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Executive Summary

Communities in Yemen face a multitude of compounding challenges that entrenched poverty in a country which was one of the poorest in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region\(^1\), even prior to a significant escalation of conflict in 2015. Beleaguered by over three years of violence, many of its institutions that deliver core services to its citizenry have collapsed, leaving households vulnerable to shocks and in a state of perpetual precariousness. Facing these conditions, and with thousands internally displaced as a result of the violence, the international community has largely concentrated on immediate life-saving humanitarian support. While this has undoubtedly improved living conditions and provided basic assistance for thousands, longer term support that tackles issues of governance, service delivery, infrastructure rehabilitation, social cohesion and economic recovery is needed as the crisis protracts.

Within this context, this Early Recovery Multi-Sector Assessment sought to gauge household and community needs – and capacities to respond to those needs – to inform the integration of early recovery strategies into the humanitarian response. Initiated by the Early Recovery Cluster, this assessment has benefited from inputs by Fewsnet and Oxfam Yemen, as well as from Cluster Coordinators. In addition, the engagement from the Central Statistical Organization and the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC) was vital to the completion of the assessment. Finally, the assessment would not have been possible without the efforts of AFCAR, in particular of Adnan Qatinah and Sharaf Alkibsi, whose support on the ground was essential.

This assessment combines quantitative data that is designed to be representative of the conflict-affected districts across Yemen, with qualitative data from focus group discussions and key informant interviews, and with existing secondary data sources. The sample was stratified by displacement status and offers gender and urban-rural disaggregations wherever applicable.

Overall, the assessment finds that households in districts across all five hubs of the response are suffering from extremely poor socioeconomic conditions, compounded by severe challenges in local governance and service delivery. Conditions appear to be particularly poor in districts in Al Hodeidah hub where households and communities reported poorer conditions across multiple indicators. For instance, 90% of households there reported that their household’s income had been “very much reduced” in the past year, while 72% cited damage to health infrastructure in their own community. Districts in Saada hub also performed poorly, particularly in damage to education infrastructure and in terms of local authority capacities to meet needs. In addition, 91% of households there reported that they do not have birth documentation for children born within the last five years, leaving them exposed to concerning protection issues.

Households in Aden, on the other hand, reported relatively better conditions across sectors, with greater levels of income, reportedly less damage to infrastructure, and greater satisfaction with service delivery. Moreover, community recovery efforts were most commonly reported there, with 64% of households reporting the presence of repair efforts, compared to, for instance, just 24% in Sana’a. In households in Aden – and in urban areas more generally – rehabilitation of electricity supply was named as the greatest need for repair and recovery. Notably, while households in Aden fared relatively better compared to other hubs, the vast majority of households remain impoverished with many entrenched needs facing them.

A key finding was that households with IDPs generally fair the worst across almost every indicator including in this assessment, while host communities (including non-displaced and surrounding communities) and returnee households are relatively, but only marginally, better off. For instance, IDP households are more likely to be engaged in casual labor as their primary income source and these households also reported the most severe decreases in their incomes over the past year. Linked to this finding, IDPs are also significantly more likely to rely on friends and family to borrow money from, rather

than from local institutions; likely due to their displacement. Households with IDPs also reported lower satisfaction levels across all utilities and services measured as part of this assessment.

This assessment also captured longitudinal effects to gauge recent changes in households conditions and equip response actors with an understanding of the likely trajectory of households in the near future. For the majority of households, their conditions are reported to be on a downward trajectory with key challenges – principally in the high price of food and underperforming utilities, particularly electricity and public works – that entrench poverty. These result in dangerous coping mechanisms across all hubs, namely in reducing food consumption and the selling of assets, rendering households in highly precarious situations.

Poor socioeconomic conditions across all districts was reflected in the high proportion (35%) of households reporting that they are dependent on casual labor – inherently short-term and precarious – as their primary income source. As a result, nearly half of the households report that they earn between 1-50,000rial a month, with a significant 21% reporting that they have no income and are reliant on aid. Poverty is becoming more widespread and is deepening, with a significant 56% and 52% in Sana’a and Ibb hubs reporting that they are “much less wealthy” in terms of assets as compared to a year ago. The primary economic challenge was not reported to be in accessing markets, but instead in high commodity prices: a finding that holds true across all districts included in this assessment.

Damage to infrastructure from the conflict was also widely reported with water (56%) and electricity (51%) most frequently cited, followed by health (46%) and education (41%) by respondents. Damage to water supply infrastructure was most commonly cited in Al Hodeidah and Sana’a where 70% and 66% included it in their ranking and was least common in Saada (38%). Damage to electricity infrastructure was most commonly cited in Aden (65%) and least commonly cited in Al Hodeidah (18%), while damage to health infrastructure was most commonly cited in Al Hodeidah (72%), and least commonly cited in Ibb (17%). Finally, the damage to education infrastructure was most commonly cited in Al Hodeidah (55%) and Saada (53%) and least in Aden (37%) and Ibb (33%).

In terms of rehabilitation, the water supply infrastructure was the most commonly emphasized as the majority (62%) included it in their top three priorities for reconstruction. Electricity supply rehabilitation was cited as a top three priority by more than 60% in three regional hubs (Sana’a, Ibb, and Aden). Health services rehabilitation was extremely important to respondents in Ibb (81% included as top three priority). Just a few respondents indicated that they had capacities to repair their homes themselves, with 72% reporting that they had no capacity and a further 20% stating that they had only ‘limited capacity’.

Local governance and service delivery has also emerged from this assessment as a key area for international support. A significant 64% of respondents across the sample think that local authorities do not meet “most” or “nearly all” of the basic needs, while for 16% some needs are met and for just 0.4% almost all needs are met. Ibb (82%) and Saada’a (78%) emerge as the two hubs with the poorest performing local authorities, closely followed by Sana’ (76%). In terms of service delivery, health services are perceived to be falling well short of needs as 43% perceive it as very or somewhat incapable, compared to 30% for education. However, the poorest performing utility is electricity provision as 70% think that it is very or somewhat incapable of meeting needs, with public works (58%) and water (50%) also performing poorly.

Despite facing these substantial challenges, social cohesion has generally remained resilient. The frequency and quality of interactions both amongst community members, and between communities themselves, have not deteriorated significantly over the past year. Just 0.5% report ‘very negative’ relations, while 36% report highly positive and 38% report somewhat positive relations. Male headed households are more likely than female headed households to report better relations. Women headed households also report less frequent engagement with members of other communities, likely meaning that greater interactions are linked with better quality of relations. Within communities, the majority (58%) describe relations as ‘somewhat’ or ‘very friendly’, with only 9% describing relations as tense. This finding is corroborated by the fact that 75% of households report feeling safe within their community as the main point of insecurity reported was the threat of airstrikes.
Ownership of personal and family IDs – key indicators for protection response actors – is low. Particularly in Al Hodeidah hub, households generally report low levels of ownership of residency and land and property ownership documentation, leaving them vulnerable to exploitation. There was a significant gender disparity in this sector as only 50% of female headed households own a national ID card, compared to 83% of male headed households. 73% of families do not own a family ID card while a third of the sampled households do not possess evidence of the property that they own; households in Al Hodeidah hub reported lower levels of ownership across all documentation types.

Access to justice proved to be another sector where women were found to be significantly more vulnerable than men. Half of the sampled households reported that they could ‘never’ access the formal court system, with more female households (58%) reporting as such than male headed households. Most turn to community leaders, particularly as confidence in the police is low; only 17% would turn to the police, with that figure dropping to 12% if only female headed households are included.

Overall, the multitude and depth of community and household needs identified in this report point to a need to embrace a holistic approach for international support that works not only on the provision of immediate humanitarian support, but to including early recovery strategies in the overall response for sustainable longer-term solutions to emerge. Chief amongst these strategies will be in addressing core socioeconomic challenges in tandem with providing support so that households are able to generate higher incomes and alleviate dependence on negative coping mechanisms, particularly related to food consumption. Multi-purpose cash would be an appropriate modality in which to cover at least some of the immediate needs, while longer term efforts to revive livelihood opportunities are initiated.

Considerations for response actors also include the need to examine districts in Al Hodeidah hub more closely given the extremely poor conditions of households across nearly all indicators there, while IDP households, too, will require a tailored approach, given their more entrenched challenges and greater needs. Importantly, support to female headed households to generate incomes and ensure protection considerations are much needed, particularly as a lack of documentation and lower levels of access to justice will have greater and more negative implications on this cohort. Looking ahead, leveraging the relatively resilient inter- and intra-communal ties to deliver international support, particularly through capacity building programmes for CBOS, would be a logical starting point as Yemenis seek to rebuild their households and communities from the devastating impacts of the conflict.
Introduction

Context

Yemen, historically one of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region’s poorest states, has long suffered from bouts of political unrest and violent conflict. The result has been fragile institutions, poor service delivery mechanisms, and stagnant incomes. In 2014, GDP per capita was at $1,418 – lower than that of Syria’s ($1,821)\(^2\) despite that country’s then three-year old civil war. Since September 2014, Yemen has been engulfed in its own civil conflict that has driven it into a humanitarian crisis and exacerbated many of its underlying issues. The war began with the Houthi militia and its allies conquering large swathes of territory in the country’s North, including Sana’a, the capital city. Since March 2015, the war has escalated significantly with heavy fighting and air strikes devastating most of Yemen’s 22 Governorates, causing mass displacement, significant loss of life and considerable damage to infrastructure. As a result, by July 2015, Yemen was declared an L3 emergency\(^3\), and now presents the world’s largest food security crisis.\(^4\)

An unprecedented outbreak of cholera in October 2016 compounded these challenges and deepened the needs of this prolonged and acute crisis. The 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview identifies, among other issues, that: (i) 22.2 million people are in need, 11.3 million of whom are in acute need; (ii) at least 2 million remain internally displaced; (iii) 17.8 million people are food insecure, 8.4 million among them are severely food insecure and are at risk of famine; (iv) 16 million require assistance to access safe drinking water and sanitation, among whom 11.6 million are in acute need; (v) 16.4 million people lack to basic healthcare; (vi) 2.9 million children and lactating or pregnant women are acutely malnourished; (vii) 4.1 million school-age children require assistance to continue their education; and (viii) 8 million require immediate livelihoods assistance.\(^5\)

Despite some progress made in the two decades that preceded the outbreak of the civil war, Yemen’s human development outcomes were extremely low in 2014. What gains had been achieved, were the result of reforms undertaken by the government, and supported by external international organizations in the form of development co-operation and direct institutional support. These programs aimed to support governance and service delivery mechanisms to boost employment and productivity and took the form of Social Welfare Funds (SWF), Social Funds for Development (SFD), Labor-Intensive Work programs (LIWP)/Cash for Work (CFW) programs and Public Works Programs (PWP).

However, many of these were suspended with the outbreak of the conflict as donors necessarily transferred much of their finite resources to immediate life-saving support.\(^6\) This shift exacerbated issues of underfunding that the government faced, and left millions of people either without social safety nets or with reduced incomes.\(^7\) Indeed, the Preliminary Damage and Loss Needs Assessment (DNA) reported that 40% of full-time and 38% of part-time employees were laid off from manufacturing establishments\(^8\), as the private sector collapsed through much of the country. The UNDP Business Survey Report estimates that over a quarter of all firms suspended their operations, including 35% of the service sector, 29% of the industrial enterprises and 20% of trading companies\(^9\), resulting in rapidly increasing unemployment.

\(^4\) 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview, Yemen
\(^5\) 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview, Yemen
\(^7\) European Union, World Bank, United Nations, ‘Yemen Preliminary Findings: Damage & Needs Assessment’, (June, 2016)
\(^8\) European Union, World Bank, United Nations, ‘Yemen Preliminary Findings: Damage & Needs Assessment’, (June, 2016)
The crisis in Yemen demonstrates how chronic developmental issues compound and exacerbate humanitarian needs, particularly in situations where states are too weak to respond effectively. The collapse of basic service delivery and institutions critical to humanitarian action require a holistic response that not only includes humanitarian action, but also more development-oriented and governance-supporting work that looks to the longer term. It is increasingly apparent that the critical and life-saving humanitarian response needs to be accompanied by programs that contribute to the rehabilitation of service delivery, the functioning of the local economy and the strengthening of affected populations to address the issues that have entrenched the humanitarian catastrophe.\textsuperscript{10}

In the absence of a sustainable peace agreement among parties and with little progress on a national, government-led post-war plan, the prospect for large scale recovery and reconstruction remains remote. Therefore, these longer-term efforts must focus on strengthening local institutions to and supporting communities by building their capacities, while not detracting from life-saving humanitarian assistance.

This framing is articulated clearly in the Periodic Monitoring Review of the 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan, as one of its principle recommendations:

“Increased development interventions in Yemen create important opportunities to help ensure critical services are maintained; something humanitarians are not able to do given their mandate. The international community needs to step up its political and financial support to coordinated and principled humanitarian action in Yemen alongside coherent and reinforcing development initiatives.”\textsuperscript{11}

It is in this context that the integration of early recovery principles across the response is a key element for medium to long-term solutions. This assessment aims to provide the Humanitarian Country Team with a common analysis on inter-cluster and cross-cluster early recovery issues in order to address the needs described here.

**Early Recovery**

Early Recovery is a concept that requires clear definition. According to the Global Cluster on Early Recovery, it is “an approach that addresses recovery needs that arise during the humanitarian phase of an emergency, using humanitarian mechanisms that align with development principles. It enables people to use the benefits of humanitarian action to seize development opportunities, build resilience, and establish a sustainable process of recovery from crisis.”\textsuperscript{12}

Previous discussions on transitions from humanitarian to development are underpinned by the notion of a linear process in which relief, rehabilitation and development take place sequentially. The early recovery model strongly rejects this notion, instead proposing that the complexities of modern conflicts require an approach that applies humanitarian, recovery and development initiatives simultaneously.

In this way, early recovery does not seek to bridge humanitarian and development support in a temporal sense, but rather seeks thematic connections between them. Moreover, it is not an approach that is explicitly linked to displacement status, i.e. it does not function exclusively as a means to understand conditions for IDPs or refugees to return, though understanding those conditions may indeed be a component of an early recovery approach.

