METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

2024 CCCM HNO PIN AND SEVERITY ANALYSIS



October 2023

Cover photo credits: IDP site in Ibb. © UNHCR/2022

About REACH

REACH facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery, and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT). For more information, please visit <u>our website</u>. You can contact us directly at: <u>geneva@reach-initiative.org</u> and follow us on Twitter @REACH_info.

About CCCM Cluster in Yemen

The CCCM Cluster is responsible for the coordination and the management of IDPs sites in Yemen. The cluster has been activated in 2020. The main objective of the cluster is to improve the living conditions and protection of IDPs in sites and ensure equitable access to services and assistance of all persons in need, with a focus on moving towards durable solutions with full participation of the displaced and host communities. The cluster is Led by UNHCR with DRC as Co-Coordinator. As Inter-Agency and Inter-Cluster member, the CCCM cluster is collaborating and coordinating with all the sectors to ensure equitable access to assistance, protection, and services.

For more information, please visit our website and follow us on Twitter @CCCMYemen





1. BACKGROUND

The outbreak of violence in Yemen in 2015 has resulted in an estimated total of 4.5 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) – with more than half of total displacements occurring during the onset of the crisis that year.¹ 99.6% of all IDPs in Yemen were displaced due to this conflict, and the protracted nature of the crisis is exemplified by over 80% of IDPs having been displaced for at least one year, and many on multiple occasions.² Specifically, evictions and flooding continue to trigger secondary displacement.³ According to the latest Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster data, as of August 2023, **1.5 million IDPs were living across 2,285 displacement hosting sites across Yemen** – primarily within Al-Hodeidah, Hajjah, Marib and Taiz governorates.⁴ Given this protracted displacement in Yemen, humanitarian actors require an understanding of the severity of humanitarian needs across IDP sites for prioritization and to inform OCHA's Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) in 2024.

2. RATIONALE

In order to understand the CCCM needs and vulnerabilities of Yemeni IDPs in sites, the 2024 CCCM People-in-Need (PIN) and Severity Score Analysis will assess CCCM-related indicators across all IDP sites in Yemen (where data is available). REACH, as a member of the Yemen CCCM Cluster's 2024 HNO Analysis Group, supports the CCCM Cluster with developing the methodology note and conducting the first draft of the related analysis, both at site-level and national level. The methodology and analytical framework have been altered substantially for the 2024 HNO in order to reflect the launch of JIAF 2.0 and updated Global CCCM Cluster guidance (*see* 3.3).

This methodological note explains how the site-level severity scores for each site in Yemen will be calculated for the 2024 Yemen HNO based on the data available in Yemen. It also outlines how these indicators / site-level severity alignment scores will be scaled in order to inform an overall PIN figure for Yemen.

The results of these calculations will directly contribute to the calculation of the intersectoral PiN, which in turn forms the basis of the 2024 HNO and HRP. Therefore, it is important that this methodology note outlines and clarifies the numerous limitations of the data available in Yemen as their consequences influence how this data should be interpreted/utilised (*see* section 5 for details).

3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Coordination and partner engagement

REACH supports the CCCM Cluster in HNO preparations as a member of the HNO Analysis Group, including in drafting the methodology note and conducting the severity score and PIN calculations. The CCCM Cluster is responsible for validating all outputs (indicator list, methodology note, dataset) and uploading the data on the online JIAF platform. The CCCM Cluster will then engage with JIAF 2.0 teams / other Clusters to determine how CCCM PiN calculations should be aligned with intersectoral PiN calculations, as well as discussing any outliers.

² Ibid.

and a stor (2020) <u>nuguet int site Master</u>





¹ IOM (2019) Yemen Area Assessment Round 37, March 2019

³ OCHA (2022) <u>Yemen Humanitarian Needs Overview 2023</u> ⁴ CCCM Cluster (2023) <u>August IDP Site Master List</u>

3.2 Data sources

The indicators used in order to make the calculations are derived from the following primary and secondary data sources in addition to the latest CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List (October 2023):

