# IDP Hosting Sites in Al Hodeidah

May 2022

Context & Methodology

As part of their regular programming, the CCCM Cluster and partners, with the support of REACH, are implementing the Site Report to build a profile of IDP hosting sites in Yemen. This activity is carried out to inform a more targeted, evidence-based humanitarian response. The findings presented here provide an overview of basic information on population demographics, site conditions, service access, site threats and community needs. A total of **168 IDP hosting sites out of 578 IDP hosting sites in** Al Hodeidah governorate were surveyed, with a total population of 169,382 individuals out 479,675 individuals. Data was received between January 2022 - May 2022 through key informant interviews with community representatives in each site. The findings presented should be generally read as the proportion of assessed sites as reported by key informants. Findings should be considered as both indicative and incomplete. All information is for humanitarian use only.

IDP Site Number Trends

Total # IDP sites

500
250

344 344 387 457 446 429 570 542 549 573 573 580 578

Jan-21 Feb-21 Mar-21 May-21 Jul-21 Sep-21 Oct-21 Dec-21 Jan-22 Feb-22 Mar-22 Apr-22 May-22

Source: CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List (January 2021-May 2022)

Site Population Trends

# of IDP HH & population

500K
250K

196K 196K 208K 303K 319K 389K 471K 412K 441K 465K 465K 481K 480K
30K 30K 32K 47K 53K 62K 75K 68K 73K 76K 76K 77K 77K

Jan-21 Feb-21 Mar-21 May-21 Jul-21 Sep-21 Oct-21 Dec-21 Jan-22 Feb-22 Mar-22 Apr-22 May-22

■ Total IDP Population in Sites
■ Number of IDP Households in Sites

Source: CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List (January 2021-May 2022)

## Al Hodeidah assessment coverage: Districts assessed through the Site Report

Number of Sites per Subdistrict
- 0
- 1 - 5
- 6 - 10
- 11 - 15
- 16 - 20
- > 20

0 20 40 80 Km

Site overview

Land ownership	Proportion of sites	Proportion of individuals
Private	92%	98%
Public	0%	0%
Owner not known	8%	2%

Type of site	Proportion of sites	Proportion of individuals
Spontaneous settlement	88%	89%
Collective Centre	0%	0%
Location	0%	0%
Urban displaced IDP location	12%	11%
Camp	0%	0%

Tenancy agreement

Proportion of assessed sites with a tenancy agreement

2% ■ Tenancy agreement
98% ■ No tenancy agreement

Proportion of assessed sites with a tenancy agreement reportedly facing eviction threat

0% ■ Eviction threat
100% ■ No eviction threat

Displacement

Most common governorates of origin of displaced households, by proportion of assessed sites

Al Hodeidah	**55%**
Hajjah	**45%**

Most common districts of origin of displaced households, by proportion of assessed sites

Harad	**33%**
Ad Durayhimi	**16%**
Hays	**10%**
At Tuhayta	**10%**
Al Hali	**8%**
Abs	**6%**

Most common reason for displaced households to leave their place of origin, by proportion of assessed sites*

Security concerns / War	**100%**
Evicted from Property	**68%**
House/livelihood assets destroyed/occupied	**0%**
Lack of basic services	**7%**
Evacuated for protection	**2%**
Lack of commodities	**10%**
Lack of employment	**0%**
Natural disaster	**0%**

*Respondents could select multiple options for these questions, and therefore overall figures may not add up to 100%.

Most common movement intention of displaced households for the coming three months, by proportion of assessed sites

99% ■ Stay in the site
1% ■ Return to origin
0% ■ Move elsewhere

CCCM CLUSTER SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

CCM CLUSTER SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

Demographics

Proportion of assessed sites with presence of High-Risk Groups*

Child-headed households	4%
Older persons	96%
Female-headed households	99%
Marginalized people / Minorities	1%
Persons with chronic diseases	99%
Persons with disabilities	98%
Pregnant and lactating women	99%
Unaccompanied / separated children	7%

Proportion of assessed sites with population groups other than IDPs*

Host community	99%
Migrants	0%
Refugees	0%
None - only IDPs present	1%
Not known	0%

*Respondents could select multiple options for these questions, and therefore overall figures may not add up to 100%.

Infrastructure/Resources

Proportion of assessed sites with cooking fuel in site / close proximity

- 24% Available
- 76% Not available

Proportion of assessed sites with electricity / solar power

- 4% Available
- 96% Not available

Proportion assessed of sites with markets in site / close proximity

- 41% Available
- 59% Not available

Access to Services

Proportion of assessed sites by adequacy of services, per service type

	Adequate	Inadequate	Non-existent
RRM distributions	11%	42%	46%
Shelter / maintenance services	27%	18%	55%
NFI distributions	17%	14%	69%
Food distributions	1%	94%	5%
Cash distributions (multi-purpose)	14%	48%	38%
WASH services	0%	20%	80%
Healthcare services	1%	14%	85%
Education services	1%	9%	91%
Livelihood services	0%	1%	99%
Protection services	53%	3%	44%
Nutrition services	7%	22%	71%
Waste disposal services	1%	1%	98%

Priority Needs

Proportion of assessed sites per priority needs

	First	Second	Third
Cash assistance	0%	4%	6%
Education	4%	3%	4%
Food	55%	9%	13%
Water	10%	13%	5%
Legal services	1%	1%	1%
Livelihood assistance	2%	4%	25%
Medical assistance	4%	16%	10%
Non-food items	5%	24%	8%
Protection services	0%	0%	1%
Sanitation services	3%	16%	14%
Shelter / maintenance	15%	12%	14%
Nutrition services	0%	0%	0%

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH
Informing more effective humanitarian action

Primary Shelter Type

Proportion of sites per primary shelter type

Own house / apartment	1%
Makeshift shelter	84%
Host family house / apartment	1%
Emergency shelter	0%
Rented house / apartment	8%
Transitional shelter	7%
Public building	0%
Open air (no shelter)	0%

Primary Latrine Type

Proportion of sites per primary latrine type

Flush latrine to tank / sewage system pit	6%
Flush latrine to the open	0%
Pit latrine - covered	16%
Pit latrine - open	36%
Open defecation	43%

Primary Water Source

Proportion of sites per primary water source

Borehole	14%
Bottled water	1%
Illegal connection to piped network	25%
Public tap	2%
Protected rainwater tank	2%
Surface water	23%
Unprotected rainwater tank	14%
Water trucking	19%

Site Threats

Most common threats to sites by proportion of assessed sites*

Conflict-related incidents / War	2%
Eviction	0%
Fire-related incidents	8%
Flooding	1%
Friction between communities	0%
Infectious diseases	7%
Water contamination	1%

Fire Safety Measures

Most common fire safety measures adopted in the sites, by proportion of assessed sites*

Fire points	0%
Fire wardens	0%
Fire breaks	0%
Escape routes	0%
None	100%

Data Collection Partners

The following **CCCM partners** supported the data collection for the CCCM Site Report in Al Hodeidah governorate from January 2022 - May 2022: Jeel Albena Association for Humanitarian Development (JAAHD), IOM, Danish Refugee Council (DRC)

*Respondents could select multiple options for these questions, and therefore overall figures may not add up to 100%.