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Executive Summary

This is the 8th Report of the Task Force on Population Movement (TFPM). The purpose of each report is to provide an up-to-date and accurate snapshot on displaced populations, their locations and displacement trends across Yemen.

The TFPM was established in April 2015 in response to the events of March 2015, which marked the commencement of international armed conflict in Yemen that has resulted in a major humanitarian crisis with the occurrence of mass displacement.

Released a year on from the start of international conflict, the 8th report reaffirms the continuation of the humanitarian impact of the conflict and validates a total number of 2,755,916 internally displaced persons (IDPs), displaced due to the current conflict in Yemen, as compared to 2,430,178 IDPs in the 7th report (published in March 2016). This represents an increase in the overall displaced population since the last report with increases observed in pockets of Yemen such as Amanat Al Asimah, Taizz, and Al Hudaydah. Despite this, the level of displacement has remained relatively stable in other areas, primarily the south, as reported in the 7th report. The recently validated increase of 325,738 IDPs (an increase of 13% from the 7th report) reflects the TFPM’s findings that while further displacement continues to decrease in the south, it is continuing to be documented in the north. Furthermore, the increase in displacement that is observed in this report is marked by two key considerations:

- The relative stability of the number of IDPs that was noted in the 6th and 7th reports is likely to fluctuate with momentum towards return increasing and then slowing and displacement continuing.
- The statistics for Sa’ada used in the 7th report are not fully verified with some data having to be carried over from previous TFPM reports. This is due to the continuing difficulties of conducting displacement tracking in Sa’ada and, in consequence, updated data is not available in respect of 6 districts within the governorate. The TFPM attempted to obtain updated statistics without success and will therefore seek to address the statistics in Sa’ada in the 9th report.

The TFPM, with its operational partners, continues to harmonize data collection and establish and implement a unified methodology for dedicated displacement tracking. In consequence, the number of districts covered by the TFPM has increased to 301 (compared to 290 districts covered in the 7th report) of the 333 districts of Yemen with over 1,418 data updates received for the 8th report. In addition, the system of confidence rating has continued to have a positive impact in the data collection for the 8th report. 81 per cent of data for the 8th report falls into the categories of Good and Medium of the data confidence level.

1 The TFPM is a technical working group (TWIG) of the Protection Cluster and is co-led by IOM and UNHCR. The group convenes on a regular basis to coordinate and systematize the collection of displacement statistics by operational partners for the purpose of analysis and triangulation of the data with an effort to, in coordination with the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), facilitate the humanitarian response in Yemen as well as provide a basis for planning.

2 An explanation of the methodology can be found in Annex 5.

3 An explanation of the data confidence level categories can be found in the section on ‘Methodology’ (section VI, page 16).

4 Data is carried over from previous reports in areas where an update of information was not possible to obtain for this report. Alternatively, if the updated data collected falls within the low or poor data confidence levels then data from the 6th or 7th report, if rated good or medium, is used. The increase in carry-over data in the 8th report is because dedicated displacement
This report continues to detail displacement statistics related to natural disasters, primarily the cyclones that impacted the southern coast of Yemen in November 2015. These statistics are presented separately and as a population in need distinct from the conflict-affected IDPs.

Chart 1: Number of districts covered by the 8th report

tracking has not yet been fully rolled-out in the northern governorates. The principal method of data collection in the north remains the receipt of reports from operational partners, which provides less predictability. The shortened time-frame between the 7th and 8th reports, now on a monthly cycle whereas previously on a bi-monthly cycle, has also impacted on partner ability to collect and provide data on displacement.
Displacement Highlights

- **2,755,916** internally displaced persons (IDPs) were identified for this report compared to **2,430,178** individuals in the 7th report (an increase of **325,738** individuals).

  - **26% of IDPs are men**
  - **29% of IDPs are women**
  - **22% of IDPs are boys**
  - **23% of IDPs are girls**

- The average size of a household is **6**.

- **66%** of the IDP population has sought refuge in Taizz (620,934 individuals), followed by Hajjah (367,007 individuals), Amran (295,620 individuals), Sana’a (272,589 individuals) and Sa’ada (245,897 individuals).

- An **increase** in the number of IDPs within a governorate was reported in **13** governorates; Taizz, Shabwah, Sanaa, Sa’ada, Marib, Lahj, Ibb, Hajjah, Amran, Amanat Al Asimah, Al Maharah, Al Hudaydah, and Al Dhale’e. In comparison, in the 7th report increases were observed in **11** governorates.

- A **decrease** in the number of IDPs within a governorate was reported in **9** governorates; Abyan, Aden, Al Bayda, , Al Jawf, Al Mahwit, , Dhamar, Hadramaut, Raymah, and Sa’ada. In the 7th report, decreases were noted in **10** governorates.

- Sa’ada, Marib, Sana’a and Amran have the highest IDP to host community ratios; 38%, 29%, 23% and 23%, respectively, while Sa’ada has suffered the largest population change since before the crisis with a reduction of **38%** of the original population.