- CCCM Site Monitoring Tool (SMT) Round 6 (July 2023): Covering managed IDP sites in IRG-controlled areas (n=251 excluding sites under 20 HHs)⁵. The latest national site master list indicates that there are a total of 268 managed sites in IRG-controlled areas with 20 HHs or more. Hence, coverage from SMT R6 will facilitate the HNO Analysis to cover 251/268 (94%) of the relevant managed IDP sites in IRG-controlled areas.
- CCCM 2023 Site Reporting Tool (SRT-23) Round 1 (April-June 2023): Covering managed IDP sites in DFA-controlled areas (n=268 out of a total of 438 managed sites in DFA-areas with 20+ HHs and unmanaged IDP sites in IRG-controlled areas (n=317 out of a total of 448 unmanaged sites in IRG-areas with 20+ HHs). Hence, coverage of managed sites in DFA-areas equates to 61% of relevant sites whilst coverage of unmanaged sites in IRG-controlled areas is 71%.
- CCCM 2022 Site Reporting Tool (SRT-22) Round 9⁷: Covering unmanaged IDP sites in DFAcontrolled areas. In absence of data collection in these sites throughout 2023, 2022 data has been utilised to avoid an absence of coverage. To mitigate the consequences of using outdated information, data submitted prior to 2022 was not considered. Hence, 229 unmanaged IDP sites in DFA-controlled areas were covered, out of a total of 772 – giving a total coverage of just 30%.
- **CCCM REACH Flood Hazard Analysis (February 2023):** Data from REACH's 2023 National Flood Hazard Analysis will form the basis of indicators related to flood hazard exposure.
- CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List (October 2023): The total number if IDP Hosting Sites in the latest CCCM Cluster Site Master List is 2,382.⁸ For the purpose of this HNO analysis, 'location' site typolgies with a total number of households below 20 are excluded from this analysis. Hence, the total number of relevant sites included in the scope of this HNO Analysis is 1,926 IDP hosting sites.

With above data sources, we are able to cover **<u>1065 out of 1926 IDP hosting sites with a population</u> <u>of 20 HHs or more</u>**. A detailed breakdown of the site population covered by district will be included in the final calculations spreadsheet.

3.2.1 Data gaps

Based on a discussion amongst the HNO Analysis Group, in cases where the IDP hosting site is not covered by SMT or SRT data submitted since January 1st 2022, site-level severity scores will be left blank. This is to ensure that data quality is not compromised by sites with insufficient information available to assign a severity score. Hence, **these site-level gaps information will result in limitations to the accuracy of PiN scores aggregated at district-level** (*see* 4.2.3).



⁵ The Master List provided by the CCCM Cluster was used as the data source for site HH population data. When considering the sites which fell under the scope of this HNO Analysis (20 HHs or more), the figures from the Master List were trusted above the figures provided in the Site Monitoring Tool or Site Reporting Tool data in cases of contradictions.

⁷ Only data submitted within 2022 will be included. All sites with data from 2021 or earlier will be considered as having no data available.

⁸ The CCCM Cluster IDP Site Master List utilised for the purpose of this HNO Analysis is not yet currently available, and was disseminated to REACH by the CCCM Cluster upon request due to some existing sites being excluded from the latest publicly available version.

3.3 Analytical Framework

The 2024 CCCM Severity Score & PIN analysis' framework is based on the sectoral <u>Global CCCM Cluster</u> 2024 HPIN & Severity Score Calculation Guidance and is interoperable with the Joint and Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF 2.0) overall PiN. JIAF 2.0 provides humanitarian actors with the framework to structure, analyse, and synthesise information to determine the humanitarian and protection needs of affected populations'⁹ JIAF 2.0 reportedly builds-on and improves the previous JIAF methodology by emphasizing interoperability, in addition to facilitating joint Overall People in Need (PIN) figures and standards to estimate the severity of intersectoral humanitarian needs.¹⁰ Meanwhile, the Global CCCM Cluster guidance has changed substantially from last year, with the launch of their own Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table which provides guidance on severity thresholds across multiple themes (*see* Table 1).

3.3.1 2024 CCCM Cluster severity scoring guidance

The below guidance from the Global CCCM Cluster indicates proposed **severity alignment classifications** that each IDP hosting site should fall under for the 2024 HNO. Severity scores '1' and '2 constitute those that **do not** comprise part of the PiN calculation. Whereas, a severity score of '5' is indicative of sectoral collapse (*for more information on the interpretation of the severity scales in calculating PiN, see 4.1*).

