CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

Background

Most IDP sites are settled on private land, with no formal land agreement established between authorities and landowners. Humanitarians including CCCM partners provide assistance in sites but face extreme challenges in supporting IDP protection and service delivery.

1. Landowner and eviction threats include; physical and verbal threats, intimidation and harassment to IDPs and humanitarian staff, destruction of IDP and humanitarian property, restrictions on humanitarian access to IDP sites, blockage of critical shelter, WASH and health infrastructure development, forcing the displaced to live in sub-standard conditions despite available resources.
2. Eviction threats are particularly inevitable in sites where the land has value for agriculture, real estate development, or re-sale. Threats and subsequent evictions are on the rise and will only increase and worsen in nature as displacement becomes increasingly protracted and the economic situation deteriorates. Humanitarian space and the ability to provide assistance and services is increasingly challenged.
3. Alternative site locations are explored however the availability of suitable land is limited in key eviction areas. As duty holders, local authorities have limited capacity and / or power to establish public land for settlement, or influence the financial motivations of private landowners, notably in the south.
4. High level and strategic investment in local authorities is required in order to support the establishment of land agreements that protect the rights of IDPs to live in safe and dignified conditions while in displacement, in key eviction areas.
5. Given its centrality to the issue of evictions, a critical review of private land use for IDP sites without a compensation scheme, is needed.
6. Critical eviction areas are to date with active eviction like cases are Lahj, Al Dhale, Aden, Taiz, Ibb governorates

Specifics

- Site Report data (covering 605,892 people in 658 sites of the largest sites in Yemen) show 116,763 people (19,734 families) in 181 sites identifying eviction as a threat in their sites
  - ✓ 86% live in private land; 12% in public institutions; 2% in land/property of unknown ownership
  - ✓ 87% live in property without any tenancy agreement
  - ✓ 1 in 3 sites in Yemen faces eviction threats
- CCCM is *currently* tracking and actively engaged in 59 evictions affecting 3,832 families (~27k people).

	Pop. threatened / total camp pop. in Yemen	Percentage of sites threatened in the governorate	Percentage of camp population threatened in the gov
Ma'rib	22.8%	42%	26%
Hajjah	22.0%	16%	9%
Al Hodeidah	17.8%	16%	20%
Lahj	12.8%	32%	50%
Ta'iz	7.0%	43%	37%
Abyan	5.7%	55%	57%
Aden	4.2%	64%	54%
Sana'a	3.7%	55%	49%
Ad Dali'	1.4%	20%	31%
Shabwah	1.1%	100%	100%
Ibb	1.0%	38%	30%
Amran	0.2%	11%	5%
Hadramawt	0.2%	10%	4%

Subnational situation and specific examples:

- **Hodeidah hub:** in this hub, evictions are still rather uncommon in IDP camps. In 2019, frontline conflict in Bani Hassan and other locations led to a number of sites being evacuated. Because of the large camp population in Hajjah and Hodeidah, particularly in the Tehamah valley, relocation of IDPs between camps is the most predictable solution in cases of imminent future evictions.
- **Aden hub (South):** the main driver of evictions in the south is land ownership and the lack of tenure agreements. Some evictions are triggered by host communities, especially when the IDPs are settled in schools. It is also observed that some of evictions threats from private landowners are being used as tool to negotiate for benefit from humanitarian partner.
  - The Aden team has observed 4 evictions where the solution was relocation
  -