Finally, the Global Cluster on Early Recovery also states that early recovery principles and actions require consideration in terms of how they are integrated into a response. The cluster identifies that “Early Recovery should be coherent with the wider humanitarian response to avoid isolated and fragmented responses and small standalone projects. This requires better coordination and partnership within and outside the UN.”\textsuperscript{13}

---


\textsuperscript{12} Global Cluster on Early Recovery, ‘Guidance Note on Inter-Cluster Early Recovery’, (January, 2016) p. 12

\textsuperscript{13} Global Cluster on Early Recovery, ‘Guidance Note on Inter-Cluster Early Recovery’, (January, 2016) p. 14
In summary, the guiding principles of early recovery are as follows:\(^\text{14}\):

1. Ensure national ownership of the entire process (where possible and appropriate);
2. Use and promote participatory practices;
3. **Conduct initial assessments of needs and capacity;**
4. Ground interventions in a thorough understanding of the context;
5. Do no harm through the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of emergency response;
6. Include risk reduction and conflict prevention in programming;
7. Promote equality and develop local capacity to prevent discrimination of any kind;
8. Promote gender equality;
9. Ensure integration of cross-cutting issues;
10. Maximize synergies between different actors;
11. Strengthen accountability mechanisms.

This assessment contributes to Principle 3. It gauges both the early recovery needs and the capacities of various actors to respond to those needs in conflict-affected areas in Yemen.

**Objectives**

**Overall Objective:**
To establish an understanding of early recovery needs in conflict-affected areas in Yemen and measure the capacity of local agents (households & community groups) to respond to those needs.

**Specific Objectives:**

i) To understand early recovery needs are present in conflict-affected areas across all sectors;

ii) To understand the depth of those needs and how they relate to different demographic groups & geographies;

iii) To understand the capacities of households and community groups and local government to respond to those needs;

iv) Build evidence for the integration of Early Recovery integration sectors of humanitarian response in Yemen.

**Sector Coverage**

Early recovery needs are inherently broad-based, existing across numerous sectors. Given this need to capture data across multiple sectors, this study has been designed as an Yemen Multi-Sector Early Recovery Assessment (YMSERA), examining cross-sector needs by adopting an analytical approach drawn from the pre-existing cluster area concept.

The following sectoral areas have been included in this assessment. The selection of areas was extracted from the Global Cluster on Early Recovery, and adapted by the assessment team, following consultation with cluster leads by the lead consultant in November & December 2017.

I: Socioeconomic Recovery

- Household wealth & income, economic interactions with community and non-community members, economic coping mechanisms, the role of women in the local economy.

II: Local Governance & Service Delivery
   - Access to local social services (health, education, water, public works)

III: Access to Justice
   - Access to formal justice processes & institutions, access to informal justice processes including community-based resolutions.

IV: Protection
   - Access to documentation, access to land & property rights

V: Social Cohesion & Conflict
   - Perceptions of other community groups, perceptions of safety & security

VI: Infrastructure Rehabilitation
   - Damage related to conflict & infrastructure repair needs, household and community group capacity to respond.

This assessment also includes a brief overview of each cluster’s humanitarian response in terms of objectives, activities and funding. This section is included to provide a snapshot of the humanitarian assistance for each cluster and offers a point of comparison with the needs and capacities to respond to those needs offered in the ‘Findings’ section.
Methodology

The approach to this assessment was informed by a preliminary scoping exercise involving a series of remote consultations with cluster leads and UN agency staff operating in country. These consultations equipped the assessment team with a detailed understanding of the context and assisted in shaping the design of the methodology presented here.

The YMSERA employed a mix of primary and secondary data collection methods. Primary data collection involved a representative quantitative survey using a multi-stage, stratified random sampling strategy, and a series of qualitative focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs). Secondary data collection was conducted in the form of a rapid literature review of available data banks and reports on the thematic areas covered in this assessment. Gender and conflict sensitivity principles were adhered to through all stages of the research process.

The research tools used in this assessment were designed to cover all of the thematic areas listed in the Introduction on Page 10, while allowing for the necessary disaggregation of the data listed above. All tools are available upon request to UNDP.

A detailed description of the methodology and tools, including the reasoning behind the selection of these tools, is presented here.

Quantitative method

A survey tool was designed to gauge the early recovery needs and capacities to recover at the household level. The tool was selected to generate a base of quantitative data in the target districts down to a household level. The household was selected as the unit of analysis based on the assessment of cluster leads that it was necessary for findings that could be used for programmatic recommendations. District-level representativeness was selected as the Periodic Monitoring Review of the 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview identified that greater district-level analysis is needed for international organizations to target more effectively. For the sake of brevity, data in this report is presented by clustering districts into hubs (as per the response in Yemen), though the full district-level dataset has been made available to UNDP.

The selection of sample districts and sampling points proceeded in five stages.

Stage 1: District Coding

As outlined in the Introduction, the early recovery principles are applied to contexts that have undergone a crisis and have experienced significant displacement as a result. Given this objective, the assessment team was required to develop a system to identify and code which districts have and have not been affected by conflict.

Using the methodology outlined in the Local Governance Capacity Assessment (UNDP, January 2018), districts were coded as either conflict-affected or non-conflict affected: districts where conflict and fighting have occurred since the intensification of hostilities in March 2015 and districts that have remained relatively peaceful.

---

15 Representatives from the following organizations were remotely engaged for consultation between 29/11/17 and 18/12/17: OCHA, UNFPA, WHO, UNICEF, UNDP, Fewsnet, Shelter Cluster, WASH cluster, and Cash Cap.

16 UNRCO & partners, ‘Periodic Monitoring Review, Humanitarian Needs Overview: January-April 2017’, (October 2017). The recommendation reads, “All partners, including donors, are required to support the analytical push closer to people in need- district level analysis- and to monitor principled humanitarian action accordingly.”

17 To establish whether a district has been or is currently experiencing conflict, PERCENT, a Yemeni research company, contacted authorities at the governorate level to identify conflict affected districts. PERCENT’s field research staff (more than 250 enumerators and facilitators residing in every governorate) were also consulted to provide an assessment of the extent to which districts identified by governorate level officials experienced
The districts that were coded and non-conflict affected districts were removed, leaving a pool of 122 conflict affected districts. Within this selection, five categorizations were formed response to determine where the assessment would take place. As the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan 2018 details, response actors are based across Yemen in five hubs where their work is operationalized from. For each hub, the number of districts within the sample was selected to be proportional to the number of people in need per hub, as defined in the Humanitarian Needs Overview (December 2017). This method was selected to allow for this study to make the statistically most valid claims in areas where there are the greatest numbers of people in need, while ensuring a national coverage.

The hubs, and the number of districts included in the sample were as follows:

**Sana’a (4 districts); Al Hodeidah (4 districts); Ibb (4 districts); Saada (3 districts); Aden (5 districts).**

**Stage 2: District Selection**

The selection of districts within each hub was then made via a randomized selection process by assigning each district a numerical designation and using a random number generator. By undertaking this process, the following districts were selected to be included in this sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub (n)</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sana’a (4)</td>
<td>Shu’ub, Bani Matar, Bani Husheish, Bani Al Hareth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hodeidah (4)</td>
<td>Al Zhurah, Al Maraweah, Al Meghla, Al Mansouryah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb (4)</td>
<td>Al Mudhafar, Maweyh, Al Mesrakh, Khadeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada (3)</td>
<td>Al-Hazm, Al Mutoun, Al Maslowb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden (5)</td>
<td>Al Mansurah, Qatabah, Al Mahfad, Al Qabeitah, Baihan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview prioritizes a deeper understanding of contexts across Yemen to a district, rather than Governorate level. Accordingly, this research was designed so that representative claims could be made of all districts included in the sample. For the sake of brevity, the findings that are presented in the report pertain to the hubs outlined above, though district level data is available from UNDP.

The size of the sample at a national level means that findings presented here are representative of the entire population of Yemen at a 95% confidence level with a +/- 2.1% margin of error. At hub level, all findings presented in this report are representative of the entire population of in those hubs at a 95% confidence level with a 4.5-5.5% margin of error. Finally, at district level, findings for each district was representative of the entire population of the district at a 95% confidence level with a +/- 10% margin of error of the population of Yemen at a 95% confidence level with a +/- 2.1% margin of error.

The 2018 Humanitarian Needs Overview prioritizes a deeper understanding of contexts across Yemen to a district, rather than Governorate level. Accordingly, this research was designed so that representative claims could be made of all districts included in the sample. For the sake of brevity, the findings that are presented in the report pertain to the hubs outlined above, though district level data is available from UNDP.

The size of the sample at a national level means that findings presented here are representative of the entire population of Yemen at a 95% confidence level with a +/- 2.1% margin of error. At hub level, all findings presented in this report are representative of the entire population of in those hubs at a 95% confidence level with a 4.5-5.5% margin of error. Finally, at district level, findings for each district was representative of the entire population of the district at a 95% confidence level with a +/- 10% margin of error.

Conflict since the intensification of hostilities in March 2015. To be coded as a conflict prone district, the violence must have disturbed the daily lives of citizens since March 2015 due to fighting between factions, airstrikes, or other violence. Districts in which there are existing tensions between adversarial factions that result in skirmishes that disrupt daily life were also coded as conflict affected. In contrast, districts that have not witnessed direct conflict, or only brief interludes of conflict that have not impacted daily life in an enduring manner, were coded as relatively peaceful.

A sixth hub, Al Mukalla, is also hub of the response. However, due to time and resource constraints – and given the significantly lower number of people in need that that hub serves – it was omitted from this study.

OCHA and partners, ‘Yemen Humanitarian Needs Overview 2018’, (December 2017)
of error. Using this measure, the target sample sizes were calculated for each of the districts. The actual number of respondents per district in all but one district exceeded the targets, as shown in the table below.

**Target and actual number of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Target # respondents</th>
<th>Actual # respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sana’a</td>
<td>Shu’ub</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bani Matar</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bani Husheish</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bani Al Hareth</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>Al Mudhafar</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mawyeh</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Mesrakh</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khadeer</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>Al Hazm</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Mutoun</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Maslowb</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansurah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Qabeitah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Mahfad</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qatabah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baihan</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hodeidah</td>
<td>Al Zuhrah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Maraweah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Meghlab</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Mansouryah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research was designed to understand the realities of three target groups: host communities/non-displaced/surrounding communities; Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs); and returnees. The sample size within each district was not large enough to make statistically significant claims about each of these population groups, though, taken in sum at a national level, statements made in this report are statistically significant for each group. The number of households in the sample of each population group (IDP vs returnee vs host community) at a district level was proportional to the population groups residing in those districts.

**Stage 3: Sub-district Selection**

Within each District, the sample was stratified into three distinct groups: Internally Displaced Persons (IDP); host communities; and returnees. This stratification was chosen as cluster leads that were
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20 For the sake of coherence, this group will simply be referred to as the ‘host community’ or ‘host communities’ from this point onwards.
consulted recommended that early recovery conditions were likely highly dependent upon displacement status. The number of respondents from each of these stratifications included were proportionate to the size of that group in the District.

The sub-district containing the largest population center was included as, given the nature of the displacement and returns in Yemen, populated areas are likely to have all three target groups residing in these areas. Half of the sample was selected from the sub-district with the largest population size. Then, another sub-district was randomly selected by assigning sub-districts numbers and using a random number generator. This has likely resulted in a degree of overrepresentation for urban households, though given the demographic balance between urban and rural areas in Yemen, this was deemed to make an insignificant difference in the determination of the results.

Note: To ensure the safety of field researchers, a security and safety review was conducted prior to visiting any sampling point. If the sampling point was unsafe for field researchers, an alternative sampling point was randomly selected. Any replaced sampling points were documented by the assessment team to account for any bias introduced by lack of access to different regions of the country.

Stage 4: Household selection

Within each village or town ward, a final stage of random sampling was employed. First, numbers of interviews to be conducted in each target area was calculated with probability proportionate to the size of the village/town ward population. Second, households in each village were selected using interval sampling with the pencil-spin approach to select a random direction for the transect walk.

Stage 5: Respondent selection

Once the household was selected, the assessment team selected a respondent within that household. The respondent to the household survey was always the Head of the Household as data that would reflect the condition of all members in the household, rather than any individual, was desired. The Head of Household was selected due to his/her primacy within the household in terms of decision-making and awareness of the household conditions.

A gender balance of 50:50 was pursued that reflects the gender sensitive approach taken in this assessment. Given the approach of the assessment team was that men would only interview men and women would only interview women, the gender balance of the sample was achieved by having a research team with an even gender balance. While this relied somewhat on researchers completing comparable number of interviews, it was identified as the best practicable approach. A post-data collection weighting to compensate for half of the sample being women was not adopted due to the fact that the proportion of female headed households is currently unknown.

Enumeration

The training of the assessment team was conducted by AFCAR consulting. Enumerators were individuals with local legitimacy, varying from researchers that AFCAR has worked with previously to students that required training on the research tools and procedures. Team leaders were recruited who supervised the enumerators at field sites alongside members of the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) and the Central Statistical Organisation (CSO). Data was entered through pen and paper enumeration as prior research experience with AFCAR in the Yemeni context had pointed to sensitivities around the use of mobile application devices for data collection. Data was manually entered, cleaned and processed for the lead consultant to analyze and draft this report.

Sample characteristics

Data was collected for this assessment in February 2018 from a total of 2,098 respondents across the five hubs. 50.3% of the entire sample was women, while 49.7% were men, with minor variations in the
gender breakdown across the hubs selected. In terms of age, all respondents were over the age of 18 and the average age in the sample was 43 years, with a median of 40 years. The following graph illustrates the age breakdown of the sample.

Overall, 25.4% of the sample were from urban areas while 74.6% were from rural parts of the country. The proportion of the sample that was illiterate was 42.7%. This figure rises to 58% when accounting for just women, whereas the illiteracy rate for men is 26%. These rates are comparable to UNICEF data on literacy rates in Yemen.\(^{21}\) The highest rate of illiteracy was found in Al Hodeidah hub, of which 59% of the respondents were illiterate, and the lowest was found in Aden, at 35%. The rate of illiteracy did not differ meaningfully across population groups (host community vs returnee vs IDP).

The average household size was 7.4 members, which is in line with the 2012 ACAPS figure of 7.\(^{22}\) This average did not differ meaningfully across gender (male vs female headed household), nor by population group. However, average household size differed meaningfully by hub as Saada had the largest average size with over 8 members, whereas Al Hodeidah’s was 6.7.

