CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH
Informing more effective humanitarian action

# IDP Hosting Sites in Yemen

January - October 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 informatin on population demographics, site conditions, service access, site threats and community needs. A total of **1,216 IDP hosting sites out of 2,374 IDP hosting sites in Yemen** were surveyed, with a total population of 1,132,744 individuals out of 1,635,925 individuals.[1] Data was received between January 2022 - October 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.

[1]Source: CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master List (October 2022)

## IDP Site Number Trends




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

## Site Population Trends




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

## Yemen assessment coverage: Governorates assessed through the Site Report




## Site overview

| Land ownership status | Proportion of sites | Proportion of individuals |
|---|---|---|
| Private | 78% | 86% |
| Public | 15% | 9% |
| Owner not known | 7% | 5% |

| Type of site | Proportion of sites | Proportion of individuals |
|---|---|---|
| Spontaneous settlement | 67% | 69% |
| Collective Centre | 6% | 3% |
| Location | 1% | 1% |
| Urban displaced IDP location | 8% | 7% |
| Camp | 18% | 20% |

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH
Informing more effective humanitarian action

## Tenancy agreement

**Proportion of assessed sites with a tenancy agreement**




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




## Displacement

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Hajjah | 27% |
| Al Hodeidah | 27% |
| Ta'iz | 14% |
| Sa'dah | 8% |
| Ma'rib | 8% |
| Al Jawf | 7% |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Harad | 21% |
| Khab wa Ash Sha'f | 6% |
| Ad Durayhimi | 5% |
| Maqbanah | 4% |
| Hays | 4% |
| Adh Dhahir | 3% |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Security concerns / War | 95% |
| Evicted from Property | 16% |
| House/livelihood assets destroyed/occupied | 6% |
| Lack of basic services | 7% |
| Evacuated for protection | 2% |
| Lack of commodities | 2% |
| Lack of employment | 1% |
| Natural disaster | 1% |

*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**



CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH
Informing more effective humanitarian action

## Demographics

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Child-headed households | 42% |
| Elderly | 89% |
| Female-headed households | 88% |
| Marginalized people / Minorities | 23% |
| Persons with chronic diseases | 88% |
| Persons with disabilities | 85% |
| Pregnant and lactating women | 93% |
| Unaccompanied / separated children | 25% |

### Proportion of assessed sites with population groups other than IDPs*

| | |
|---|---|
| Host community | 70% |
| Migrants | 2% |
| None - only IDPs present | 27% |
| Not known | 1% |
| Refugees | 2% |

*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




### Proportion of assessed sites with electricity / solar power




### Proportion of assessed sites with markets in site / close proximity




## Access to Services

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

| | Adequate | Inadequate | Non-existent |
|---|---|---|---|
| RRM distributions | 25% | 34% | 41% |
| Shelter / maintenance services | 15% | 29% | 56% |
| NFI distributions | 12% | 37% | 51% |
| Food distributions | 5% | 79% | 16% |
| Cash distributions (multi-purpose) | 6% | 53% | 41% |
| WASH services | 7% | 38% | 55% |
| Healthcare services | 5% | 45% | 50% |
| Education services | 8% | 42% | 50% |
| Livelihood services | 1% | 13% | 86% |
| Protection services | 8% | 47% | 45% |
| Nutrition services | 11% | 40% | 50% |
| Waste disposal services | 4% | 18% | 78% |

## Priority Needs

### Proportion of assessed sites per priority needs

| | First | Second | Third |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cash assistance | 6% | 12% | 16% |
| Education | 1% | 3% | 9% |
| Food | 45% | 12% | 6% |
| Water | 16% | 16% | 4% |
| Legal services | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Livelihood assistance | 7% | 8% | 21% |
| Medical assistance | 2% | 8% | 10% |
| Non-food items | 6% | 19% | 11% |
| Protection services | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Sanitation services | 3% | 5% | 7% |
| Shelter / maintenance | 13% | 16% | 11% |
| Nutrition services | 0% | 0% | 1% |

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

REACH
Informing more effective humanitarian action

## Primary Shelter Type

**Proportion of assessed sites per primary shelter type**

| | |
|---|---|
| Own house / apartment | 2% |
| Makeshift shelter | 49% |
| Host family house / apartment | 6% |
| Emergency shelter | 19% |
| Rented house / apartment | 8% |
| Transitional shelter | 12% |
| Public building | 3% |
| Open air (no shelter) | 1% |

## Primary Latrine Type

**Proportion of assessed sites per primary latrine type**

| | |
|---|---|
| Flush latrine to tank / sewage system pit | 21% |
| Flush latrine to the open | 8% |
| Pit latrine - covered | 33% |
| Pit latrine - open | 14% |
| Open defecation | 25% |

## Primary Water Source

**Proportion of assessed sites per primary water sourece**

| | |
|---|---|
| Borehole | 21% |
| Bottled water | 3% |
| Illegal connection to piped network | 8% |
| Public tap | 9% |
| Protected rainwater tank | 6% |
| Surface water | 5% |
| Unprotected rainwater tank | 16% |
| Water trucking | 31% |

## Site Threats

**Most common threats to sites, by proportion of assessed sites***

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict-related incidents / War | 19% |
| Eviction | 17% |
| Fire-related incidents | 20% |
| Flooding | 22% |
| Friction between communities | 9% |
| Infectious diseases | 29% |
| Water contamination | 16% |

## Fire Safety Measures

**Most common fire safety measures, by proporiton of assessed sites***

| | |
|---|---|
| Fire points | 17% |
| Fire wardens | 6% |
| Fire breaks | 1% |
| Escape routes | 1% |
| None | 79% |

## Data Collection Partners

The following 33 **CCCM partners** supported the data collection for the CCCM Site Report in Yemen from January 2022 - October 2022: ACTED, AOBWC, AYF, BCFHD, BFD, CRB, DEEM, DRC, FMF, GWQ, Human Access, IMC, IOM, JAAHD, MONA, NFDHR, NMO, NRC, OSUS, PAH, PDA, RADF, Rawafed, SDF, SHS, Tamdeen, UNHCR, YARD, YCO, YDF, YFCA, YGUSSWP, YRCS.

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