- o SN Cluster in South has successfully engaged ExU in eviction risk management, ExU on proactive basis moving ahead and negotiating with landowners for land tenure agreement. Future eviction cases will be different because Cluster and ExU are jointly working on a strategy for immediate and long term intervention pertaining to eviction management.
  - o Evictions are causing high level uncertainty among service providers and contributing in already complexed protection issues. High level uncertainty due to eviction threats to IDPs site is hindering in provision of dignified services and in engaging stakeholders in the process towards durable solutions.
  - o IDPs are vulnerable; however chronic development challenges are making host communities equally vulnerable particularly in terms of WASH, Health and Livelihood; cluster may consider advocacy for peaceful co-existence centered livelihood, health and WASH projects by covering a %age from host community too.
  - o **Example:** Relocation from Beer Ahmed site Aden to Al shab-1, following multi-cluster land suitability assessment, currently SMC partner ACTED is planning relocation of IDPs and services through inter-camp coordination. Role of government in land identification, understanding of inter-cluster suitability assessment, land tenure agreement and site clearance are the indicators of ExU's improved understanding that how to use relocation as last resort option.
- **Sa'adah hub:** there has not been any known eviction cases in the hub. However, IDPs near conflict frontlines move from risky areas to safer ones. For example, six months ago, the conflict in Al Hazam city in Al Jawf governate forced IDPs to move Al Khalq and other districts in Al Jawf, and south to Marib governorate. To address evictions in the future, resources and funds must be allocated to provide housing solutions to IDPs. Furthermore, empowering and pushing local authorities and SCMCHA to support CCCM partners finding effective solutions as well as ensure their full cooperation in evictions cases in order to keep IDPs lives safe during any evictions in conflict areas. and with no support from local authorities, responses will be weak from CCCM partner.
- **Ibb hub:** The governorates in Ibb Hub (Ibb, Taiz, and Al Dhale'e) have received displacement waves from various governorates due to conflicts, and the number of IDPs here is large compared to the size of the cities. This housing shortage has raised the prices of real estate in general and contributed to a lucrative business for landlords. In the eyes of the land owners, the IDPs are hampering this business. This also created a challenge for the local authorities when finding alternative housing solutions for IDPs at risk of eviction. Some IDPs resorted to living in unsafe locations such us flood paths and the authorities usually argue that the alternative, if any, is worse than the current option.
  - o The subnational coordinator has observed 6 eviction cases which are being resolved through direct engagement with SCMCHA and negotiation with landowners.
  - o While negotiation and arbitration has proven effective to elongate IDPs stay in the sites, solutions in the future will need to be durable. While authorities are lack the capacity of providing alternative solutions and may need to be incentivized to support in this regard, financial support may be tricky as evictions could turn into another business.
  - o **Example:**
    - ▪

- ▪ *"At Al-Ghaithi site, we were able to extend the stay of the IDPs to nearly an additional year, through direct discussions and negotiations with the owner of the*

  building. In the last verbal notice of eviction, we reached a dead-end, and it was necessary to search for alternatives for those IDPs. and This is what we have done, and we have followed it up, and UNHCR will respond to them with rental subsidies in November"
- ▪ *"At the Qahza site, the reasons for the eviction threat were discussed with neighbors and community leaders, and it became clear that the main reason for the eviction threat is the level of hygiene among the IDPs and the noise they make during their loud parties. During group focus discussions with the IDPs and the hygiene campaigns, we were able to convince the community to allow the IDPs to stay in the site. We still face some complaints from the neighbors. I coordinated a shelter and HK intervention to the inhabitants, which improved the overall look of the site somehow. In another site, decisions were based mainly on the results and outputs of the intention-survey. my role was to make sure of delivering shelter, RRM EXT.. interventions immediately"*