Overall, 16% of the sample had at least one disabled person residing in the household. The number of households with at least one disabled member was much higher in Ibb, where a quarter (24%) of respondents stated as such, whereas in Aden only 12% of respondents reported having a disabled person in the household.

Qualitative Methods

The qualitative methods for this assessment were Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIs).

Focus Group Discussions

Semi-structured FGDs were selected to complement the quantitative survey tool by adding explanatory power and to deepen understanding of the causal mechanisms behind the quantitative survey findings at the community level. The FGDs were designed to gauge the early recovery needs and capacities to recover to those needs in the community.

Aligning with the stratification used for the survey tool, the sample for the FGDs was stratified along the lines of displacement status and gender, while taking into account Urban vs Rural demographic breakdowns. However, due to constraints on time and resources, instead of conducting FGDs in every

\(^{21}\) [https://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/yemen_statistics.html](https://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/yemen_statistics.html)

\(^{22}\) [https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/acaps_country_profile_yemen_24july2015.pdf](https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/acaps_country_profile_yemen_24july2015.pdf)
district, FGDs were conducted in at least one district in each Hub, with at least one FGD for each stratification (ie. Host community – Male, or IDPs – Female).

A district was selected for each of the categories based on there being a significant number of IDPs and returnees to include. Among the districts that qualify, one district was selected randomly for inclusion in the sample.

The sample for FGDs is summarized by the table below.

Target number is bracketed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Host community</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sana’a</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hodeidah</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 (5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 (5)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of FGDs conducted

The number of participants in each FGD ranged from 6-10. Between six and eight was generally found to be the most effective in terms of understanding a multitude of views of respondents while being small enough to ensure the active involvement of all participants. Participants were selected in discussion between enumerators and village / town ward leaders and roughly constituted a mix of ages and livelihoods that were reflective of the population residing in the area.

FGDs were conducted in Arabic with enumerators facilitating the discussion with a FGD guide and one note-taker. The FGDs were not recorded, but instead the notes were translated into English and delivered to the lead consultant for analysis.

Key Informant Interviews

Key Informant Interviews (KII) were selected to gauge the capacity of community groups to respond to early recovery needs. Therefore, KII engaged leaders of community organizations that are either implementing, or are seeking to implement, local projects that contribute to early recovery. This included informal groups and collectives undertaking rehabilitation initiatives of local infrastructure such as roads and bridges, as well as schools and medical facilities.

KII were conducted on a rolling basis with leaders of community organizations that were encountered during the data collection phase. Given this, the enumerators used a snowballing method to identify and engage relevant respondents. KII were generally conducted with one respondent. However, up to 3 respondents were included in one interview if selecting just one individual risked causing tensions among community leaders. Overall, 35 KII were conducted across the five hubs. KII were facilitated by one enumerator and one note-taker. They were not recorded, but instead the notes were translated into English and delivered to the lead consultant for analysis.

In total, 35 community-based organizations were interviewed across 13 districts across the country. Four were interviewed in Sana’a, seven in Ibb, 5 in Saada, 11 in Aden and eight in Al Hodeidah.

---

Limitations

- **Securitized environment**: Due to the ongoing nature of the conflict and the securitized environment in which many Yemenis live, a key concern was whether responses reflected respondents’ true perceptions or were overtly influenced by security actors (state and non-state). The security of the research team was also of paramount concern. The assessment team mitigated this risk by working in close co-ordination with Government officials from the Ministry of Planning & International Co-operation (MoPIC) and the Central Statistical Organization (CSO) to assess the safety of the target districts. Moreover, close monitoring of secondary sources of the evolving conflict situation was conducted as part of this assessment.

  o The security concerns were particularly acute in Al Hodeidah hub due to the intense fighting that has been taking place there. As a result, the survey questions on social cohesion and conflict were removed from the survey as they were deemed too sensitive, while some of the responses in the Protection and Access to Justice section must be assessed considering that some responses may be skewed towards giving favorable answers towards authorities.

- **Snapshot approach**: This assessment presents the status quo in target areas at a single point in time and is shaped by the specific interests of early recovery actors. As a consequence, it does not provide significant insight into the trajectory of the wider political situation in Yemen, which remains volatile. Furthermore, the assessment was not designed to provide comprehensive information on the returns/relocations process and should not be seen as a substitute for a fully-realized End of Displacement assessment.

- **Multi-sector approach**: The multiple focal sectors for this study has allowed a broad picture of households and communities to be developed to inform early recovery responses. However, this picture is necessarily shallow in each thematic area, given the number of sectors covered. A deeper focus of specific sectors, particularly livelihoods, would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of specific community and household needs. Further, more targeted assessments in particular geographies or sectors is recommended in the future.

- **Al Mukalla coverage**: The resources and time constraints for this assessment meant that districts in Al Mukalla hub were not included in this assessment. Although the number of people in need in the two Governorates there – Hadramaut and Al Maharat – is significantly lower than the other hubs, it is estimated that around 570,000 people are in need there. Any future work that has national coverage should aim to include these districts as many of the issues visible in Yemen’s other districts are also present here with the added complexity of the existence of extremist groups such as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant – Yemen Province.
Key Findings

Socioeconomic conditions and challenges

Four years of armed conflict have had a severe economic impact on all communities in Yemen, resulting in diminished livelihood opportunities which have forced many to adopt precarious coping mechanisms. The primary livelihood finding from this assessment largely corroborates data from previous studies: economic hardship, in large part due to conflict, is clearly evident and widespread across all geographic areas, population groups and livelihoods. However, the economic situation of certain households was found to meaningfully differ from others based on certain characteristics. From a socioeconomic standpoint, the most vulnerable households were more likely to be located in Al Hodeidah hub, be female-headed, and have experienced displacement.

Livelihood types

While national level poverty data is difficult to attain in Yemen24, livelihood types serve as a useful indicator for how the economy’s deterioration has negatively impacted households. The most prominent livelihood type across the country is casual labor, followed by employment in a national NGO, reflecting an employment scenario characterized by uncertainty, low wages, and precariousness—and where aid drives employment as well as furnishing humanitarian needs. This situation, with its the lack of sustainable, decent paying, and predictable employment, was reflected across all geographies. The significant proportion of respondents reporting that they work for an international NGO or rely upon remittance compounds this notion.

Dependence on casual labor is notably higher in Ibb, where 35% of household cited it as their primary means of income. In Saada, it is much lower, and the majority (55%) of households work for a charity / national NGO (included here are faith-based organizations and community-based organizations). When FGDs enquired why this was the case, researchers found that local economies around the Saada had almost completely ceased functioning and households were now almost completely reliant on emergency income sources to support their incomes.

A notable finding was that districts in Aden hub were in a somewhat better livelihood scenario. According to FGDs in districts in this hub, at least some of the respondents reported continuing cultivation of various products – most commonly qat and beekeeping – whilst others report turning to handicrafts or running small-scale “home shops”. 23% of households in this area are engaged in farming. Despite the ongoing conflict, damage to infrastructure and land, covered later in this report, was notably less severe around Aden Hub, which meant that farming activities could continue, relative

24 The most recent national poverty data seems to be from the World Bank’s assessment in 2011.
to other parts of the country. In Ibb Hub only 1.5% of respondents reported that they farm, while 23% reported that they are reliant on remittances.

Important differences emerge when the sample is broken down by displacement status. For instance, IDPs rely much more than other groups on casual labor, and, unsurprisingly, on the work of both national and international NGOs. Host communities, on the other hand, are much more likely (18%) than both IDPs and returnees to be involved in farming, indicating their relatively more stable economic situation.

In terms of differences emerging from disaggregation by gender, women (23%) were more likely to work for a national NGO than men (16%), while men were somewhat more likely to be engaged as a farmer. 18% of men compared to 14% of women were farmers within this sample.

**Income sources, levels & change**

Reported income levels across the sample underline the poor economic conditions evident in other indicators included in this assessment. Nearly half (48%) of respondents reported a monthly income of under 50,000 rial, while over a fifth of the population are reliant on aid. According to FGDs across multiple geographies, it was found that significant decreases in income levels have resulted in households adopting highly negative coping mechanisms, including selling core household assets, expanded upon later in this section.

When disaggregated by gender, women are more likely to rely on aid – either from national or international organizations – than men. Indeed, over a quarter of female headed households in Yemen are now reliant on aid, while 12.6% are dependent on remittances from other sources. The proportion of female headed households earning over 50,001 rial a month is only 16%, compared to 22% of male headed households.

---

25 FGD in Sana’a Hub (14/02/18)
This finding is at least in part explained by the fact that women are, in general, not perceived to have a significant role in the household in terms of earning an income. According to the survey data, ‘work’ was only named by 42% of respondents as a primary role for women, behind 46% of respondents naming ‘leisure’, 70% stating ‘religious worship’, and 95% identifying ‘domestic work and child rearing’. The assigning of these roles to women held true across both male and female headed households, emphasizing that women themselves do not necessarily perceive working outside the home as their role. The trend of perceiving women’s’ role as being narrowly focused on domestic work was more acute in IDP households, followed by returnee households, while host communities were generally the most amenable to alternative roles for women in the household.

When examined geographically, statistically significant differences also emerge as a full 36% of households in Saada Hub rely on aid, rendering it the poorest in terms of this indicator in our sample. Aden, conversely, is relatively better off with only 14% being reliant on aid for their monthly income, while 21% declare to earn between 50,001-100,000 rial a month, and about 9.6% earn between 100,001-200,000 rial. Over a fifth of households in Al Hodeidah do not know how much their monthly income is; a proportion that is significantly higher than in the other hubs. Another notable finding was there were significantly more households reporting that they do not have any income in rural (24%) rather than urban (15%) areas in the sample. Indeed, when examining higher income brackets, such as households earning between 50-100,000 rial a month, there was also a notable difference as 22% of urban households, compared to just 9% of rural households reported earning that amount last month.

Where deterioration in income levels have been most significant, price volatility of produce, alongside other compounding factors such as drought and frost, were identified as reasons that incomes have been suppressed.

The results of the different population groups across the sample also shed light on the dependence on aid for IDPs populations. Nearly a third of displaced respondents reported that their household does not have an income, and is instead reliant on aid, compared to 19% of host community and 18.5% of returnee households. Further, across all income brackets, IDP household fare worse than their returnee and host community counterparts. For instance, 42% of IDP households in the sample reported that they only earn between 1-50,000 rial a month, lower than the situation for both returnees and host communities; 50% of both of whom earn only this amount.

Overall, the monthly income data points to by far the most precarious income situation for IDPs, followed by returnees - who rely more significantly on remittances – followed by host communities, as summarized in the chart below.
Monthly income: Longitudinal change

Studies on socioeconomic conditions in Yemen have demonstrated household incomes deteriorating significantly since the escalation of the conflict in 2015. These deteriorations are corroborated in this assessment, which finds that deteriorating economic conditions have been compounded in the past year. Triangulated through qualitative FGDs, which found abrupt price hikes, coupled with a longer, steady increase in commodity prices, reduced incomes have made living conditions even more difficult for households who have had their incomes considerably eroded. In particular, rising fuel prices, especially diesel, was reported as a primary challenge for communities. 69% of respondents reported that their incomes have “very much reduced” over the course of the past year – many of whom declaring that they have no income and are now reliant on aid, or are in casual labor – while just 12% stated that their income remained unchanged. The very small number of respondents who reported any increases in income were generally farmers or owners of small businesses.

Regionally, the most negatively affected hubs over the past year have been Al Hodeidah and Sana’a where incomes have “very much reduced” for 94% and 84% of households respectively. Respondents residing in districts in Aden hub were – as corroborated through other indicators - the least likely to report negative changes in their income situation as only a quarter of respondents reported that their incomes had “very much reduced” over the past year.


27 Focus Group Discussion, Sana’a Hub 12 February 2018
Not only were households in rural areas generally reporting to be poorer, but were also more likely to report a negative trajectory over the past year. Indeed, 75% of rural households, compared with 49% of urban households, reported that their incomes had “very much reduced” over the past year.

When examining this metric through the lens of displacement status, once again IDPs emerge as the group that has suffered the most over the course of the past year. Over three quarters of IDP households reported that their income has “very much reduced” over the reporting period.

Assets - compared to community and compared to last year

Underlying poverty, as perceived by the respondents themselves relative to their neighbors in their community, was found to be high and prevalent across all geographies. Households were asked to describe their relative wealth in terms of home assets, personal items, and savings, compared to other households in their community.

A total of only 14 respondents in the sample of over 2,000 reported that they felt either “quite” or “very rich” in comparison to their community members. Indeed, 74% of the total sample stated they felt either “quite” or “very poor” in comparison to their neighbors. Only a very small minority of participants in FGDs reported owning assets that were not furniture, shelter, land, or vehicles, with some of these respondents stating they own livestock. The most frequently used coping mechanism has been in

---

28 Multiple FGDs across multiple hubs, February 2018
sells all assets in order to meet the cost of survival – which is most often and most significantly in purchasing food.

Reflecting and aligning with reported levels of income, there is significant variation in how households perceive their own poverty in relation to their neighbors. For instance, households in Al Hodeidah were much more likely (74%) than their counterparts in Aden (41%) to perceive themselves as poor.

Mirroring the other socio-economic findings, IDPs were found to be notably poorer when reporting their assets in comparison to other households in the community; over half of IDP households described themselves as “very poor”. Significantly, returnees reported the highest proportion (35.3%) of households with “average” assets compared to others in the community. Further, urban households (34%) were less likely than rural households (47%) to report that they feel “much less wealthy”, aligning with the finding that the income levels have depressed more rapidly in rural areas in the past year.

A key finding of this section is that reported income levels have deteriorated more significantly than asset wealth, though a primary coping mechanism due to reduced incomes has been to sell assets. As a result, while assets have been heavily depleted throughout the war, many households have retained some semblance of their assets. Any development intervention to bolster the resilience of households and communities more broadly should account for this—as asset wealth is increasingly under threat. Asset wealth has deteriorated significantly over the past year with a full 46% reporting that they perceive themselves as “much less wealthy” than they did a year ago. At the same time, 30% of the sample saw their asset holdings as “unchanged”, either underlining the finding that assets seem to have been more resilient to negative impacts than income levels, or highlighting that assets may have already been sold in previous years.