- **472,338** returnee individuals were identified in Abyan, Aden, Al Bayda, Al Dhalee, Hadramaut, Ibb, Jawf, Taizz, Lahj and Shabwah.

  - **25% of Returnees are men**
  - **30% of Returnees are women**
  - **22% of Returnees are boys**
  - **23% of Returnees are girls**

- **68%** of the returnee population have been identified in Aden (300,912 returnees) and **14%** in Lahj (63,510 returnees).

---

5 While the TFPM has been able to achieve a high level of sex disaggregation through the reports received from partners, the portion of the data still remains disaggregated only between the male and female groups. This explains the disproportion in the number of boys and girls in relation to men and women. The average size of household of six persons is calculated by the number of households divided by the total number of IDPs per governorate.

6 Estimates on the IDP to host community ratios were made based from population baselines obtained from the Yemeni Central Statistics Office’s Population Projections for 2016. Additional details can be found in Annex 4.

7 Throughout the report a ‘returnee’ refers to an IDP who, as reported to the TFPM, has moved and returned (voluntarily, in safety and with dignity) to his/her home or place of habitual residence.

8 The number of returnees does not match the decrease in the number of IDPs since the 6th report because the TFPM uses a methodology that tracks population through key informants (see Annex 5). Consequently, an identified decrease may not precisely match an increase in returnees as it is likely that the key informant providing the information will be in a different geographic location.
Following the landfall of the two cyclones, Chapala and Megh, IOM implemented displacement tracking to track and monitor displacement triggered as a result. This report validates that 2,100 households (12,600 individuals) remain displaced while 4,851 households (29,106 individuals) have since returned to and in Hadramaut, Shabwah and Socotra.
Displacement Overview and Trends

A year on from the onset of the current crisis that intensified with the start of airstrikes by a Saudi-led Coalition on the 26 March 2015, displacement in Yemen has continued with some governorates hosting hundreds of thousands of IDPs.

The 8th report reaffirms the scale of the displacement seen in Yemen identifying 2,755,916 IDPs to have fled their homes as a result of conflict. Overall the data trend signifies an increase of some 325,738 individuals since the 7th report. An increase of 108,041 IDPs was reported in Amanat Al Asimah, 65,886 IDPs in Taizz, 53,496 IDPs in Al Hudaydah, and 49,931 IDPs in Amran. A further population increase of 89,035 was reported across the governorates of Marib, Sana’a, Hajjah, Sa’ada, Ibb, Al Dhale’e, Lahj, Shabwah, and Al Maharah. For the 8th report, a significant increase was observed in Amanat Al Asimah as a result of new data collected and is largely owing to presence of significant numbers of displaced populations from Sa’ada (72,481 individuals), Taiz (71,381 individuals), Al Jawf (9,133 individuals) and Marib (8,376 individuals) and IDPs displaced within the governorate itself (33,460 individuals).

So far through 2016, there has been a general trend of displacement populations decreasing in many of the southern governorates while IDP populations have increased in several of the northern governorates. This is consistent with the political and security situation on the ground since the publication of the 6th report in December 2015.

In general, IDP populations have been concentrated within the northern regions of Yemen and these areas account for over two-thirds of the overall displaced population, as indicated in Table 1 below. The five governorates with the highest IDP population were reported as Taizz (620,934 individuals), highlighted in the map below, followed by Hajjah (367,007 individuals), Amran (295,620 individuals), Sana’a (272,589 individuals), and Sa’ada (245,897 individuals).
Mass displacement on a scale as seen in Yemen leads to significant changes in population numbers across the governorates. In Sa’ada, the pre-crisis estimated population was 1,044,000 individuals and has since reduced by 38 per cent, which is indicative of the proportion of the governorate population that is now in displacement. As a result, the current population within the governorate can be estimated at 651,853 individuals.\(^9\) While the population of Sa’ada continues to suffer the most significant change, the governorates of Marib, Amran, Sana’a, Taizz, and Hajjah also report high IDP to host community ratios which vary between 29 and 17 per cent. Further analysis for each governorate can be found in Table 1 and Annex 2.

Displacement has occurred at a varied rate from governorate to governorate. The majority of the displaced population has fled from Taizz, Sa’ada, Amanat Al Asimah, Hajjah and Sana’a with 87% or 2,389,632 individuals identified to have originated from these governorates as further indicated in Table 2. From these governorates, 1,206,435 IDPs are displaced within their own