	NOT PIN	PIN				
1. Minimal	2. Stressed	3. Severe	4. Extreme	5. Catastrophic		
Minor or no Sectoral deprivation	Borderline and stressed Sectoral deprivation	Elevated Sectoral deprivation	Extreme Sectoral deprivations	Sectoral collapse		
IDPs outside a collective site or displacement setting, above a specified minimum population threshold	IDPs outside a collective site or displacement setting, above a specified minimum population threshold	IDPs in a collective site or displacement setting, above a specified minimum population threshold +	IDPs in a collective site or displacement setting, above a specified minimum population threshold +	IDPs in a collective site or displacement setting, above a specified minimum population threshold +		
+ Access to sustainable rented/subsidized/owned housing or accommodation in host community with low risk of near-term displacement secondary displacement to camp or camp-like settings.	+ Access to rented/subsidized/owned housing or accommodation in host community with medium risk of near-term displacement to camp or camp-like settings.	 One of the following: Limitations to the availability of or access to non-humanitarian life-saving services. Limitations to systems and services for participation, complaints and feedback, information sharing and coordination of services. Risks due to physically, socially, culturally inappropriateness of site. 	 Two or more of the following: Restrictions on freedom of movement. Very limited availability of or access to non-humanitarian life-saving services. Risks to safety and security. High risks due to physically, socially, culturally inappropriateness of site. Low probability of near-term safe, orderly, dignified, voluntary returns, reintegration or resettlement. Very limited a basence of systems and services for participation, complaints and feedback, information sharing and coordination of services. Site demographics contain higher proportion of vulnerable populations (elderly, children, disabilities, ethnic minorities. High risks due to site susceptibility to hazards (fire, landside, flooding, cyclone, etc.) 	 + Two or more of the following: Extremely limited to no freedom of movement outside of the site. No availability of or access to non-humanitarian life-saving services. Widespread life-threatening risks to safety and security. Widespread life-threatening risks due to physically, socially, culturally inappropriateness of site. No probability of near-term safe, orderly, dignified, voluntary returns. Site demographics contain extremely high proportion of vulnerable populations (etherly, chidren, disabilities, ethnic minorities etc.) Widespread imment life-threatening risks due to site susceptibility to hazards (fire, landslide, flooding, cyclone, etc.) 		

Table 1: Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table11

To develop this methodology note, REACH extracted the definitions noted across Table 1 detailing the sectoral deprivation level descriptions, in addition to their varying descriptions at their respective severity



⁹ JIAF 2.0 Technical Manual, August 2023

¹⁰ Ibid. p.7

¹¹ Global CCCM Cluster PiN & Site Severity Guidance 2023

levels (e.g limitations, very limitated, extremely limited). The result of this is the translation of the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table into **eight distinct macro-indicators**, with distinguished descriptions of severity (limitations -> no availability, risks -> widespread lifethreatening risks), including

- 1. Availability/Access to non-humanitarian live-saving services
- **2.** Systems/Services for participation, complaints & feedback, information sharing and coordination
- 3. Risks due to physical, social, cultural inappropriateness of site
- 4. Freedom of movement
- 5. Safety and security
- 6. Dignified/voluntary returns, reintegration or resettlement (DS)
- 7. Site demographics & vulnerable populations
- 8. Site hazards (floods, fire etc.)

Crucially, this table demonstrates that not all themes are present at each severity score level. For instance, 'risks due to the physical, social and cultural inappropriateness of the site' cannot trigger a severity score of '5', and is capped at '4' in instances of sites with 'high risks.'





 Table 2: Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table,, with 'Macro-indicators' extracted across

 sectoral deprivation level descriptions

Macro-indicators	3. Severe	4. Extreme	5. Catastrophic	
Availability/Access to non-humanitarian life- saving services	'Limitations'	Very limited'	No availability'	
Systems/Services for participation, complaints & feedback, information sharing and coordination	'Limitations'	Very limited or absence'	N/A	
Risks due to physical, social, cultural inappropriateness of site	'Risks'	High risks'	N/A	
Freedom of movement	N/A	Restrictions	Extremely limited	
Safety & Security	N/A	Risks	Widespread life- threatening risks	
Dignified/voluntary returns, reintegration or resettlement (DS)	N/A	Low probability'	No probability	
Site demographics - # vulnerable populations	N/A	High proportion	Extremely high proportion	
Site hazards (floods, fire etc.)* ¹²	N/A	High risks'	Widespread life- threatening risks	

Based on the above, REACH identified the indicators (*see* Table 3) across available data sources that are relevant to each identified 'theme' in Table 2, before setting thresholds to distinguish between their classification across different severity scores (*see* Table 4).