As with other indicators, IDP households are the population group with the greatest deterioration over the last year with over 54% of households reporting they were “much less wealthy”, compared to 42% of host communities and 40% of returnee households. Examined further in FGDs, it emerged that IDPs – the majority (67%) of whom were displaced between one and three years prior to data collection – would indicate that their assets were often rented houses and items of furniture from other members in the community. In contrast, non-displaced and host communities – who were more often than not rural – continue to hold assets such as land and vehicles. As a result, it’s clear that displacement, and the loss of owned assets that the process entails, leaves displaced households more vulnerable to the economic shocks as presented by conflict than those who are not displaced.

Figure 8: Household assets relative to other households in community, by Hub

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Quite poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Quite rich</th>
<th>Very rich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saan'a</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hodeidah</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 FGD in Aden Hub on 15/02/18
Economic challenges and access to markets

In both the quantitative and qualitative tools used in this assessment, lines of questioning were used to unpack exactly how deterioration in the socioeconomic condition of households were unfolding, as well as the challenges that households face on a day to day basis. Across both tools, the response to questions about primary challenges was clear: high commodity prices and a lack of jobs.

Over 93% of households named high commodity prices as the primary challenge, with 58% identifying no jobs and 48% stating that high debt was their household’s primary challenge. Notably, there were no meaningful differences amongst male and female headed households, nor amongst population groups with differing displacement statuses, though there was between urban and rural households. Indeed, 41% of households in rural areas named the issue of high commodity prices as a primary challenge, six percentage points higher than the 35% in urban areas.

Despite the ongoing armed conflict, access to markets was generally not perceived to be a major challenge for most of the households interviewed as part of this assessment. In fact, 39% of households describe their access to market as “very easy”, while a further 28% describe it “usually fine”; only 16% of households describe their access to market as “not easy” – and this finding holds true across population groups with differing displacement statuses.

However, on this metric, a statistically significant gender gap emerges as 21% of female headed households, as opposed to only 10% of male headed households, find it difficult to access markets. In FGDs, women more readily expressed issues with personal safety in accessing markets, preventing them from accessing markets, particularly later in the day. Access to markets was notably poorer in Aden (20%) and Sana’a (20%) hubs, though access was still deemed to be “very easy” by nearly half of the respondents in Sana’a.

Reiterating the negative trajectory demonstrated by other indicators, access to markets has deteriorated over the past year. Approximately half of the respondents stated that their access had either gotten “worse” or “much worse”, while 25% stated that their situation had stayed the same. Notably, in the districts surrounding Aden, access to markets has improved with a full 47% stating an improvement, while only 28% recorded a deterioration. In contrast, the greatest deteriorations in accessing markets were seen in Sana’a, where 60% of households report that their accessing of markets has become more difficult in the past year, and in Ibb where 63% stated as such.

---

Multiple FGDs with women in Sana’a and Al Hodeidah hubs
Corroborating the emerging narrative from other indicators, the primary challenge in accessing markets was deemed to be insufficient cash for food. 87% of respondents identified this issue as their primary challenge, whilst a significant 60% of respondents stated that cash for transport is one of their primary challenges. The finding that the vast majority who face difficulty accessing markets identify not having enough money for food held true across both male and female respondents.

The primacy of the price of food as the main challenge in accessing markets held true across all hubs in the sample. In FGDs, many participants identified the recent and dramatic spikes in commodity prices, coupled with an overarching depreciation of the Yemeni Rial, as key factors behind making the purchase of food a greater challenge than a year ago. Aligning with other indicators that demonstrate the relatively more prosperous situation in districts around Aden, those stating that the price of food was the primary challenge was approximately 10% lower.

Challenges were generally found to be more acute for female headed households who were more likely to identify challenges – and a greater range of challenges – in not only accessing markets, but in their overarching economic situation. Indeed, the survey data serves to reveal that 75% of households consider that ‘child rearing’ is the primary barrier for their greater involvement in the economy, while 71% identify that women having ‘no skills’ is the most significant barrier. Other key challenges identified include ‘limited access to finance’, named by 46% of households, and not enough jobs for women, identified by 40% of the sampled households. An examination across hubs finds that a lack of jobs for women emerges particularly strongly in Sana’a as 38% named it as the primary economic challenge for women, compared to the average of 25%.
Basic needs

Food

The Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), a USAID-funded project which monitors the risk of famine in Yemen, has continually highlighted that many households are severely food insecure and that households struggle to pay for food to keep their families nourished. This struggle is reflected in this assessment’s data with the overwhelming majority of households reporting that their primary challenge is to pay for food; 98% of respondents stated that food was their household’s primary expenditure.

Households were also asked if they were able to meet their basic needs over the past 30 days, using WFP’s coping strategies index. Overall, although 80% of households stated that they were able to meet their needs in terms of food over the past month, there was significant regional variance. Nearly all respondents in Aden hub stated that they were able to meet their needs, while only 53.3% of households in districts in Al Hodeidah hub were able to meet this need. With nearly half of the households reporting that they fail to meet their basic food needs, this finding presents a food security scenario in that hub which is significantly worse than the other hubs in this sample. Households in Sana’a hub were also at least somewhat unable to meet this need as a significant 25% of the households reported.

IDP households are the population group least able to meet their needs: a full 25% of households were unable to do so in the past month. In contrast, over 80% of returnee and host communities met their basic food needs over the past month; meaning that once again IDP households were proven to be in a more vulnerable position regarding their socioeconomic conditions.

Water

The assessment also evaluated the ability with which households were able to meet their needs in terms of water. The most significant finding here was the statistically significant difference in the ability of male and female headed households to meet their water needs. Just 68% of female headed households, in comparison to 82% of male headed households were able to meet this need. FGDs highlighted that this variance was attributable to the fact that the role of collecting water for the household was nearly always the duty of women in the household. However, within female headed households, the vast majority only had one woman that would be responsible for the household’s primary livelihood, as well as a range of other household duties, including the fetching of water.31 Stretched across too many roles in providing for the household, this finding explains the lower rate of female headed households being able to meet their needs in terms of water.

31 FGDs across multiple districts, February 2018
Regional variance also emerges with households in Saada and Al Hodeidah hubs less likely to have been able to meet their water needs over the past month. On the other hand, households in Ibb and Aden Hub were much more likely to have met this need as 85% and 77% of households across districts in these hubs were able to meet their needs in terms of water. Similar disparities across different displacement status groups emerged on this metric as with households being able to meet their needs in terms of food: households with one or more IDPs were significantly less able to have met their needs in terms of water.

Shelter

The vast majority (83%) of households’ reported that they were able to meet their shelter needs in the last month, with male headed households slightly more likely (85%) than female headed households (81%) being able to meet this need. Across geographies, once again districts in Al Hodeidah hub emerged as the least able to meet needs with only 74% of households reporting that they were able to do so last month. Similarly, IDP households also fared worst with only 71% of them reporting that they are able to meet needs in comparison to 86% of the host community households.
Gas

Many participants in FGDs also mentioned that households are unable to purchase gas as fuel for household activities such as cooking and heating, reporting that the primary barrier is the cost of the gas. Notably, during the period of data collection, there was a gas shortage crisis in several of the northern governorate in Yemen which has likely negatively impacted responses to gas access questioning here.

The survey data indicates that households are generally unable to purchase gas, with only 36% of the sampled households reported that they are able to meet this need. A concerning 95% of households in Al Hodeidah reported that they were unable to meet this need in the last month, as compared to 51% in Ibb hub, highlighting the high degree of regional variance on this metric as well.

Coping strategies

Households across the sample have developed a multitude of coping mechanisms to address the needs and challenges described above. These strategies further underline the vulnerability of households in that their adoption of dangerous coping mechanisms that are symptomatic of their desperation.
In response to a lack of income, the most commonly adopted coping mechanisms are all related to food consumption. Namely, the three most frequently reported mechanisms are: reducing food consumption (72%); buying food on credit (61%); and in buying lower quality food (52%). Borrowing money (38%), as well as a number of other strategies that involve liquidation of household assets such as their savings (11%) and livestock (8%) were also mentioned. The primacy of food-related coping strategies underlines that, despite many households reporting that they meet their food needs, a reduction in the quantity or quality of the food consumed or entering into a debt cycle for food renders households in a precarious situation regarding their food security and nutrition.

Differences between female and male headed households did not emerge on metrics related to coping strategies. However, considerable variance was observable by hub that reinforce the notion of high vulnerability in Al Hodeidah hub in particular, and relative security in Aden.

![Figure 18: Households reporting that they reduced their consumption of food in the last 30 days to cope with a lack of income](image)

Indeed, across all three food-related coping strategies reported, households in Al Hodeidah were the most likely to state that they had reduced food consumption in the last 30 days, while those in Aden were the least likely to do so.

When disaggregated by displacement status, returnee households were less likely to turn to dangerous coping strategies than their IDP and host community counterparts. For instance, 64% of returnee households in comparison to 75% of IDP households and 73% of host community households reported that they turn to reducing their consumption of food due to their lack of income. This finding holds true for other strategies such as buying food on credit, or for buying food of a lower quality. The one strategy that remains consistent across the displacement groups is the borrowing of money, which approximately a third of households in all groups turn to.

Meaningful differences also emerged when examining the data by urban-rural divides, as rural households were much more likely to resort to negative coping mechanisms than their urban counterparts – as observed in the graph below.
Credit

Borrowing money informally was named as a key coping mechanism across households in all geographies. 74% of households borrow money regularly. There were no statistically significant differences between male and female headed households, nor between IDP, host community and returnee households; depicting a scenario where informal borrowing is ubiquitous amongst all communities in the country. The geographical breakdown across Yemen’s hubs are illustrated in the charts below which demonstrate a particularly high proportion of households in Saada Hub borrowing, with relatively fewer in the more prosperous hub of Aden.

The informality of the borrowing is evidenced when examining the sources as 79% of households identified friends and 39% mentioned family as lending sources. Notably, women are more likely to borrow from family (42%) than men are (36%) with Al Hodeidah and Sana’a hubs emerging as the areas in which households are most likely to borrow from family these sources.

IDPs are generally significantly more likely to borrow from friends, while host communities and returnees were more likely to identify family members as their primary sources of lending. When probed as to why this was the case, households with displaced persons were forced to borrow from members of their new community, rather than what many would prefer: borrowing from family members that now were not in nearby locations.
Infrastructure Damage & Rehabilitation

Years of conflict have caused major damage to infrastructure across Yemen. The World Bank’s most recent phase of the Yemen Needs Assessment, which sought to capture damage levels and costs across 10 urban areas, has estimated that in some sectors physical damage could be as high as 46% of all assets damaged or destroyed. A particular challenge, given the ongoing cholera outbreak, is that the most affected sector has been WASH, while an estimated 30% of health infrastructure also damaged or destroyed.32

For this assessment, the survey sought to first evaluate what sectors are understood by communities to be the most affected, i.e. damage estimates, and then identify community priorities for rehabilitation both by sector and in terms of kinds of support. The survey also sought to provide data on how the level of damage to respondents’ homes, before asking a series of questions about the capacity of household and community capacity to respond to the damage caused to local infrastructure.

As infrastructure is only a component of the study, this is not a detailed needs assessment for planning infrastructure rehabilitation projects across Yemen. Instead, it seeks to inform the strategies for recovery by identifying what how communities view the damage to infrastructure and their most pressing needs.

Infrastructure damage by sector

The survey asked respondents to rank what local infrastructure had been the most damaged within the village or town ward. Seeking to get a better understanding of what kind of infrastructure damage had been experienced by communities in Yemen is a first step towards designing rehabilitation efforts. This question also seeks to build on the data collected by the World Bank Damage Needs Assessment, Phase 2, which provided estimated damages for several of this study’s regional hubs.

Across the full sample, damage to water supply infrastructure was the most commonly cited form of infrastructure damage, with 56% of all respondents including it in their ranking. Electricity was a close second, with just over half of the sample including it in their rankings. Health, education and roads follow.

There are clear regional differences contained within this overall assessment. The figure below shows the proportion of respondents who included each infrastructure sector in their ranking, by regional hub. Going region by region, this analysis allows us to see how water infrastructure damage was commonly cited in Sana’a and Al Hodeida, while comparatively less of an issue in Saada. Within each of these hubs, there was also differences in the proportion of respondents who ranked each sector first. For example, in Ibb and Al Hodeida, water was ranked as the most damaged sector by 56% and 62% of those who included it, respectively. This stands in contrast to Saada (25%) and Aden, where despite 51% mentioning damage to water infrastructure, just 30% ranked it as the most important.

Electricity was most commonly cited in both Ibb and Aden, with 60% of those respondents in Aden also saying it was the most damaged sector. Of the 37% in Saada who included electricity on their ranking, just 20% of them ranked it first.

Al Hodeida has experienced the greatest level of damage to its health infrastructure but appears to have suffered comparatively less little damage to its electricity infrastructure. However, damage to this sector was not ranked has highly important: just 12.5% ranked it as the most damaged compared to 39% of respondents from Sana’a, for example, who included health infrastructure in their rankings.

Damage to education is perhaps the most analogous across regional hubs: with the exception of Ibb, between 37% and 55% of the other hubs included it in the rankings. It was least emphasized in Aden, where just 8% placed it at the top of their infrastructure damage prioritization.

The figures also suggest that Sana’a has experienced some of the highest overall levels of damage across infrastructure sector, while hubs like Aden and Ibb have had one or two sectors that have been particularly badly damaged but other sectors are comparatively intact.

The data also shows that, with a few exceptions, most regions have experienced significant cross-sector damage to infrastructure. At the same time, the different prioritization of infrastructure damage, for example the higher urgency of water infrastructure in Ibb and Al Hodeidah versus urgency of electricity in Aden, indicate that the response to damage must be differentiated by geography. There is also a clear urgency behind the provision of water infrastructure as a basic need, one that is particularly acute given the cholera epidemic in the country. Comparative analysis at the regional-hub level with the WHO’s Weekly Epidemiological Bulletin (W12 2018, March 19-March 25) found a clear correlation between inclusion of water infrastructure in damage rankings and cholera attack rate. Sana’a and Al Hodeidah, where there was the highest inclusion of water infrastructure 66% and 70% respectively, also had attack rates much higher than the national average, above 60% of other governorates.

---

Figure 22: Sector-Wise Infrastructure Damage per Hub.
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http://www.emro.who.int/images/stories/yemen/week_12.pdf?ua=1
Analysis of the sample finds clear differences in damage to sectors between communities defined as rural villages and those defined as urban wards.

