# IDP Hosting Sites in Hadramawt

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 **14 IDP hosting sites out of 105 IDP hosting sites in Hadramawt** governorate were surveyed, with a total population of 21,498 individuals out 52,114 individuals. Data was collected between February 2022 - March 2022 through key informant interviews with community representatives in each site. The findings presented should be 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

| Jan-21 | Feb-21 | Mar-21 | May-21 | Jul-21 | Sep-21 | Oct-21 | Dec-21 | Jan-22 | Feb-22 | Mar-22 |
| 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 38 | 86 | 126 | 100 | 101 | 105 | 105 |

Site Population Trends

# of IDP HH & population

	Jan-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	May-21	Jul-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Dec-21	Jan-22	Feb-22	Mar-22
Total IDP Population in Sites	16.08K	16.08K	16.08K	16.08K	26.74K	49.30K	55.49K	51.35K	51.37K	52.11K	52.11K
Number of IDP Households in Sites	2,452	2,452	2,452	2,452	4,300	8,179	8,785	8,194	8,197	8,309	8,309

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

*IDP site number and site population trends are based on the official CCCM IDP Hosting Site Master Lists.

Number of Sites per Subdistrict

| 0 | 6 - 10 | 16 - 20 |
| 1 - 5 | 11 - 15 | > 20 |

0 40 80 160 Km

Site overview

Land ownership	Proportion of sites	Proportion of individuals
Private	79%	68%
Public	14%	31%
Owner not known	7%	1%

Type of site	Proportion of sites	Proportion of individuals
Spontaneous settlement	0%	0%
Collective Centre	57%	68%
Location	0%	0%
Urban displaced IDP location	0%	0%
Camp	43%	32%

Tenancy agreement

Proportion of sites with a tenancy agreement

7% ■ Tenancy agreement
93% ■ No tenancy agreement

Proportion of sites with a tenancy agreement facing eviction

0% ■ Eviction threat
100% ■ No eviction threat

Displacement

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

Raymah	29%
Ma'rib	21%
Ibb	21%
Sa'dah	14%
Al Jawf	7%
Amran	7%

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

Security concerns / War	100%
Evicted from Property	0%
House/livelihood assets destroyed/occupied	0%
Lack of basic services	0%
Evacuated for protection	0%
Lack of commodities	0%
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 districts of origin of displaced households, by proportion of assessed sites*

As Salafiyyah	29%
Sirwah	21%
Kitaf wa Al Boqa	14%
Al Qafr	7%
Dhi As Sufal	7%
Hobeish	7%

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

100% ■ Stay in the site
0% ■ Return to origin
0% ■ Move elsewhere

* Additionally, Khab wa Ash Shaf, Khamir districts were also reported as most common districts of origin in 7% of assessed sites.

Demographics

Proportion of sites with presence of High-Risk Groups*

Child-headed households	71%
Older persons	100%
Female-headed households	100%
Marginalized people / Minorities	29%
Persons with chronic diseases	100%
Persons with disabilities	79%
Pregnant and lactating women	100%
Unaccompanied / separated children	21%

Proportion of sites with population groups other than IDPs*

Host community	7%
Migrants	7%
Refugees	7%
None - only IDPs present	79%
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 sites with cooking fuel in site / close

71% Available
29% Not available

Proportion of sites with electricity / solar power

36% Available
64% Not available

Proportion of sites with markets in site / close

71% Available
29% Not available

Access to Services

Proportion of sites by adequacy of services, per service type

	Adequate	Inadequate	Non-existent
RRM distributions	21%	71%	7%
Shelter / maintenance services	0%	0%	100%
NFI distributions	0%	71%	29%
Food distributions	0%	50%	50%
Cash distributions (multi-purpose)	0%	64%	36%
WASH services	0%	86%	14%
Healthcare services	7%	43%	50%
Education services	7%	71%	21%
Livelihood services	0%	0%	100%
Protection services	14%	14%	71%
Nutrition services	0%	57%	43%

Priority Needs

Proportion of sites per priority needs

	First	Second	Third
Cash assistance	0%	0%	14%
Education	0%	0%	0%
Food	64%	21%	14%
Water	36%	57%	0%
Legal services	0%	0%	0%
Livelihood assistance	0%	0%	43%
Medical assistance	0%	7%	7%
Non-food items	0%	0%	7%
Protection services	0%	0%	0%
Sanitation services	0%	7%	7%
Shelter / maintenance	0%	7%	7%
Nutrition services	0%	0%	0%

Primary Shelter Type

Proportion of sites per primary shelter type

Own house / apartment	0%
Makeshift shelter	50%
Host family house / apartment	0%
Emergency shelter	0%
Rented house / apartment	50%
Transitional shelter	0%
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	71%
Flush latrine to the open	7%
Pit latrine - covered	7%
Pit latrine - open	7%
Open defecation	7%

Primary Water Source

Proportion of sites per primary water source

Borehole	0%
Bottled water	0%
Illegal connection to piped network	0%
Public tap	0%
Protected rainwater tank	0%
Surface water	7%
Unprotected rainwater tank	0%
Water trucking	93%

Site Threats

Most common threats to sites by proportion of assessed sites*

Conflict-related incidents / War	0%
Eviction	7%
Fire-related incidents	0%
Flooding	21%
Friction between communities	0%
Infectious diseases	36%
Water contamination	64%

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 partner** supported the data collection for the CCCM Site Report in Hadramawt governorate from February 2022 - March 2022:

Field Medical Foundation (FMF)

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