The indicators selected to calculate site-level severity scores have considered to **maximise** the **comparability of data** across IDP hosting sites. The drawback of this method is that it results in some more sophisticated relevant indicators that were included in the SMT not being included in the indicators.

3.4 Indicators & Severity Score Classifications

Macro-Indicator	Sub-Indicator	Source(s)
	1.1 Percentage of sites that reported access to an 'improved' source of water	<i>SMT, SRT-23, Site Reporting Tool 2022 (SRT-22)</i>
1. Availability &	1.2 Percentage of sites reportedly able to access 'improved' latrine type	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22
Access to Non- Humanitarian Life Saving Services ¹³	1.3 Percentage of assessed sites that reported issues with missing civil documentation	SMT, SRT-23
	 1.4a Percentage of assessed sites with access to primary healthcare services for IDP residents or no access to any form of healthcare (SMT/SRT- 23) 	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22

Table 3. Indicators used to calculate CCCM PIN and Site-level Severity Scores



¹² It was determined by the CCCM Cluster and IMPACT HQ that there was insufficient data to classify 'widespread lifethreatening risks' for flooding. Therefore, the boundaries for this indicator were set as between 3-4.

¹³ There was a lack of consensus amongst the HNO Analysis Group regarding

1.4b 'Adequate' **healthcare** services available within close proximity of the site (SRT-22)





2. Systems for Participation/ CFM /	2.1 Percentage of assessed sites with at-least one community committee	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22
Information Sharing & Coordination	2.2 Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM)	SMT, SRT-23
3. Risks: Physical, Cultural & Social	3.1 Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter	SMT, SRT-23, SRT- 22
Inappropriateness of Site	3.2 Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22
4. Freedom of Movement	Lack of available data to accurately cover this Global Alignment Table Theme (see limitations section	CCCM Cluster Severity on 5 for details)
5. Safety & Security	5.1 Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards)	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22
6. Dignified Returns: Reintegration & Resettlement	Lack of available data to accurately cover this Global Alignment Table Theme (see limitations section 5 f	CCCM Cluster Severity for details)
7. Site Demographics: Vulnerable Populations	7.1 Percentage of assessed IDP sites with presence of five or more different types of vulnerable groups ¹⁴	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22
8. Site Hazards	8.1 Percentage of assessed IDP sites reported to be facing flooding as a site threat / 'medium' + exposure to flooding	Primary: SMT, SRT- 23, CCCM Flood Report REACH Flood Risk Analysis; Back-up: SMT, SRT-23
	8.2 Percentage of assessed IDP sites reported to be facing fire as a common threat and lacking fire	SMT, SRT-23, SRT-22 CCCM Fire Report

Severity scores for IDP hosting sites will be calculated based on the below table (Table 4) which was created following Global CCCM Cluster guidance outlined in Table 1. This methodology below differs from the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table **only in its treatment of severity scores '1' and '2'**, which the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table suggests is relevant only to IDPs outside displacement settings. This divergence from Global CCCM Cluster guidelines is due to a lack of clarity over how an IDP hosting site would be classified if it fails to meet the minimum criteria for severity score '3'/'4'/'5', given that '1' and '2' are seemingly reserved for non-displacement settings.



¹⁴ Groups considered as 'vulnerable' for the purpose of this analysis are

¹⁵ If a site is missing at least two fire safety measures (i.e. fire points, fire wardens, fire breaks, escape routes) it is considered lacking fire safety measures.

