds are available for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by DDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>manufacture of the devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 people in the target areas have received firearm safety education</td>
<td>Participant records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from DDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL GOAL &amp; DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. SMALL ARMS/LIGHT WEAPONS (CONT'D)</strong></td>
<td>Reduced number of reported accidents, threats and thefts involving small arms light weapons in targeted communities</td>
<td>40 community volunteer trainers are trained to help sustain the firearm safety skills within the community</td>
<td>Participant records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 of the 40 trained volunteers educate their peers during the project period in their community</td>
<td>Volunteers’ records</td>
<td>Community volunteers remain actively engaged for the benefit of their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALW reported accidents are reduced by 25% from baseline</td>
<td>DDG surveys and reports</td>
<td>No negative external influences impact of levels of local conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALW reported thefts are reduced by 25% from baseline</td>
<td>DDG surveys and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats involving SALW are reduced by 35% from baseline</td>
<td>DDG surveys and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **D. EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR (ERW)** | Reduced presence and fear of ERW in targeted communities | 75% of acknowledged owners of private domestically held stockpiles have surrendered their ERW to DDG for demolition | Demolition records. Records of acknowledged ERW owners | Communities perceive the need for this activity and are willing to include it in their Community Safety Plans. |
| | 100% of identified abandoned UXO are demolished | Demolition records | Communities and ERW owners do not perceive this as compromising their right to self defense. |
| | 1/3 people in the targeted communities receive mine risk education from DDG | Participant records | |

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
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### OVERALL GOAL & DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR (ERW) (CONT'D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced presence and fear of ERW in targeted communities</td>
<td>40 community volunteer trainers are trained to help sustain the mine risk education within the community</td>
<td>Participant records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 of the 40 trained volunteers educate their peers during the project period in their community</td>
<td>Volunteers’ records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of ERW accidents is reduced by 50% from the baseline</td>
<td>DDG survey and reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. FORMAL SECURITY PROVIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication and relationship between the communities and the formal security providers is enhanced in target communities</td>
<td>8 of the targeted communities have established a Community Police Partnership mechanism and committee</td>
<td>DDG reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CPP committee have received training from DDG in their role and how to function as an effective committee</td>
<td>Participants’ records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The popular perception of levels of conflict is decreased by 10% in the targeted communities.</td>
<td>DDG survey and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% of community members report they have greater trust in the police from the baseline</td>
<td>DDG survey and reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goal &amp; Development Objective</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Formal Security Providers (Contd)</strong></td>
<td>Communication and relationship between the communities and the formal security providers is enhanced in target communities</td>
<td>The number of people who prefer to report crimes to the police, instead of traditional authorities, increases by 15%</td>
<td>DDG survey and reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Results / Outputs | Community Safety is Maintained & Further Strengthened in Previous Target Areas for Approximately 35,000 Beneficiaries

- Development and security improvement in previous targeted communities is monitored and supported on a needs based approach to encourage sustainable community driven development
- All previous communities are visited at least three times in the year following the period in which they were targeted
- Additional DDG activities and services on a needs basis
- All requested services within DDG programme to be delivered within two months of the request

- Development and security improvement in previous targeted communities is monitored and supported on a needs based approach to encourage sustainable community driven development
- All previous communities are visited at least three times in the year following the period in which they were targeted
- Additional DDG activities and services on a needs basis
- All requested services within DDG programme to be delivered within two months of the request

### 3 Safety Is Enhanced for 2 Districts of Somaliland

- 2 Districts have formulated District Safety Committees which are representative of the district as a whole
- 2 District Safety Committees are functioning and representative of the District
- The District Safety Committee have formalized relationship with the District Council
- The Mayor and 80% of council members know the function and membership of the DSC

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
## Overall Goal & Development Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Safety is Enhanced for 2 Districts of Somaliland (Contd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both DSCs have developed and started to implement their District Safety Plan

- The DSP is validated by both rural and urban communities
- Both DSCs have implemented at least three activities
- External agencies have implemented at least one activity of the DSP
- There is one representative from the formal security providers on the DSC and s/he attends meetings regularly
- There is a clearly defined and understood representation from the community safety committees on the DSC
- The community safety committees make a local safety plan with reference to the DSP, and implement at least 2 activities

- Representatives from the district communities
- DSC activity records
- DSC activity records
- Meeting attendance records
- Meeting attendance records
- Reports from the community safety committees