**Proportion of respondents who ranked sector damage as the most severe, urban vs. rural**

Among urban communities, respondents much more frequently ranked damage to electricity and road infrastructure highest, while among rural communities, water was much more frequently ranked highest. Damage to health and education infrastructure ranked behind all, though notably rural respondents were somewhat more likely to highlight damage to schools and other education infrastructure, a reflection of how school buildings have suffered as a result of being used as IDP shelters or bases for different armed groups.

**Priorities for rehabilitation**

Respondents were asked to list which sector they would prioritize for rehabilitation and repair in their community, ranking them 1-3. Table xx shows the percentage of respondents who included each of the sectors in their responses. Unsurprisingly, this data, to a large extent, mirrors the damage assessment data provided above, with water infrastructure repair appearing most frequently in respondents' rankings, followed by electricity, health, education and, finally, roads.

**Figure 23: Rural-Urban Most Severe Damage Ranking**

Examining the full sample in more detail, it is clear that water infrastructure has the highest prioritization for repair: 49% of respondents who included it in their list ranked it first. Notably, however, roads came in second in terms of prioritization by those who included it: of the 36% who mentioned roads, a full 48% of them ranked it first. This suggests that damage to road infrastructure is less common among
sampled communities than other damage to other sectors, but where it has occurred it has significant negative effects and its repair is highly prioritized.

Breaking down the priorities for infrastructure rehabilitation by geographic area, the different needs of each regional hub begin to emerge. All regional hubs include a high demand for repair of water infrastructure, with only one hub (Saada) having less than 50% include it as a top three priority. For other sectors, there are regional hubs that are less likely to prioritize them: for health infrastructure just 18% of respondents included it in their top three while for electricity in Al Hodeidah is similarly low priority (18%). Outside of Ibb, education generally sat well behind health in terms of service infrastructure and generally lags being other sectors.

As with the damage assessment question above, repair to water provision is particularly important in Sana’a and Al Hodeidah, while restoring the electrical system is clearly the highest priority in Ibb and Aden. Nonetheless, the high scores across sectors reflect the widespread damage to key infrastructure across the board and the respondents understanding of the need for a broad-based approach that seeks to repair different sectors. There is no one sector of acute need, instead all five hubs require at least three forms of infrastructure rehabilitation.

There was some difference in rehabilitation priorities between urban and rural respondents, though this depended largely on the sector under consideration. As shown in figure xx, road rehabilitation was more frequently ranked first in urban areas (and indeed was only in 6% of rural respondents ranking at all) while rural respondents were more likely to emphasize water facilities rehabilitation as a higher priority.

Rehabilitation of water infrastructure was clearly a priority for communities across all five regional hubs; it’s prioritization was highest among respondents in Al Hodeidah, where 68% ranked it first. This was followed by Ibb, where 62% ranked water infrastructure as their first priority. Electricity was highest priority in Aden, where 56% ranked it as most important. In no other hub did more than 40% rank it has highest priority, suggesting that while electricity rehabilitation is important to communities, it is not seen as their most pressing need. Health and education infrastructure rehabilitation ranked behind water and electricity in terms of priority. Notably more than 30% of respondents Sana’a, Ibb, and Saada ranked health infrastructure rehabilitation as their highest priority, suggesting that for some communities the lack of health service is infrastructure is a major need.
Type of rehabilitation support

The survey asked respondents to rank what support to their community they would prioritize in an effort to rehabilitate local infrastructure. Financial support was the most commonly cited and prioritized: included on 82% of respondent responses, with 76% of them ranking it first. Materials and tools support was the second most frequently cited option, reported and ranked second by 64% of those respondents. There was little difference between male and female respondents, though women were somewhat more likely to rank labor support higher (24% of those who included it ranked it as highest priority) than men.

There were some differences by regional hub, as demonstrated in figure xx. In contrast to most hubs, where financial support was most often included in prioritization lists, just ahead of materials and tools, Sana’a included materials and tools much more frequently. For Al Hodeidah, the only support that is not urgently required is labor.

Figure 27: Proportion of respondents who included specific types of support, by regional hub
Housing damage

Respondents were asked if their family’s home had been damaged due to the conflict, in an effort to better understand the extent of residential damage in the research areas as well as the context of service infrastructure.

Exactly 1/3 of the sample reported that their homes had been damaged or destroyed, but there as significant variation across regional hubs, as show in figure xx. As many as 55% of respondents reported housing damage in Sana’a, while just 16% of Al Hodeidah residents reported housing damage.

Unsurprisingly, when assessed by IDP status, current IDPs had the highest reported incidence of housing damage at 58.4%. This was closely followed by returnees at 54.6%, with non-displaced respondents reporting a housing damage rate of 22.4%. These figures suggest that housing damage is a significant contributor to displacement but is not the only one: at least 40% of IDPs did not experience housing damage.

Alongside damage and prioritization assessments, the study sought to evaluate the capacity of individual respondent households and communities more generally to engage in or support local repair and rehabilitation efforts. The responses to these questions primarily highlighted the lack of capacity...
that exists within most Yemeni communities and their vulnerability: for many, they are unable to improve their context without external assistance.

The first question on this topic asked respondents to describe their capacity to repair and rehabilitate their home. Only those who had experienced damage to their house were asked to respond to this question. A 72% responded that they had no capacity to repair their home, with an additional 20% said they had only limited or very limited capacity. There was no gender difference in responses to this question.

There was some variance by regional hub. For example, communities within the Aden hub had a lightly lower proportion of respondents who answered ‘no capacity’ but 33% who answered ‘very limited capacity’ and 12% who responded ‘some capacity.’ This was 12% and 4% more than any other hub for these response options.

Unsurprisingly, IDP status has a significant effect on the capacity of respondents to repair their home. As shown in figure xx, IDP’s had the least capacity to repair their home while returned IDPs had the highest capacity, with 12% saying they had ‘some capacity’ and just under 30% having ‘very limited capacity. In addition to showing how all groups have very limited capacity, this data suggests that the IDPs who return to their homes are those who have somewhat greater ability to effect repair, but that this remains a very small proportion of displaced.

Figure 30: Respondents evaluation of their households’ capacity to repair their homes

Respondents were also asked about their involvement in local infrastructure rehabilitation efforts within their community. This question seeks to evaluate the extent of local collective action efforts to rebuild (i.e. self-help initiatives) while also evaluating the ability of a household to contribute such efforts. A clear majority of respondents have not been involved in any community rehabilitation efforts: 65% of respondents have not been involved, with no real difference between women and men (63% vs 66%, respectively).

There was some difference across regional hubs: respondents in Saada and Sana’a were the most likely to not be involved (86% and 79% respectively, while Al Hodeidah was the only hub where a majority of respondents were involved in such efforts, with only 33% saying they had not contributed. Notably, returnees were the least likely to participate.

The most frequent activities reported were focused on rehabilitating water provision infrastructure (12% of respondents), education (9%). No other sector was more than 5%. This focus reflects the urgency of water needs: in Al Hodeidah where water infrastructure damage was most commonly reported, 20% of respondents have participated in activities to rehabilitate water provision.

Figure 31: Proportion of respondents engaged in community initiatives to rehabilitate infrastructure, by IDP status
Community ability to repair and rehabilitate infrastructure

Respondents were asked to assess their community’s ability to repair and rebuild local infrastructure—and the extent to which such activities exist. These questions built on the previous ones to provide a fuller picture of collective action at the community level.

Most respondents assessed their community’s capacity to repair local infrastructure as either absent (55% of respondents) or limited (22%). Less than 6% expressed a positive outlook for community capacity, and men tended to be more pessimistic about community capacity than women. 10% of women and 16% of women responded that the did know the level of local community capacity. Figure xx shows the gender breakdown of responses.

Figure 32: Respondent’s evaluation of their community’s capacity to rehabilitate local infrastructure, by gender

Regionally, there is some significant variation for certain responses. Respondents in Sana’a, Saada, and Al Hodeidah were the most likely to report their communities had no capacity for local infrastructure rehabilitation at 68%, 67% and 58%, respectively, while in Aden just 36% reported their community had no capacity. It is important to note that while Al Hodeidah had the highest levels of household participation in rehabilitation efforts, respondents from that hub were some of the least optimistic about

---

34 Positive outlook defined as communities have ‘some capacity’, ‘a lot of capacity’, or ‘no assistance needed’
their communities’ capacity to improve the infrastructure situation. In Aden, 12% of respondents saw their community as having ‘somewhat limited capacity’, compared to 1.18% in Al Hodeidah.

There was limited variation in responses to community capacity by displacement status. IDP’s were the most likely to express their community had no capacity (59%), but these were closely followed by both non-displaced and returned IDPs at 55%.

Finally, respondents were asked to outline what, if any, initiatives to rehabilitate infrastructure existed within their community. Across the sample, 45% reported the presence of an active initiative in the village, with significant variation by regional hub. Such initiatives were most frequent in Al Hodeidah and Aden (64% and 71%, respectively) and least common in Sana’a and Saada.

**Figure 33: Proportion of respondents reporting existence of rehabilitation initiatives in their community, by regional hub**

![Bar chart showing proportion of respondents reporting rehabilitation initiatives by regional hub.]

There is also clear variation in the level of rehabilitation initiatives dependent on IDP status. 47% of non-displaced communities reported the presence of initiatives, compared to just 36% of returned IDPs, as shown in the figure below.

**Figure 34: Proportion of respondents reporting existence of rehabilitation initiatives in their community, by IDP status**

![Bar chart showing proportion of respondents reporting rehabilitation initiatives by IDP status.]

In keeping with the damage to water infrastructure and its rehabilitation that has been clear throughout this analysis, initiatives to repair water supply infrastructure were the most common, mentioned by 12% of the sample overall, though this is heavily influenced by the 28% of Aden respondents who reported such initiatives. Across the remaining hubs, including those areas that had the highest priority for water rehabilitation, the percentage reporting rehabilitation initiatives was under 8%.
Governance & Service Delivery

One of the primary challenges identified by the Humanitarian Needs Overview 2018 is the collapse of local governance, precipitated by the ongoing national contest over central authority. Yemen’s local governance systems - namely the Local Councils - have been undermined, de-funded, or have had parallel systems emerge in response to unmet needs during the protracted conflict. In many areas, particularly in Houthi-controlled areas, new systems of local governance have emerged such as Executive Units, which, as the Sana’a Centre for Strategic Studies has explained, while ‘initially created by the UNHCR to coordinate activities related to IDPs and refugees, have become the de facto decision-making bodies. Houthis have re-established these Executive Units and expanded their structure to encompass entire governorates, with local offices in each district. In areas controlled by the internationally recognized government, financial resources are being made available to local councils. These resources have generally been distributed by foreign aid, most notably from the Emirati government, and have almost wholly avoided cash disbursements, and instead focused on direct infrastructure rehabilitation and redevelopment, such as the provision of power generators and the rebuilding of government offices. Despite most of their resources coming from non-government actors, local councils in these areas continue to report to the central council in Sana’a. Most local councils also operate in coordination with tribal leaders with varying degrees of success. Overall, the estimated effect of conflict on local councils has been extremely negative. Previously, these bodies obtained approximately ‘150 million Rials per year in central government support; this has currently dropped to between 20 to 30 million Rials. Income from local sources – such as taxes and fees – that previously brought in between 50 to 100 million Rials per year has also dropped roughly 70% due to the economic fallout of the war. These funding shortfalls have had severe effects on local service delivery, as this assessment will demonstrate.

Overall service delivery

Across the sample, 64% of respondents think that local authorities do not meet “most” or “nearly all” of the basic needs, while 16% report some of their needs are met. Just 0.4% reported almost all needs are met. Ibb (82%) and Saada’a (78%) reported the poorest performing local authorities, closely followed by Sana’a (76%).

Local councils in Ibb hub, while performing very poorly across service delivery indicators in this study, were flagged in FGDs and in the secondary literature as playing a expanded governance role that includes peace-brokering. The Sana’a Center for Strategic Studies has found that, in Ibb, the ‘local councils have managed to mediate numerous local ceasefires, facilitate the movement of basic commodities and humanitarian supplies across front lines, and orchestrate prisoner exchanges, among various other agreements between the warring sides.’ Nonetheless, this assessment shows that while these important brokering functions are important and should garner support, such efforts have not implied an ability to deliver services and the Ibb hub is in particular need to support to provide basic public service provision.

35 Sana’a Center for Strategic Studies & Adam Smith International, ‘The Essential Role of Local Governance in Yemen’, (October, 2016)
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Across all geographies, IDP households consistently report poorer service delivery than returnee households, who in turn report poorer service provision than host community households. Further, notable differences emerged between rural and urban households as urban households reported greater satisfaction with all services. The differences were greater in electricity and public works where urban households were much more likely to report better services.

**Health**

In terms of different types of service delivery, health services are perceived to be falling well short of needs: 43% perceive it as very or somewhat incapable to meet their needs, with female headed households significantly more likely to perceive health services as incapable than male headed households by seven percentage points. Health services in Ibb hub were deemed to be particularly poor as a very high 58.1% described health services as “very incapable” at meeting needs; the highest by over 20 percentage points across all five hubs of the response.

IDP households, much the same as with other indicators in this study, fare worse than host communities and returnees, with just 29% responding that health services are “very” or “somewhat capable”. Host communities are most positive on health services with 38.1% responding positively on this metric – though that proportion is still significantly lower than the proportion of respondents stating that the service is largely incapable at meeting needs.
Education

Education services were in general perceived to be fulfilling community needs more effectively than health services. Precisely half of households responded positively about education services, stating that they are “very capable” or “somewhat capable” in meeting needs. However, when examined across geographies, Sana’a (30.7%) and Ibb (29.6%) are areas in which education services are perceived to be relatively poorer, while in Aden (69.8%) this service is perceived to be much stronger. Similar to the findings for the ability of health services, for education, IDP and returnee households fair noticeably worse than host communities with only 45.3% and 45.4% of respondents respectively reporting that services are capable of meeting needs, in comparison to 51.6% of host community households. Across the sample, there were no meaningful gender differences.

Water

Analysis of the dataset shows that water provision is the utility most commonly failing to meet community needs across geographies and displacement groups. Half of all households stated that water providers are “very” or “somewhat incapable” of meeting their needs – higher than the proportion for health and education services.