Table 4: Severity Scoring per indicator per site across available data sources¹⁶

Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of sites that reported access to an 'improved' source of water	lf '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	'unimproved' water source(s) in site (excluding none)	'unimproved' water source(s) only (excluding none)	Unimproved – no direct water access				
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of sites by proportion of HHs reportedly able to access 'improved' latrine type	lf '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	unimproved' latrine types in site	plastic bag' as primary latrine type	open defecation' as primary latrine type				
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of assessed sites that reported issues with missing civil documentation	lf '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Site reported issues with one/two of the following: a lack of birth certificates, personal identity cards and/or family identity cards	Site reported issues with all of the following: a lack of birth certificates, personal identity cards and/or family identity cards	N/A				
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of assessed sites with access to primary healthcare services for IDP residents and/or reporting no access to any form of healthcare (SMT/SRT-23) or 'adequate' healthcare services available within close proximity of the site (SRT-22)	 of assessed sites with rimary healthcare IDP residents and/or to access to any form of (SMT/SRT-23) or healthcare services ithin close proximity of IT-22) N/A IDP residents have no access to primary healthcare services (SMT,SRT-23)		IDP residents have no access to any form of healthcare services (SMT, SRT-23) Healthcare services reported as 'non-existent' (SRT-22)					
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of assessed sites with access to primary education/education services for (SMT/SRT-23) or 'adequate' education services available within close proximity of the site (SRT-22)	lf '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 3	Education access is severely limited in the site	Education access is non-existent / extremely low in site	N/A				
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Percentage of assessed sites with at-least one community committee	If '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	N/A	Site does not have at-least one functioning community committee	N/A				
			functioning community commutee					
Indicator	Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM)	Severity score 2- Description If '3'. '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM)	Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards)	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description N/A				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards) Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites with presence of five or more different types of vulnerable groups	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency sheter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description N/A	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has 5+ categories of vulnerable populations residing within the site	Severity score 5- Description N/A				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites with presence of five or more different types of vulnerable groups Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has 5+ categories of vulnerable populations residing within the site Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites with presence of five or more different types of vulnerable groups Indicator Percentage of sites that reported a 'medium'or higher exposure to flooding and lack of flood mitigation measures	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description M/A Severity score 3- Description M/A Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over>50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has 5+ categories of vulnerable populations residing within the site Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A				
Indicator Percentage of assessed sites with an established complaint & feedback mechanism (CFM) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites whose primary shelter type is a makeshift shelter, emergency shelter or open-air shelter Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites without verbal or written tenancy agreements Indicator Percentage of IDP sites with the presence of safety & security threats (excluding natural hazards) Indicator Percentage of assessed IDP sites with presence of five or more different types of vulnerable groups Indicator Percentage of sites that reported a 'medium'or higher exposure to flooding and lack of flood mitigation measures Indicator	Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description If '3', '4'or '5' fail to be triggered , it's a 2 Severity score 2- Description	Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building and/ or open-air shelter present in the site Severity score 3- Description Assessed IDP site has verbal tenancy agreement only Severity score 3- Description N/A Severity score 3- Description M/A Severity score 3- Description M/A Severity score 3- Description M/A Severity score 3- Description Medium exposure to flooding or 'High Hazard' in National Flood Analysis Severity score 3- Description	Severity score 4- Description Site reported no access to an established complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) Severity score 4- Description Makeshift shelter, emergency shelter, unfinished building over> 50% total shelters or at-least 2 HH living in open-air shelter Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has no verbal or written tenancy agreement Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site reported at risk of forced eviction and / or friction with host community or reported war/conflict-related incidents Severity score 4- Description Assessed IDP site has 5+ categories of vulnerable populations residing within the site Severity score 4- Description Very high or high exposure to flooding Severity score 4- Description	Severity score 5- Description N/A Severity score 5- Description				

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action



4. SEVERITY SCORES & PIN CALCULATION

This section outlines the steps for calculating the site-level severity score & PIN calculations:

- 1) Identification of relevant sites by setting **site typology** parameters and **minimum population thresholds**
- 2) Determination of **severity scores at the site and district level**, including the distribution of severities of the chosen indicators on a 3-5 scale in accordance with the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table,
- 3) Calculation of CCCM HNO PIN figures at the district and national level
- 4) **Review** of CCCM Severity Scores and PIN by CCCM Cluster, SNCC's and Area-Based Coordinators

4.1 Site Population Minimum Thresholds & Settlement Type

Data from the CCCM Cluster IDP Site Master List will be used to determine fulfillment of the minimum population threshold and as a source of site typologies. The minimum thresholds and relevant settlement types are as follows;

- a) Minimum site population: 20 HHs
- b) **Relevant site typologies:** Planned camps, self-settled informal settlements, transit sites, collective centres, evacuation centres, reception centres are included within the scope of this analysis. Given the minimum site population of 20 HHs, the **'location' site typology is excluded** from site-level severity calculations.²¹