- **Sana'a Hub:** The situation is critical in Sana'a hub especially in Amran Governorate, where seven IDP sites are affected by eviction issues due to landownership and natural disaster. A number of WASH and Shelter interventions in those locations have been prevented by landlords. Negotiations from site community leaders and local authorities have provided temporary solutions. However, in and around the main cities, landowners and local departments are more likely to reuse the lands/public institutions where IDPs settled. Largescale intention surveys and risk assessments should be conducted to inform response options and possibly national policies regarding evictions. The hub also needs further engagement with authorities and landowners, as well as inclusion of host communities in CCCM response to improve cohesion. With this in mind, it has been difficult to adhere by standards (Sphere for example) when it comes to evaluating alternative solutions. What is also needed is advocacy with authorities at national level to mobilize needed resources to address camp evictions.
  - o **Example:** *"In Amran Gov, after year of negotiations and coordination with authorities, CCCM partner and related stakeholders, a new site has been identified by SCMCHA for relocating two eviction-affected IDP sites with approx. 122HH. The new land has capacity could accommodate 72 HHs only according to sphere standards.*
  - o *SCAMCHA remains uncommitted to upholding standards and insisted to relocate all HHs in both IDP sites to new land regardless of standards, or at least 92 HHs. Shelter /CCCM cluster requested clear endorsement from SCMCHA to carry the responsibility in future. CCCM partner started the process but Amran Governor stopped them and promised to find alternative lands for both IDP sites. However, there is no update till now. Eviction response task force team already established with the first ad hoc meeting agreed to assess capacity of nearby IDP sites that could accommodate people of eviction affected IDP sites. CCCM partners in cooperation with protection partners to conduct FGDs and intention surveys within eviction affected IDP sites. Eviction response force task to hold follow up meeting within two weeks and invite Amran SCMCHA FP for better coordination,*

advocacy, eviction tracking negotiations with local authorities in order to reach solution for eviction affected IDP sites in Amran gov collaboratively."

- **Marib hub** has experienced several different eviction scenarios which can broadly be grouped into the following categories:

- The main trends of evictions in Marib have mainly related to armed conflict, flooding, Marib dam overflow, and land ownership. The trends of eviction differ from district to district according to the closeness to the clashes or proximity to the dam. Recently the armed conflict caused urgent evacuation and relocation of IDPs from Madghal, Majzar and other districts. While in Serwah the flooding was the driver of evictions and relocations in the area. In Marib city the eviction threats are related to the land ownership.

- In the last couple of months, the SNCC observed three eviction threats in Marib city (Tadhamon, Kanteerat Al Rawdha and Al moasasah) all due to land ownership and still in the stage of negotiation with the authorities and land owners.

  o In Serwah; Dhana Al hayal and Al sawabeen IDPs sites were affected by the dam overflow and IDPs had to move up and relocate to a higher ground in the same area. While in Nabat Serwah the site was totally evicted in response to the clashes approaching and IDPs were relocated to a safer area in Al Rawda Serwah.

  o Many sites in Madghal and Majzar were evicted recently due to the armed conflict and IDPs relocated to Marib city, and Marib Al Wadi forming new sites or integrating in pre-existing sites.

- The general trend with solutions is relocation according to the case, however negotiations with the land owners are being held in less emergent cases.

- With most evictions being forced and sudden in nature in Marib, the eviction guidelines and relocation standards are not applicable most of the time. Guidelines into dealing with those cases would be of benefit.

- **Example:** *"Al moasash IDP site received an eviction threat that was reported by the CCCM agency through email. The IDPs occupy a public owned land however it is on a side of a main road and the department of public works needs to expand the 40th road, therefore these IDPs are frequently asked to leave. Multiple discussions have been held and the relocation of the IDPs to another area was brought up as the last resort, protection partners were informed, and technical assessment was done for the new proposed site in AL Jufainah. IOM agreed to provide iron nets and latrines in the new site."*

- Eviction notices being received and at times enforced by local authorities, primarily in government buildings and public-owned land. This includes sites like Maktab Al-Ziraa (owned by MoA), Kuliyat Al-Mujtama, where IDPs have been allowed to continue living but it is acknowledged that government departments would at some point want their offices back, or areas like Saba University, Maktab Al-Tijara which were closed and IDPs relocated to other existing sites (Sowayda camp and Jufainah camp respectively).

- There is also the case of Al-muasasa site which is public land and has been occupied for more than a decade but receives new IDPs mostly from Hudaydah and Taiz (muhamisheen). This site is very unsafe and there have been multiple attempts to relocate the residents which encountered both backlash from residents and from landowners in the planned relocation site. Discussions and negotiations continue.