There are highly significant differences across geography. Services in Aden hub were deemed the best as 20% and 21% of respondents thought that services were “very” or “somewhat capable” to meet needs respectively. However, in Sana’a and Ibb hubs, the service was extremely poor as just 10.3% and 9% respectively deemed water services as either “very” or “somewhat capable”.

Figure 37: Health services ability to meet needs, by displacement status

Figure 38: Capability of water services to meet needs, by hub
As with every other service and utility in this study, host community households were found to have better water provision than other displacement groups with 23.2% reporting “somewhat” or “very capable” services, in comparison to 21% of IDP households and 19.4% of returnee households.

**Electricity**

The poorest performing utility or service at the local level was found to be electricity provision as 70% thought it was “very” or “somewhat incapable” of meeting needs, with public works (58%) and water (50%) also performing poorly. Electricity was particularly poor in Al Hodeidah hub where two thirds of the sample stated that electricity services were “very” or “somewhat incapable” at meeting their needs. Electricity provision was reportedly stronger in Aden and Saada where 19.8% and 29% respectively found this service “very” or “somewhat capable”. However, these proportions are still low in comparison to other services and utilities assessed in this study. No significant differences emerged along the lines of gender nor displacement status on the perceived capability of electricity provision across hubs.

**Public works**

Public works – another key service delivered by local authorities – was deemed to be performing very poorly across the country. Just 16% of respondents thought that this service was “very” or “somewhat capable” at delivery while, notably, 20% of female respondents “do not know” about this service.

Significant differences were not noted across displacement status groups – though, as with other services, Aden hub emerged as the area where public works are meeting the greatest needs, whereas Ibb is where this service is failing the most significantly. Indeed, in districts in the latter hub, 75% of households believe that public works are “very incapable” of meeting needs.

![Figure 38: Capability of electricity services to meet needs, by hub](image-url)
Social cohesion & safety

Social cohesion

Under the early recovery framework, this assessment considers the effect that the war in Yemen is having on the social fabric of communities – both between and within distinct groupings. Across the country, out of the chaos that the national conflict between the Houthi rebels and the Hadi Government are waging, militant groups have formed and proliferated, weakening the government’s control and, in certain areas, eroding social stability. Long-lasting social divisions, namely between the Saifi’is (south, west, east) and the Zaydi’s (north, and in power) have reemerged and strengthened. As the Project on Middle East Democracy (POMED) noted in 2017, many in the southern districts ‘historically resented northern rule and felt that their wealth and resources lined the pockets of northern Zaydi elite, while their own areas remain politically marginalized and deprived of basic services.’

In this way, the breakdown of government services and the increasing scarcity of resources has contorted tribal relations with varying degrees of increased social tension between community groups, as disputes develop over access and equity to resources.

To measure the state of intercommunal relations and their change over time, this survey tool pursued a line of questioning to unpack these relations, while the qualitative tools sought to examine the causal mechanisms behind these changes. One limitation on the data included in this section was that in Al Hodeidah hub, lines of questioning about social cohesion and safety were deemed to be too sensitive by the local government, resulting in their removal from the survey.

Intercommunal relations

Overall, despite the severity of the armed conflict, mostly positive intercommunal relations were found across the country. The survey tool sought to probe the level of intercommunal cohesion by asking about the quality of relations with other communities in the area – a framing that was understood by participants as communities of a different ethnicity or religious background. A full 74% of respondents felt either “highly positive” or “somewhat positive” about relations with other neighboring communities. This finding held true across genders, displacement group and across geographies. Men held more positive views than women in general, with 76% of male headed households, compared to 72% of female headed households holding generally positive views. This difference was examined in FGDs and was found to be primarily due to women being more confined to the household, interacting less frequently with members of other communities, and thus degrading their perceptions of members of other religious or ethnic groups relative to men.

Across geographies, it emerged that relations in Ibb and Aden hubs were notably more positive than in the other hubs included in this assessment. The most positive relations were seen in Ibb Hub, where over 80% of respondents said that relations were either “very positive” or “positive”. Although these regional variations were present, the overarching message from this data was that intercommunal relations were generally, but not unanimously, positive across geographies.

While regional variance was present, disaggregating the data by displacement did not yield statistically significant differences; that is to state that intercommunal relations remained in the large part, positive from the perspective of IDP, returnee and host community households.
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Some variation emerged when examining rural households against urban ones as rural areas tended to have better relations. 78% of rural households, compared to 67% of urban ones described how they would feel about interacting with another group as “highly positive” or “somewhat positive”.

The recent trajectory of intercommunal relations was also measured by the survey tool with respondents asked about changes in the frequency of intercommunal interactions over the course of the past year. The majority (54%) reported that the situation has remained unchanged in the last year, while over 25% reported that intercommunal contact has increased. These figures suggest that the conflict is Yemen is not reducing intercommunal contacts for over three quarters of households.

At the same time, this does not necessarily mean that intercommunal relations more broadly (especially at community-leader levels) are not deteriorating. Indeed, political loyalties were found in some FGDs as working to divide some communities, resulting in the re-emergence of divisions along the sectarian lines. This finding is corroborated by work from Search for Common Ground, for instance, which found that ‘community gatherings in mosques had previously united individuals from differing social and religious affiliations, but are now exclusive affairs held in separate locations for different religious sects.’

Across the study hubs, Saada was the only area in which a greater proportion of households reported a decrease in interactions (29%) than an increase (28.4%), though this difference was only marginal. These changes by region are illustrated in the graph below.

Figure 40: Change in frequency of interactions between communities across hubs
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Intra-communal relations

When examining intra-communal relations, the data points to relatively strong community cohesion. Overall, 26% of respondents described a neutral relationship while 58% stated that relations within the community are either “very friendly” or “friendly”. Only 9% of respondents explained that relations were “somewhat tense”. Men were also more likely than women to perceive these relations as positive, though only marginally so (5.2%).

A more significant variable for intra-communal relations is geography. Relations in Saada hub were noticeably worse than relations in the other three hubs with just 7.3% reporting that they had “very friendly” relations within their community. Nevertheless, underlining the notion that intra-communal relations are positive across a number of variables, a significant 42.1% reported that relations were “positive”. Statistically significant differences did not emerge along the lines of displacement status.

Safety

The generally positive quality and frequency of both inter- and intra-communal relations offers one element of overall feelings of safety that community members experience as other threats may abound. In general, it was found that household members feel relatively safe within their own communities while around a quarter of respondents feel unsafe within their communities, though there was higher variance according to geography than with other indicators in this section. In Saada, for instance, a significant third of the respondents reported that they feel either ‘somewhat unsafe’ or ‘not safe at all’. This contrast with Sana’a (22%), Ibb (23%) and Aden (18%) hubs where generally feelings of safety were higher.
Within the sample, notably, returnees were recorded as feeling more unsafe than their IDP and host community counterparts. Specifically, 36% of returnee households reported that they felt ‘somewhat unsafe’ or ‘not safe at all’, compared to 20% of IDP and host community households. In addition, secondary data sources point to tensions emerging not only between these groups, but within them as well. As research from Search for Common Ground identifies, ‘conflicts between IDP and host communities have also resulted in violence and reinforced regionalist or tribal affiliations as a source for conflict.’ While this study did not find such tensions in the communities studied, these issues warrant further research as not all the nuance of local conflict dynamics are possible to capture in broad-based survey.

Longitudinal analysis of perceptions data on safety points to a mixed picture. 30% of respondents reported that they feel safer than a year ago, while precisely the same proportion report that they feel less safe, while 40% report that their situation has not changed. Focus group discussions indicated that many respondents do not see their community life as meaningfully different compared to the situation a year ago, at least in terms of socioeconomic welfare and safety.

In terms of geography, a significant deterioration in perceptions of safety was witnessed in Sana’a, where 40% reported that they feel less safe than they did 12 months ago. Given the ongoing instability in that area with fighting having flared up in late 2017, this perhaps at least in part explains the greater feelings of instability. In contrast, feelings of safety notably improved in the Aden hub, which has experienced relative stability compared to other areas of the country. IDPs and returnee households were more likely to report a reduction in their perception of safety, with 34% and 35% of households respectively reporting a degradation in their feelings of safety.

---

Protection & Access to Justice

Protection

The survey sought to examine the prevalence and severity of protection concerns, with a focus on issues caused by a lack of various types of documentation. Survey questioning probed the possession of personal and family ID cards, birth certificates, and property and land ownership documents.

The principal finding was that a majority of households do not hold documentation, which has multidimensional effects on their ability to access formal governance systems from justice mechanisms to certain services. Overall, host community households were the least likely to hold any of the forms of documentation included in the survey. Although a determinative driver for this phenomenon was not identified in the survey nor elucidated in the FGDs, follow-up discussions with enumerators posited that the displacement that IDP and returnee households have undergone acted as an incentive to acquire documentation. At the same time, given the inherent vulnerabilities that displacement carries, this finding should not be seen as concluding that host communities are inherently more vulnerable. All other findings in this assessment point to higher vulnerabilities amongst displaced populations.

Birth certificates

In the sample overall, half of the households do not hold birth certificates for children born within the last five years, only 22% have certificates for some of their children, while only a quarter have a certificate for all children born during this timeframe. There is a greater number of respondents lacking birth certificates in Saada and Al Hodeidah hubs where a striking 91% and 78% respectively of households do not have any documentation for any of their children born within the last five years. Aden and Sana’a, by contrast, are two hubs where this rate is much lower with 29% and 21% of households suffering from this issue.

Figure 44: Proportion of children born in the last five years with birth certificates across all hubs

Households without a displaced member were statistically less likely to own registration certificates for any children in their household born in the last five years. The proportion of respondents reporting that
‘none of their children’ are registered was 52% for these households, and 47% for returnees and 45% for IDP households.

**National ID card**

The survey found that a 30% of households do not hold a national ID card, the most frequently used form of identification in Yemen. Officially this limits access to basic services, and leaves households more vulnerable to extortion. There is a significant gender gap emerges between male and female headed households as 87% of the former and only 50% of the latter households hold ID cards. This finding renders female headed households in a far more precarious situation, particularly, as elaborated later in this section, in terms of accessing justice mechanisms.

National ID cards see similar and significant geographical variance between the different hubs of the response. Households in Al Hodeidah hub once more are significantly less likely to hold this documentation, while levels of ID possession in Saada are similarly low. Households in Aden are the most likely to hold national ID cards. Meanwhile, IDP and returnee households in this assessment were more likely to hold cards as 70.4% and 73.6% of respondents respectively answered in the affirmative, compared to just 65% of non-displaced households.

Family ID cards were less commonly held than national ID cards with 73% of respondents not possessing this card. Just 6% of the sample reported that they had updated their list within the last five years, while only a further 6% updated their list over five years ago. Statistically significant differences did not emerge when disaggregating this data point by geography nor by displacement status.
Land & Property Ownership Documentation

In terms of documentation for land ownership, similar geographic patterns emerge. Overall, for those that own land, documentation is relatively high with 82% of households responding that they hold documentation. Broken down by geography, in terms of property ownership, households in Saada are the most likely to have associated documentation with 86% of households affirming they have documentation, followed by Ibb (82%) and Aden (81%), while Al Hodeidah once more emerges as the hub with the lowest possession of ownership documentation with just 38%.

In terms of the type of land ownership, 90% affirmed that they have ownership documents while just 5% said that they have ‘rental’ documents and 3% said ‘sharecropping.’ Importantly, land ownership does not necessarily entail negative repercussions for households as a customary land tenure system operates across the much of the country. As a recent USAID report found, land disputes are relatively common due to the lack of documentation; ‘however, both urban and rural landowners have a reasonable degree of tenure security with rights enforceable under either civil law or customary and Islamic law.’

For property and home ownership, the same pattern emerges, with an overall rate of property ownership that is lower (63%) than land ownership. Similar geographical variance emerges as up to 83% of households in Ibb and 71% of households in Aden hold home owning documentation, whereas in Al Hodeidah, the rate is much lower, with just 29% of households reporting as such. Documentation for home ownership was one area of documentation possession that IDP households were in a relatively worse position as 38% of the households have never had any documentation, compared to 34% of host community households and 27% of returnee households. Taken in sum, the lack of land and property ownership documentation, particularly for households in Al Hodeidah and particularly for IDP households, presents various protection risks for those population groups.

Access to Justice

Challenges to access for both informal and formal justice mechanisms have prevailed in Yemen before the onset of the civil war, particularly and disproportionately affecting women. For both genders, the situation presented multiple, compounding obstacles, most strikingly acknowledged by a 2013 report by Hiil, which found that in 2013, 95% of the interviewed Yemenis (women and men) reported facing problems when attempting to access justice systems within the previous 4 years. All three tiers of justice institutions in the country – the Courts of First Instance, the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court – have a reputation, both domestically and international, as being highly corrupt and dysfunctional. A 2012 report by the United States Institute for Peace found Yemen’s courts to be ‘ineffective, weak, and case outcomes [are] highly subject to corruption and political interference.’ Since then, the functioning of the central, state-run institutions has only worsened, resulting in greater numbers turning to informal, localized mechanisms.

The data in this assessment corroborates this reliance on informal structures of justice provision. Respondents were asked who they would turn to if they were the victim of a crime, and the most frequently cited individual or body was the community leader, accounting for 27% of responses. The police came second with just 17% of the responses while a 12% reported that would not turn to anybody else. This last figure rises to 18% for women and just 6% for men, reflecting the challenges women face in accessing justice systems and, as a result, women tend to place less trust than men in key institutions or individuals associated with justice. Men (23%) are also significantly more likely than women (12%) to go to the police in the event of a crime.

---
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Significant variation emerges when examining the data by hub. Whereas in Aden, Saada and Ibb community leaders emerged as the primary point of interaction for respondents, in Sana’a and Al Hodeidah the police were the institution that most respondents would turn to. The high response rate in Al Hodeidah should be treated with some caution as the heavily securitized environment there may have skewed the results; indeed, the FGD data points to some discrepancy between the quantitative and qualitative data. FGDs indicated that informal mechanisms were most commonly used. No significant differences were found between groups with differing displacement statuses.