4.2 Determination of severity scores at the site and district level

4.2.1 Determining site-level severity score

According to the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table (*see* Table 1), Severity scores '1' and '2' refer exclusively to IDPs 'outside a collective site or displacement setting', whilst severity scores '3', '4' and '5' refer exclusively to IDPs in a 'collective site or displacement setting.' Global CCCM Cluster guidance therefore implies that IDPs in a collective site or displacement setting should be considered as a '3 / severe' in the alignment table as a minimum. However, to meet the criteria for a score of '3', and be considered part of PiN, the site must meet at least one of the specified site limitations criteria. Hence, **in cases where sites do not fulfill the criteria to be considered as severity '3','4' or '5' will an IDP hosting site be considered a '2'**. This means that if a site covered by this analysis did not provide information for a specific indicator or answered 'do not know', this site will be assigned a score of '2' for this indicator. Therefore, while scores of 3/4/5 are indicative of heightened severity, **an indicator score of '2' could reflect either non-heightened needs or a lack of information necessary to determine heightened severity.** For 'location' site typologies that are beyond the scope of this HNO Analysis – no severity score will be assigned.

²¹ There are instances in the latest CCCM Site Master List where sites are listed as 'location' despite having 20 HHs or more. In these cases, the sites are included in the analysis due to fulfilling the minimum threshold of 20 HHs and not technically fitting the definition of a 'location' IDP site





See below specific guidance on how to calculate the suggested site-level severity scores:

- Severity '5': Sites will be categorized under severity score '5' if **two** or more of the macroindicators below fall into the '5' score (see Table 3). In accordance with the scoring system outlined in the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table, these **two** indicator scores of '5' **must** be triggered across two separate macro-indicators/themes. For example, if a site falls into severity category '5' for indicators 1.1 and 8.2, that site will be classified as a 5, irrespective of other macro-indicators. Whereas, if a site triggers severity category '5' for indicators 1.1 and 1.4, this will not trigger a site-level severity score of '5' because both are sub-indicators of the same macro-indicator or theme (1).
- Severity '4': Sites will be categorized under severity score '4' if the conditions for severity '5' have **not** been met **and two** or more of the macro-indicators fall into the '4' or '5' scores (see Table 3). As above, if a site falls into severity category '4' for indicators 1.1 and 8.2, that site will be classified as a 4, irrespective of other macro-indicators. Whereas, if a site triggers severity category '4' for indicators 1.1 and 1.4, this will not trigger a site-level severity score of '5' because both are sub-indicators of the same macro-indicator or theme (1).
- **Severity '3':** Sites will be categorized under severity score '3' if the conditions for severity scores '5' and '4' fail to be met **and** at-least one macro-indicator falls into the '3' score.
- **Severity '2':** Sites will only be categorized under severity score '2' if the conditions for severity scores '5', '4' and '3' fail to be met OR or a lack of information necessary to determine heightened severity. ²²²³
- Severity '1': In this methodology, there would be no circumstances under which a site would be categorised under severity score 1.

The highest triggered score will be used for all sites, meaning that if the characteristics of '5 / sectoral collapse' are met – the severity score will be '5' irrespective of whether the the triggers for the lower severity scores have been met. Hence, it is possible that a site could fall under '*extreme (4)*' or '*catastrophic (5)*' without fulfillment of the characteristics of a site in the lower categories(e.g. *severe (3)*). Given the lack of clarity in the Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment guidelines regarding the severity alignment score for an IDP hosting site that does not fit into categories '1' and '2' due to being a displacement setting, but also does not meet the characteristics of severity scores '3', '4' or '5' – the HNO Analysis Group agreed that such sites will be classified as a '2'.



²² This could refer to key informants responding "I do not know".

²³ This does not include locations, which will not be assigned a score courtesy of being beyond the scope of this HNO analysis

4.2.2 Determining district-level severity score

In order to aggregate the site-level severity scores at **district level**, REACH followed the below steps:

- Calculate the total <u>number</u> of IDPs living in sites per severity class per district by summing up all coveredIDP sites with the same severity score (*see* Table 5 & 6). <u>NOTE</u>: Due to the use of site-level data to calculate severity scores all site residents of the assessed site (100%) are considered to be in the same severity class (although in reality this might differ).
- 2. Calculate the total <u>percentage</u> of IDPs living in sites per severity class per district (*see* Table 6). While locations were ommitted from the site severity calculations, individuals living in sites of under 20 HHs are included in district-level PIN. In this manner, the Yemen HNO differs from the global guidelines.²⁴ In total, approximately 28,000 individuals live in 'location' type settlements across Yemen.
- 3. Calculate the severity <u>score</u> per district by in accordance with the JIAF 20% rule, with a severity score being triggered by the highest score that at least 20% of the district IDP site population falls under (*see* Table 7).