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
### OVERALL GOAL & DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

**INDICATORS** | **MEANS OF VERIFICATION** | **ASSUMPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 RESULTS / OUTPUTS</th>
<th>THE THREATS POSED BY EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR ARE REDUCED FOR APPROXIMATELY 110,000 BENEFICIARIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threats from explosive remnants of war are reduced in targeted communities</td>
<td>10 ERW Advocacy Workshops are held. Each workshop will target ERW owners, Elders and community members from 10 communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of private domestically held stockpiles from approximately 100 communities</td>
<td>Somaliland Mine Action Center reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of acknowledged private domestically held stockpiles are surrendered and demolished</td>
<td>DDG reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of abandoned ERW identified by the communities are collected and demolished</td>
<td>Somaliland Mine Action Center reports. DDG reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 of population in the 100 targeted communities receive MRE from the EOD staff</td>
<td>Participants’ records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumptions shown here are not specific to individual goals.
ANNEX 4 | PEOPLE CONSULTED

Ali Maah (Dr.) | Director | Somaliland Mine Action Centre (SMAC)
Andrew John Shearer | Technical Field Manager | MAG Somaliland
Ayan Mahamed Handule | M&E Coordinator | DDG Somaliland
DDG EOD Teams 1&2
Eric Lohann | intern | DDG Somaliland
Evan Hibak Kosar | SMAC
Fatima Abdi Elmi | Education Coordinator | DDG Somaliland
Hamdi Abdulah | UNHABITAT | Somaliland
Hussain Yussef | Peacebuilding Unit | Ministry of Interior/UNDP
Idris Abdi | Community Liaison Coordinator | DDG Somaliland
Ivanoe Fugali, Coordinator | Community Driven Recovery project | Somalia Programme | DRC, Nairobi
James Mead Stephenson | DDG | District Safety Manager
Karen Culver | DDG | Programme Manager, Somaliland
Karina Lynge | DDG | AVR Programme Manager | Nairobi
Klaus Ljørring Pedersen | DDG | Regional Programme Manager | Nairobi
Mads Frilander | Programme Manager | Somalia/Somaliland | Saferworld | Nairobi
Mahamoud Ahmed Elmi | Operations Manager and EOD Team Supervisor | DDG Somaliland
Mark Belford | Capacity Building/Technical Advisor | UNMAO | Somaliland
Mirieille Widmer | Community Safety Specialist | UNDP Somaliland
Muhammad Ali | Ministry of Interior
Phillipa Beale | Country Director | DRC | Somaliland
Pi Tauber | Programme Advisor, DDG Somaliland
Roly Clark | Country Director | Halo Trust Somaliland
Salahaley team | Du’ale Sulieman Adbi | Community Liaison Facilitator; Khadar Osman
Idiris | Community Liaison Facilitator; Muse Mohamed Muse | Education Facilitator;
Faisal Abdirahman Madar | Education Facilitator
Udaya da Silva | Police Reform Advisor | UNDP Somaliland
Ugbad Mouse | Education Team | DDG Somaliland
Yoshito Nakagawa | Japan Centre for Conflict Prevention/Somali Observatory of Conflict and Violence Prevention
ANNEX 5 | DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Danish Demining Group

> Impact Assessment Report (Draft) | Somaliland | 2011
> Stabilisation through Community driven Safety and Socio-economic Recovery in Somalia | Joint strategy with DRC | 2010
> Armed Violence Reduction Framework | DDG Horn of Africa | April 2010
> DDG Community Safety Operational Guidelines | March 2009
> DDG-DRC Somaliland Community Attitudes Survey (SALW) | Report | 2007
> Analysis and Recommendations on Community Safety in Somalia (based on survey) | 2007

DDG and Small Arms Survey, Community Safety and Small Arms in Somaliland, 2009


Hamming, Tore R. Stabilizing Somalia through integrating community-driven safety with socio-economic development | Community Development Journal | 2011

Hartkorn, Siris | Community-led stabilisation in Somalia, Forced Migration Review 37 | 2011

Jakobsen, Rasmus Stuhr | Community Safety in Somalia | Journal of Mine Action | Issue 15.1 | Summer 2011


SIDA | DDG Somaliland Programme Evaluation, Final Report | 8 August 2011 | Elsebeth Krogh and Tim Lardner

UNDP | The Somali Community Safety Framework strategy