Formal justice institutions

The disengagement with the formal justice sector is illustrated most starkly by the nearly half (49%) of respondents replying that they feel they do not have any access to the formal court system. Just 13% described their access as ‘easy’. Women were also less likely to have easy access to the courts than men with 54% reporting that they never have access in contrast to 45% of men. Similarly, just 9% of women had easy access, compared to 17% of men. By hub, a similar message emerged where Saada hub clearly was an area where formal justice mechanisms are least trusted and accessible, with Aden, Ibb, and Sana’a also hubs were the majority report not ever being able to access the formal system. The commonly referenced reason as to why respondents were not able to access the courts was the need for informal payments with 30% of sample reported as such. A further 18% explained that they thought that going through the formal system would only make things worse.
Distrust in the system is only compounded by government officials often going beyond their mandated roles and taking on informal roles in the justice sector. As the USIP report explains, ‘local community leaders (akls),’ local council members, or government officials at the governorate or district levels acting beyond their formal duties (for example a district director or the governor), is common in Yemen. Often, these actors operate in a more ad hoc way than the formal or the tribal systems that are in place. Other leaders also have assumed informal justice roles, such as religious leaders in nontribal areas such Aden and Taizz.

Informal justice institutions

The use of community-based mechanisms has proliferated across the country with much higher rates of access. Indeed, 51% of the sample reported either “easy” or “very easy” access with just 18% of respondents explaining that they never have access to these mechanisms. However, the disparity between genders observed with formal access is even more significant in informal institutions. Just 16% of female respondents state that they always have access, compared to 30% of men. Similarly, 23% of women described that they had ‘sometimes easy’ access in comparison to 34% of men. There were no meaningful differences between groups of differing displacement statuses.

In conclusion, informal mechanisms are more readily accessed by respondents across the country, despite much attention from international organizations to bolster formal systems. As noted by USIP, outside of the formal system, the most commonly accessed system is the tribal system which frequently arbitrates on community disputes. Despite this, donors have by and large not engaged with the system, instead electing to fund existing formal structures, as explained by HiIL; ‘the majority of rule of law and justice sector assistance programs in Yemen by Western donors have focused on improving the formal justice sector in the cities.’ Looking ahead, it will be vital for international engagement to address these culturally embedded practices and work with them in order to bolster overall trust in and access to the justice system.

---
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Capacity of CBOs to respond

Community based organizations (CBOs) working on development issues, including income generating activities and other socioeconomic work, reported myriad challenges to their ability to respond. The most frequently cited challenges were the lack of financial support to carry out activities, a general sense of insecurity, and a lack of support from local authorities. Approximately 37% of the groups said that they strongly disagree with the statement that they have enough money to carry out their activities. Groups in Sana’a hub in particular, alongside Ibb hub, reported noticeably less funding according to the KIIs.

Figure 50: Degree of dis-/agreement with statement, ‘our group has enough financial resources to carry out its activities’, across all sectors

While CBOs reported that funding was a primary challenge, they had a more positive view of their own technical capacity to carry out their activities. For instance, over half (52%) of sampled organizations said that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement, “my group has the tools and equipment to conduct its activities”.

Organizations often explained that their groups plan their activities strategically, setting goals and objectives and measuring their progress against them. 94% of organizations reported they take this approach to their programs, though of course organizations have a self-interest when discussing their own work.

Similarly, many organizations also replied in the affirmative to the statement, “my group has the local knowledge needed for its work” and reported that they have good working relations with local authorities.

Finally, all but one of the groups strongly agreed with the statement, ‘my group would welcome support from an international organization’, underlining the widespread desire for international assistance among CBO leaders. These findings demonstrate that CBOs consider themselves as having the necessarily contextual knowledge and expertise, though lack material and financial resources to fulfill their activities and meet community needs.
Overview of humanitarian response

This section provides an overview of the humanitarian response in 2017. It is provided here as a reference tool in light of the findings of this assessment, in order to identify potential gaps in thematic or geographic areas.

Context

The total population in need stands at 22.2 million in 2018, having risen considerably from the 18.8 million identified at the beginning of 2017.\(^{51}\) It is important to note that needs rose since the publication of the Humanitarian Needs Overview in late 2017, primarily due to an escalation of hostilities in November and December 2017 and following an extended closure of Yemen’s major ports. These events drove a sharp rise in the price of basic commodities which has contributed to increasing food insecurity across the country.\(^ {52}\)

Strategy

The international community’s humanitarian response is guided by the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan 2018, which outlines four strategic objectives to improve realities on the ground. These are objectives are:

1. To provide life-saving assistance to the most vulnerable people in Yemen through an effective, targeted response;
2. Ensure that all assistance promotes the protection, safety & dignity of affected people, and is provided equitably to men, women, boys and girls;
3. Support and preserve services & institutions essential to immediate humanitarian action & promote access to resilient livelihood opportunities;
4. Deliver a principled, multi-sectoral, coordinated and inclusive humanitarian response that is accountable to and advocates effectively for the most vulnerable people in Yemen with enhanced engagement with national partners.

Given the sheer scale of the needs across Yemen, there is a need to prioritize thematically, by geography and by modality of response. Principally, this has been achieved by transitioning from a Governorate level analysis of needs, to a District one, achieving greater granularity in the targeting process: a process which this assessment has also adopted. Districts in need are clustered and the response to those districts are coordinated by ‘Hubs’, of which there are five, with a sixth planned for operationalization in 2018.

---
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Priorities

i. **Cash:** A number of assessments by the Yemen Cash and Markets Working Group, identified cash as a key modality of support.

ii. **Protection:** The depth of hardship that the crisis is causing, particularly but not exclusively on displaced populations, has meant that protection concerns are of (and are treated as such) central importance in the response. Activities are guided by the HCT Protection Strategy.

iii. **Gender:** Women and children, particularly girls, are disproportionately affected by the crisis. In response, gender focal points have been placed in each cluster of the response.

iv. **Accountability & community engagement:** In 2018, partners will implement the Accountability to Affected People (AAP) commitments at all stages of the program cycle.

v. **Stronger partnerships & local empowerment:** The number of national partners doubled from 2015 to 2017 and the response will seek to continue this trend. Moreover, cooperation with Gulf partners, who contributed over US$458 million in 2017, will be more deeply engaged with.

vi. **Linking Relief to Development and Application of the New Way of Working:** Partners will look to implement early recovery activities which include supporting lifesaving services and livelihoods opportunities in the most vulnerable districts.

vii. **Strategic Use of Pooled Funds:** Funds such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) will be called upon to address short-term funding gaps in the HRP driven by unforeseen needs.

In order to address the panoply of needs (including the risk of famine, disease outbreaks and protracted displacement) – and the approaches to address those needs – an integrated multi-sector response will be implemented. Implementing such a response requires close working cooperation between clusters; a summary of each is given below.
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## Summary of clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>People in Need:</th>
<th>Targeted:</th>
<th>Appeal:</th>
<th># of partners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Security &amp; Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>17.8m (targeted: 8.8m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$1.27bn</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>16.37m (targeted 12.3m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$572.4m</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water, Sanitation &amp; Hygiene</strong></td>
<td>16m (targeted 11.1m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$298.8m</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection</strong></td>
<td>12.9m (targeted 5m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$104.1m</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition</strong></td>
<td>7m (targeted 5.6m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$195.4m</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter &amp; Non-Food Items, Camp Coordination &amp; Camp Management (CCCM)</strong></td>
<td>5.4m (targeted 3m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$195.3m</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>4.1m (targeted 1.8m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$53.4m</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Employment &amp; Community Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>8m (targeted 1.3m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$99.1m</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (RMMS)</strong></td>
<td>0.17m (targeted 0.17m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US$106.7m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US$2.2m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US$33.3m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US$22.9m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex

Quantitative Assessment: Survey Tool

For the enumerator:

Name:
Date:
Governorate:
District:
Sub-district:
Urban ward / village:

Introductory statement:

Good day. My name is […]. I am here on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme. We are an international organization providing support to communities across Yemen, including in this Governorate. We are currently undertaking an assessment across many Governorates to identify what communities need so that we can make sure that our support is relevant.

We are interested to hear all your opinions, both positive and negative. You can choose not to participate in this interview if you don’t want, and you can choose not to answer questions or to stop the interview at any time. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your relationship with the United Nations, or your ability to get services from them or anybody else.

Anything you say in this interview is private – we will not tell your name to anyone when we use this information. If you choose to give an example of an incident, please do not name the individuals or organizations in question. We cannot offer you any benefits as a result of this interview, but we will use your opinions to design our support and make sure it does the right things to help this area.

Acknowledgment of informed consent: Yes / No

For the participant:

Gender:   Male   Female
Age:

Highest education level of respondent:

- Did not complete elementary school
- Elementary School
- High school
- University
- Other, specify:
Gender of HH head: Male Female

Number of household member:
   Male (.........) Female (.........)

Disability status:
   - If yes, number of disabled HH members:

Are you…:
   ☐ Displaced (IDP) ☐ Not-displaced (Host)
   ☐ Returnee ☐ Other, please specify

Displacement status:
   - If you are displaced, length of time displaced:
     o Less than 6 months
     o Less than a year
     o Between 1-3 years
     o Over 3 years

Begin survey:

Socioeconomic Needs

1. Over the past 12 months, what was the main source of income for this household?
   Guidance: Income can be cash or in-kind, e.g. foraging or food growth for own consumption

   ☐ Farmer
   ☐ Casual laborer (construction & agricultural work)
   ☐ Fishing
   ☐ Trading (retail or wholesale of goods)
   ☐ Artisan/Handicraft (making goods for sale)
   ☐ Animal husbandry / livestock rearing
   ☐ Teacher
   ☐ Doctor/nurse/health worker
   ☐ Government employee (not-teacher, not-doctor/nurse/health worker)
   ☐ Private sector employee
   ☐ Remittances
   ☐ International NGO
   ☐ National NGO
   ☐ None
   ☐ Other________

2. How much did you earn last month?

   9

   organization to collect taxes or fees from the household.

   ☐ 1-50,000 Yemeni Rial
   ☐ 50,001 – 100,000 Yemeni Rial
- 100,001 – 200,000 Yemeni Rial
- 200,001 – 500,000 Yemeni Rial
- 500,001+ Yemeni Rial
- No income, dependent on remittances
- No income, dependent on aid
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

3. How has your income changed since a year ago?
   - Very much reduced
   - Slightly reduced
   - Unchanged
   - Slightly increased
   - Very much increased
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say

4. In terms of your household’s assets (home, personal items, savings), compared to the average household in this co, are you:
   - Very poor
   - Quite poor
   - Average
   - Quite rich
   - Very rich
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say

5. In terms of assets (home, personal items, savings), compared to last year, is your household:
   - Much less wealthy
   - Somewhat less wealthy
   - The same
   - Somewhat more wealthy
   - Much more wealthy
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say

6. What are your household’s main expenditures?  
   Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as largest proportion of household expenditure
   - Food
   - Education
   - Healthcare
   - Debt repayments
   - Livelihood assets
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other:_______________________________

7. Do you borrow money regularly?
   - Yes
   - No
8. If 7 is yes, who / what are your main sources of credit?

Guidance: Select as many as apply

- Government bank
- Private / commercial bank
- Micro-finance institution
- Co-operative / savings group in village / union
- NGO
- Family
- Friends
- Informal money lenders
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other:_____________________

9. What are the main economic challenges facing your household?

Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as most significant economic challenge.

- Low Salary
- No salary
- No jobs
- Safety and security in the workplace
- High commodity prices
- High debt and repayment terms
- Natural disasters / drought
- Physical access to markets
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other:_______________

10. Do you have access to a market to buy or to sell products?

- Yes, very easy access
- Yes, access is usually fine
- Yes, but only some of the time / access is often difficult
- No
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

11. What are the main challenges in accessing the market?

Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as most significant challenge.

- Not enough cash to buy food
- Not enough cash for transport to/from market
- Distance from here
- Poor infrastructure
- Market does not have good quality / wide selection of products
- Safety / security at the market or on the way
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other:___________________
12. Is access to the market better or worse than a year ago?
- Much better
- Somewhat better
- Neither better nor worse
- Somewhat worse
- Much worse
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

13. During the last 30 days, has your household been able to meet its basic needs for food, water, shelter and urgent medical care?
Guidance: Includes both household’s ability to pay, and the access the household has to the service/goods. If they have money, but lack access, mark as no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent medical care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy for cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. During the last 30 days, in order to support your household or to compensate for your income, has your household turned to any of the following coping strategies?
Guidance: Select as many as apply
- Reducing food consumption
- Buying food on credit
- Buying food with less quality
- Spending savings
- Borrowing money
- Borrowing assets
- Loaning or selling land
- Loaning or selling livestock
- Rely on remittances
- Working overtime
- Ensuring the children in the household are working
- Selling food vouchers to buy other needs
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
15. During the last 30 days, in order to compensate for your household’s potential lack of food, has your household turned to any of the following coping strategies?

*Guidance: Select as many as apply*
- Reducing food consumption
- Buying food on credit
- Buying food with less quality
- Spending savings
- Borrowing money
- Borrowing assets
- Loaning or selling land
- Loaning or selling livestock
- Rely on remittances
- Working overtime
- Ensuring the children in the household are working
- Selling food vouchers to buy water
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other__________

16. What is the main role of the eldest woman in your household?

*Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as the role that the woman spends most of her time doing:*
- Domestic work and child rearing
- Work
- Leisure
- Religious worship
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

17. What are the main barriers for women to take a greater role in the local economy?

*Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as the most significant barrier*
- Child rearing and domestic work
- Not skilled
- Not enough jobs
- Limited access to finance
- Cultural and religious reasons
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other__________

Infrastructure Damage, Repair & Rehabilitation

18. What infrastructure in this village / town ward has been most damaged by conflict?

*Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as most damaged infrastructure facility*
- Roads
- Health facilities
19. What infrastructure in this village / town ward would you prioritize for repair and rehabilitation?

*Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as the highest priority infrastructure facility for repair*

- Roads
- Health facilities
- Education facilities
- Water supply
- Electricity supply
- Telecommunications
- Transport
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other________

20. What sort of support for your village / town ward would you prioritize in terms of repair and rehabilitation of local infrastructure?

*Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as the highest priority infrastructure facility for repair*

- Financial
- Materials & tools
- Labor
- Trainings on construction methods
- I don’t know

21. How would you describe your household’s capacity to repair and rehabilitate your home?

- No capacity
- Very limited
- Some capacity
- A lot of capacity
- No assistance needed
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

22. What community infrastructure repair and rehabilitation initiatives is your household involved in?

*Guidance: Select as many as apply*

- Roads
- Health facilities
- Education facilities
- Water supply
23. How would you describe your community's ability to repair and rehabilitate the local infrastructure?
- No capacity
- Very limited
- Somewhat limited
- Some capacity
- A lot of capacity
- No assistance needed
- I don't know
- Prefer not to say

24. What community infrastructure repair and rehabilitation initiatives are present in this village / town ward?
Guidance: Select as many as apply
- Roads
- Health facilities
- Education facilities
- Water supply
- Electricity supply
- Telecommunications
- Transport
- Nothing
- I don't know
- Prefer not to answer
- Others: __________________

Social cohesion, peace & reconciliation

Guidance: Repeat the confidentiality of the survey answers to the respondent by explaining that no answers given will be attributed to the respondent directly. Request the respondents, therefore, to respond openly and honestly as far as possible.

25. How do you feel about interacting with members of another group or community?
Guidance: do not read “prefer not to say” option.
- Highly positive
- Somewhat positive
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat negative
- Very negative
- Prefer not to say
26. How would you describe the relationship between your community and other communities of different groups in this area?
Guidance: do not read “prefer not to say” option.
- Very tense
- Somewhat tense
- Neither tense nor friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Very friendly
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

27. Compared to 12 months ago, has your amount of interaction with members of another group increased, decreased, or stayed the same.
Guidance: do not read “prefer not to say” option.
- Increased
- Stayed the same
- Decreased
- Don’t know /
- Prefer not to say

28. In future, would you like to see these interactions become more frequent, less frequent, or stay the same?
Guidance: do not read “prefer not to say” option.
- More frequent
- Stay the same
- Decrease
- Don’t know /
- Prefer not to say

29. Do you feel safe in this town/village?
Guidance: do not read “prefer not to say” option.
- Very safe
- Somewhat safe
- Not sure
- Somewhat unsafe
- Not safe at all
- Prefer not to say

30. If you feel unsafe, what is causing this?
Guidance: Rank 1-3, with 1 as most significant factor in feeling unsafe.
- Airstrikes
- On the ground armed conflict
- Cyclone and flooding
- Violence from villagers within your community
- Violence from another group
- Lack of documents
- Domestic violence
- Sexual abuse
- Arbitrary arrest by security forces
- Thieves
- Fires
- Epidemics
- Lack of livelihood opportunities
- None
- Don’t know
- Prefer not to say
- Other: ________________

31. Compared to 12 months ago, do you think the safety situation in your area has improved, stayed the same, or got worse?
- Improved
- Stayed the same
- Got worse
- Prefer not to say

Local Governance & Social Service Delivery

32. How would you rate how the local authority meets the needs of people in this area?
- Meet nearly all needs
- Somewhat meet needs
- Some needs are met, some needs are not
- Most needs are not met
- Almost all needs are not met
- I don’t know
- Prefer not to say

33. How would you rate the capacity of local authority to meet the needs of the people in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic service</th>
<th>Very capable</th>
<th>Somewhat capable</th>
<th>Neither capable nor incapable</th>
<th>Somewhat incapable</th>
<th>Very incapable</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works (Such as roads, maintenance, or garbage collection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Do you have access to the following basic services?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic service</th>
<th>Yes, very easy access</th>
<th>Yes, easy access</th>
<th>Yes, access is usually fine</th>
<th>Yes, but only some of the time / access is often difficult</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works (Such as roads, maintenance, or garbage collection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Justice

35. To whom, or what other organization would you turn to first if you were the victim of a crime?
   - Influential elders
   - Family & friends
   - Court system
   - Village / town ward government official
   - Police
   - Other security forces
   - Community group leader
   - Religious leader
   - Local Council
   - Private lawyer
   - Paralegal
   - International organization
   - I would not turn to others for help
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other, please state:__________

36. Are you able to access the formal court system?
   - Yes, always
   - Yes, sometimes
   - Yes, only rarely
   - Never
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say

37. If and when the formal court system is inaccessible, why not?
   Guidance: Select as many as apply
   - Informal payments are needed
   - I don’t think they are fair
▪ Too far
▪ Fear that it will make things worse
▪ I don’t know
▪ Prefer not to say

38. Are you able to access community-based justice mechanisms?
▪ Yes, always
▪ Yes, sometimes
▪ Yes, only rarely
▪ Never
▪ I don’t know
▪ Prefer not to say

39. If and when community-based justice mechanisms are inaccessible, why not?
*Guidance: Select as many as apply*
▪ Informal payments are needed
▪ I don’t think they are fair
▪ Too far
▪ Fear that it will make things worse
▪ I don’t know
▪ Prefer not to say

Protection & Documentation

40. Have any new children been born in this household in the past 5 years?
▪ Yes
▪ No
▪ Prefer not to say

41. [If yes] Do these children have birth certificates?
▪ Yes all
▪ Yes but not all
▪ Yes but lost
▪ None of them
▪ Prefer not to say

42. Do you have a national ID?
▪ Yes
▪ No, I did but I have lost it
▪ No, I have never had that documentation
▪ I don’t know
▪ Prefer not to say

43. When was the last time the family list has been updated with a family ID?
▪ Less than a year ago
▪ 1-5 years ago
▪ More than 5 years ago
▪ Never
▪ I do not have a family ID
44. Do you own land (either residential or for farming purposes)?
   ▪ Yes
   ▪ No
   ▪ Prefer not to say

45. [Filter: If 44 ‘yes’]
   Do you have documentation that proves the ownership of the land where your house is located (residential property)?
   ▪ Yes
   ▪ No, I did but I have lost it
   ▪ No, I have never had that documentation
   ▪ I don’t know
   ▪ Prefer not to say
   ▪ Not applicable

46. [Filter: If 44 ‘yes’]
   Do you have documentation that proves the ownership of your farmland (where applicable)?
   ▪ Yes
   ▪ No, I did but I have lost it
   ▪ No, I have never had that documentation
   ▪ I don’t know
   ▪ Prefer not to say
   ▪ Not applicable

47. [Filter: If yes to 45], for what type of access to land does your documentation permit?
   ▪ Owned
   ▪ Rented
   ▪ Sharecropped
   ▪ I don’t know
   ▪ Prefer not to say
   ▪ Not applicable

48. Does not having documentation have a negative impact on your situation?
   ▪ Yes, it is detrimental in many ways
   ▪ Yes, it is somewhat detrimental
   ▪ Yes, but only a limited detriment
   ▪ No, not at all
   ▪ Not applicable

49. Do you have documentation that proves the ownership of your home?
   ▪ Yes
   ▪ No, I did but I have lost it
   ▪ No, I have never had that documentation
   ▪ I don’t know
   ▪ Prefer not to say
   ▪ Not applicable
50. If yes, does this have an impact on your situation?
   ▪ Yes, it is detrimental in many ways
   ▪ Yes, it is somewhat detrimental
   ▪ Yes, but only a limited detriment
   ▪ No, not at all
   ▪ Not applicable

Guidance: Enumerator ends interview with following passage:

“This is the end of the survey, thank you very much for your participation. Just to reiterate, we cannot promise anything from our project, but we will consider carefully your views when we are thinking about our activities. Thank you very much for your time.”

Post-interview data quality assurance

Was the interview attended by a local leader or other actor who may have influenced respondent’s answers?

Guidance: This does not refer to another family member, but a person with local authority eg. police, military etc.

   ▪ Yes (describe)
   ▪ No

Did the respondent struggle to answer many questions due to language or comprehension issues?

Guidance: This refers to comprehension of the questions, rather than not knowing the answer

   ▪ Yes (describe)
   ▪ No

Did the respondent appear to be answering questions openly and truthfully?

   ▪ Yes
   ▪ No (describe)

Additional notes:

Qualitative Tool: Focus Group Discussion Guide

For the enumerator:

Name:

Date:
Governorate: 

District: 

Sub-district: 

Urban ward / village: 

The enumerator will first read out the statement below in order to gain informed consent of the participants.

**Introductory statement:**

*Good day. My name is [...]. I am here on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme. We are an international organization providing support to communities across Yemen, including in this Governorate. We are currently undertaking an assessment across many Governorates to identify what communities need so that we can make sure that our support is relevant.

We are interested to hear all your opinions, both positive and negative. You can choose not to participate in this interview if you don’t want, and you can choose not to answer questions or to stop the interview at any time. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your relationship with the United Nations, or your ability to get services from them or anybody else.

Anything you say in this interview is private – we will not tell your name to anyone when we use this information. If you choose to give an example of an incident, please do not name the individuals or organizations in question. We cannot offer you any benefits as a result of this interview, but we will use your opinions to design our support and make sure it does the right things to help this area.*

Acknowledgment of informed consent: Yes / No

Then, the enumerator will fill out the participant information sheet which will be provided before beginning the discussion.

**Begin FGD:**

**Socioeconomic Needs**

1. What are the main economic challenges facing your community?  
   - How have they changed over the past 12 months?  
   - Why?

2. What are the main sources of income in this area?  
   - How have they changed over the past 12 months?  
   - Has the level of income increased or decreased for people here in the past 12 months?  
   - Why?

3. What are people’s assets? What do they own?  
   - Has that changed in the past 12 months?
4. Does this community have economic interactions with people from other villages / town wards nearby?
   ▪ What kind of interaction is that?
   ▪ How do people feel about it (positive or negative)?
   ▪ Why?

5. What do people in this community do to cope if they lack income?
   ▪ Has that changed in the past 12 months?
   ▪ Why?

6. What do people in this community do to cope if they lack food?
   ▪ Has that changed in the past 12 months?
   ▪ Why?

7. What role do women play in the local economy?
   ▪ What are the main barriers they face for greater involvement?
   ▪ What are some of the ways to increase their participation?

Infrastructure Damage, Repair & Rehabilitation

8. What infrastructure in this village / town ward has been most damaged in the war?
   ▪ Are there initiatives under way to rehabilitate them? Yes or No, if yes what?
   ▪ Which infrastructures would you prioritize repairing first?
   ▪ Is the community able to do this without external support?
   ▪ If not, what sort of external support would be most beneficial?

Social cohesion, peace & reconciliation

9. Do you engage in joint social activities with members of other groups?
   ▪ How does the community feel about this?
   ▪ How would you describe the relationship between yours and other communities in the area overall?
   ▪ In future, would you like to see these interactions become more frequent, less frequent, or stay the same?

10. Do you feel safe in this town/village?
    ▪ If you feel unsafe, what is causing this?
    ▪ Compared to 12 months ago, do you think the safety situation in your area has improved, stayed the same, or got worse?

Access to Justice

11. To whom, or what other organization would people in this community turn to first if they were the victim of a crime?
    ▪ Are people generally able to access the formal court system?
    ▪ If and when the formal court system is inaccessible, why not?
    ▪ Do people readily access community-based justice mechanisms?
    ▪ If and when community-based justice mechanisms are inaccessible, why not?
Protection & Documentation

12. Do people in this community have XXX?
   ▪ If not, does it impede on their ability to carry out their livelihood? If yes, how?

13. Do people in this community have documentation that proves the ownership of land?
   ▪ If not, does it impede on their ability to carry out their livelihood? If yes, how?

14. Do people in this community have documentation that proves the ownership of property?
   ▪ If not, does it impede on their ability to carry out their livelihood? If yes, how?

*Guidance: Enumerator ends interview with following passage:*

“This is the end of the focus group, thank you very much for your participation. Just to reiterate, we cannot promise anything from our project but we will consider carefully your views when we are thinking about our activities. Thank you very much for your time.”

Post-FGD data quality assurance

Was the interview attended by a local leader or other actor who may have influenced respondent’s answers?

*Guidance: This does not refer to another family member, but a person with local authority eg. police, military etc.*

▪ Yes (describe)
▪ No

Did the respondents struggle to answer many questions due to language or comprehension issues?

*Guidance: This refers to comprehension of the questions, rather than not knowing the answer*

▪ Yes (describe)
▪ No

Did the respondents appear to be answering questions openly and truthfully?

▪ Yes
▪ No (describe)

Additional notes:

**Qualitative Tool: Key Informant Interview Guide**

*For the enumerator:*

Name:

Date:
Governorate:
District:
Sub-district:
Urban ward / village:

The enumerator will first read out the statement below in order to gain informed consent of the participant(s).

**Introductory statement:**

*Good day. My name is [...] I am here on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme. We are an international organization providing support to communities across Yemen, including in this Governorate. We are currently undertaking an assessment across many Governorates to identify what communities need so that we can make sure that our support is relevant.*

*We are interested to hear all your opinions, both positive and negative. You can choose not to participate in this interview if you don't want, and you can choose not to answer questions or to stop the interview at any time. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your relationship with the United Nations, or your ability to get services from them or anybody else.*

*Anything you say in this interview is private – we will not tell your name to anyone when we use this information. If you choose to give an example of an incident, please do not name the individuals or organizations in question. We cannot offer you any benefits as a result of this interview, but we will use your opinions to design our support and make sure it does the right things to help this area.*

Acknowledgment of informed consent: Yes / No

Then, the enumerator will fill in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Founding year of organization</th>
<th>Name of position of respondent</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Begin KII:**

1. Why was your organization formed?
2. What does your organization do?
   a. What are the types of activities that it does?
3. What are the main challenges that your group faces in conducting its activities?
4. Do you think that your group has the technical skills required to undertake your work?
5. How does your organization pay for the work it conducts?
   a. Is the group funded by an international organization?
6. Does your group have access to the necessary resources to do its work?
   a. If not, what are the resources that your group needs more of?
I am now going to read you a series of statements. For each one, I would like to know if you agree, disagree, or are unsure:

7. “My group has the money to conduct its activities”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say

8. “My group has the tools and equipment to conduct its activities”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say

9. “My group is well organized to conduct its activities”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say

10. “My group sets goals and objectives, and measures its progress against them”
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree
    f. Don’t know
    g. Prefer not to say

11. “My group has local knowledge needed for its work”
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree
    f. Don’t know
    g. Prefer not to say

12. “My group considers the welfare of everyone in this community, rather than a select few”
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree
    f. Don’t know
    g. Prefer not to say
13. “My group has good working relations with local authorities”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say

14. “My group consults the community first to understand their needs before conducting its activities”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say

15. “My group would welcome support from an international organization”
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Somewhat agree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Somewhat disagree
   e. Strongly disagree
   f. Don’t know
   g. Prefer not to say