²⁴ It was the decision of the CCCM Cluster in Yemen to include those residing in 'location' site typologies as contributors to district-level PIN scores.





Table 5. Total number of IDP site residents per severity class per site

Site	District	Site Severity	Total Site Population	3	4	5
SITE A	District A	3	9,000	9,000	0	0
SITE B	District A	5	1,000	0	0	1,000
SITE C	District B	3	8,000	8,000	0	0
SITE D	District B	4	2,000	0	2,000	0

Table 6. Total number & percentage of IDP site residents per severity class per district

District	Total District Population (IDP in sites)	1	2	3	4	5
DISTRICT A	10,000	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9,000 (90%)	0 (0%)	1,000 (10%)
DISTRICT B	10,000	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8,000 (80%)	2,000 (20%)	0 (0%)

Table 6. Total severity score per district

District	Population	1	2	3	4	5	Total severity score
DISTRICT A	10000	0	0	90%	0%	10%	3
DISTRICT B	10000	0	0	80%	20%	0%	4

In the above example, for district A with two IDP hosting sites, the district-level severity score would be a '3', as the proportion of the population in severity categories '5' and '4' fall below the minimum threshold of 20% population. Whereas, in District B, the district severity score would be a '4'.

NOTE: According to the Global CCCM Cluster guidance, the 20% rule may risk that a high number of districts have a similar severity score. At the discretion of the CCCM Cluster, additional criteria can be applied to further distinguish district scores after reviewing the initial calculations. A potential suggestion is to increase the severity score by +1 for districts that have a very high number of IDP households (i.e. 90th percentile of total HHs) and/or sites (i.e. 90th perentile of total sites). This is based on the assumption that there is a higher need for CCCM coodination/support in these districts.

4.2.3 Determining extent of coverage at district levels

Due to the fact that coverage will **not** be universal across all IDP hosting sites in Yemen, **there will be information gaps at district-level**. These information gaps at district-level will vary by district according to the proportion of sites within the district ommitted from the site-level analysis. Hence, alongside our HNO analysis, our HNO analysis will display the % of site population covered per district – which will facilitate transparency regarding the extent of coverage at district-level/governorate-level, and any variations in the accuracy of PiN calculations in different geographies.

In instances where districts containing IDP hosting sites have **zero** sites covered by the SMT, SRT-23 or SRT-22 R9, district-level severity scores will be set at '3' by REACH. This is reflective of the fact that



the Global CCCM Cluster Guidelines imply that IDPs in displacement settings are inherently at heightened risk. These scores will also be reviewed by area-based coordinators (ABCs) in collaboration with sub-national-cluster coordinators (SNCCs), and scores will be adjusted upon receipt of sufficient justification.

4.3 Calculation of CCCM PIN at the district and national level

- The **2024 CCCM HNO** <u>district</u> **PIN** will be the sum of the number of IDPs in hosting sites with a severity score of 3 or higher. An additional buffer of 15% will be applied after calculating the district-level severity score calculations to account for the host community, who live in/around sites that are classified as Severity Scores 3, 4 and 5.
- In cases where districts contain IDP sites that are not covered by site-level severity scores, the CCCM Cluster decided that these districts would automatically be assigned a severity score of '3', reflective of the perceived inherent heightened needs of those residing in displacement settings.
- The 2024 CCCM HNO national PIN will be calculated by suming up all district PIN figures.
- A total PIN figure and a 2024 HNO PIN figure will be calculated on a national and district level.

4.4 Review of CCCM severity scoring and PIN

Suggested severity scores at site- and district-level as well as PIN figures on district and national level will be submitted to the CCCM Cluster by REACH for their review/confirmation. Districts that were not covered by the SMT, SRT-23 or SRT-22 were assigned a district-level severity score of '3' by REACH. This review should involve an informed discussion involving the National CCCM Cluster Team, Sub-National Cluster Coordinators (SNCCs) and wider Yemen HNO Analysis Group. This discussion should consider whether the suggested severity scores and PIN reflects the situation on the ground. **Recommended severity scores may be adjusted in districts where we have limited data** (site not covered by SMT/SRT data), if SNCC and Area Based Coordinators can **provide a clear and justified reasoning**. This is in line with JIAF 2.0 recommendations which allow the CCCM Cluster to use any available source of evidence, so long as the process is transparent and the limitations clearly stated. The CCCM Cluster will have responsibility to aggregate all this feedback, determine whether changes are required, and make the necessary adjustments.





5. LIMITATIONS

REACH provided a supporting role in drafting this methodology note as part of the Yemen HNO Analysis Group by informing the CCCM Cluster. **Accountability and validation, including the fit-for-purpose responsibility for the methodology lies with the National CCCM Cluster.**

A range of **limitations** are recognized as part of this CCCM HNO PIN analysis:

- The PIN and severity scores calculated through this methodology should be considered as **indicative estimates** since the information provided through multiple CCCM Site Monitoring/Reporting Tools (KI interview for each IDP site) and other data sources are not linked to a statistically representative survey.
- Lack of universal coverage: The information available across the SMT, 2023 SRT and 2022 SRT assessments does not cover all IDP hosting sites in Yemen. Current data suggests that from a total of 1926 IDP hosting sites (with >=20 HHs), sufficient site information is available through the SMT/ SRT to cover only 1065 sites. Coverage is considerably wider in IRG areas than DFA areas. Primarily, data gaps are derived from a lack of recent data on unmanaged sites in DFA controlled-areas. As a result, district-level severity scores will have varied levels of accuracy depending on the level of district level coverage of its IDP hosting sites across the SMT & SRT tools.
- Lack of unified methodology for site-severity: The 2023 SMT tool benefits from an extended indicator list which facilitates the development of a more sophisticated list of indicators available to inform site-level severity classifications in managed sites in IRG-controlled areas. However, many of these indicators are unavailable across either/both the 2022 & 2023 SRT tools. In order to **maximise comparability across IDP hosting sites**, the indicators selected have been chosen to be consistent across sites wherever possible. This means that the methodology applied to calculate the severity score for some sites will not be as sophisticated as it could have been, in order to prioritise comparability.
- **Overlooking HH-level nuances within sites:** Utilising site-level data to calculate site-level severity risks fails to account for any divergences/contrasting severity of humanitarian needs amongst IDP HHs residing within the same hosting site.
- Lack of data for some 'themes' in Global CCCM Cluster Severity Alignment Table: For the 'freedom of movement' and 'dignified and voluntary returns' themes (*see* Table 2), there was a lack of available indicators to accurately cover these themes. However, this does **not** indicate that there was no issues with freedom of movement in IDP hosting sites in Yemen.
- In relation to **IDP population figures** used for the analysis, it has to be noted that both the CCCM IDP Hosting site Master List, as well as the OCHA Population dataset, might not be exhaustive. The CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List is updated monthly, and site verifications are taking place on a rolling basis for which site population figures may vary. As such, IDP sites might be missing from the Master list or have been closed recently. In addition, the IDP information in the 2023 Population Projections might under or overestimate IDP figures in Yemen. Accordingly, there are cases where the figures from the CCCM Master List show higher IDP figures in a district than the 2023 Population Projections.
- No data was collected in unmanaged sites in DFA controlled-areas during 2023. Hence, the HNO calculations for these sites rely on outdated 2022 data from SRT Round 9 (data between January 2022 October 2022), meaning that the 2024 HRP will be, in-part, informed by outdated information. Sites that had data only as recently as 2021 were excluded. As a result, district-level severity scores will have varied levels of accuracy depending on the level of district level coverage of its IDP hosting sites across the SMT & SRT tools.





• While best efforts have been made by the CCCM Cluster, REACH and the Yemen HNO Analysis Group to ensure that the indicators used match the descriptions outlined in the Global CCCM Cluster severity alignment table, the limitations outlined above, in addition to a limited selection of indicators available (particularly in unmanaged sites and in DFA-controlled areas) limit the ability to use this analysis to enable cross-country comparisons of needs. This data can primarily be used only to inform the HNO and HRP to inform the prioritization of interventions in specific areas of Yemen.

Annex 1. Calculation of specific indicators

See HNO Calculations Excel Spreadsheet for Detailed Breakdown of how site-level scores were calculated. REACH utilised an R-script to generate results per site per sub-indicator.

If you would like to view the R scripts that calculated the subindicator scores, please contact IMPACTYEM@acted.org