---


### Table 1: Number of displaced households and individuals per governorate of displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate of Displacement</th>
<th>IDP Households</th>
<th>IDP Individuals</th>
<th>Percentage of IDPs to host community</th>
<th>Current estimated total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>23,148</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>575,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>25,566</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>882,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bayda</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>33,246</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>746,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Dhalee</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>714,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hudaydah</td>
<td>18,974</td>
<td>113,488</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3,137,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jawf</td>
<td>5,559</td>
<td>33,354</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>573,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maharah</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>145,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mahwit</td>
<td>8,265</td>
<td>49,588</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>724,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanat Al Asimah</td>
<td>32,377</td>
<td>211,965</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,965,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amran</td>
<td>46,231</td>
<td>295,620</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,294,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamar</td>
<td>19,705</td>
<td>118,477</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,976,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,449,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajjah</td>
<td>60,894</td>
<td>367,007</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2,101,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>18,564</td>
<td>111,384</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,885,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>8,811</td>
<td>52,866</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>991,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marib</td>
<td>15,676</td>
<td>95,869</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>327,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymah</td>
<td>7,186</td>
<td>43,074</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>592,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>41,045</td>
<td>245,897</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>651,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanaa</td>
<td>45,039</td>
<td>272,589</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,201,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>8,514</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>624,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taizz</td>
<td>103,489</td>
<td>620,934</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2,867,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>452,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,755,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,431,707</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The governorates of Sā‘ada and Taizz have not experienced an inflow of IDPs from other governorates. The IDP population in these governorates are identified to have displaced only from within their own governorate.

Focus on Taizz

Taizz remains the governorate of origin for the highest number of IDPs with approximately 869,721 individuals fleeing the conflict in Taizz. The TFPM identified 620,934 individuals to have fled to areas still within the governorate while the remaining population of 248,787 individuals were tracked to areas outside of the governorate. These findings are consistent with reports from Displacement tracking is carried out by identifying groups of IDPs within a given geographic area. The area of origin recorded for that group of IDPs is therefore based on the majority of the identified population in that given area of displacement. As a result, this can lead to populations who originate from less affected governorates having their area of origin under-represented as they do not represent the majority within an identified group for that given geographic area.
the field and findings of humanitarian actors that the situation in Taizz remains dire and unlikely to improve in the near future. Within Taizz, displacement has been observed to primarily occur from the districts of Al Mudhaffar (343,571 individuals), Al Qahirah (187,148 individuals) and Salh (154,428 individuals). These populations account for 79% of the total population identified to have fled areas within Taizz.

The southern district of Ash Shamayatayn, which borders Lahj, hosts the highest IDP population in Taizz with 159,444 IDPs. This is followed by Hayfan which also borders Lahj and hosts 71,070 IDPs. The district of At Ta’iziyah on the border with Ibb hosts the third largest IDP population (in Taizz) of 57,090 IDPs. These three governorates host 46% of the total IDP population in Taizz.

Of those displaced from areas in Taizz, there are 248,787 IDPs who fled out of the governorate. The majority of this population, 92,754 IDPs has sought refuge in the bordering governorates of Ibb with 60% of the population displacing to Ibb’s southern districts of Dhi As Sufal, As Sabrah, Madhaykhirah and As Sayyani which sit on the northern border of Taizz.

Approximately, 71,381 IDPs have fled from Taizz to Amanat Al Asimah, while a further 27,966 IDPs fled to the bordering districts of Lahj to the south of Taizz. IDPs from Taizz sought refuge in Lahj primarily in the bordering districts as indicated in Map 2 below.

Map 2: Number of displaced and returned households by populated location overlay with displacement flows from within Taizz
Returnees

The geographic distribution of the IDP population is a result of the relative stability seen in large areas of the southern governorates. This analysis is complemented with the identification of 443,232 returnees in ten governorates of the southern regions of Yemen.

The TFPM has documented the return of 300,912 individuals in Aden. A further, 63,510 previously displaced individuals have returned to Lahj and 25,530 returnees were identified in Al Dhale’e. Approximately, 20,214 individuals were identified to have returned in Shabwah. However, this figure will be reviewed with data collection for the next TFPM report. Since the collection of data for this report, conflict has escalated in the governorate, which is likely to have caused some of those who returned to flee again. This will be investigated for the next report. Smaller populations have returned to other governorates as identified in Table 3.

Table 3: Number of returnee households and individuals per governorate of return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate of Return</th>
<th>Returnee Households</th>
<th>Returnee Individuals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>50,152</td>
<td>300,912</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bayda</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Dhalee</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>25,530</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jawf</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>5322</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hudaydah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maharah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mahwit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanat Al Asimah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amran</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajjah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>10,585</td>
<td>63,510</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marib</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanaa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>20,214</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taizz</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>12,396</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>70,194</td>
<td>421,164</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDP returns are currently being captured in the south where IOM has rolled-out the Displacement Tracking Mechanism (DTM) for dedicated movement tracking. UNHCR is in the process of rolling out a similar system covering the north, Population Movement Tracking (PMT) following which return movements will also be captured.
Needs Overview

In December 2015\textsuperscript{12} the TFPM conducted location assessments\textsuperscript{13} in 10 governorates.\textsuperscript{14} In each of these governorates, assessments were conducted in the top three districts hosting the largest IDP populations with a total of 70,169 households (422,361 Individuals). 2,439 key informants were surveyed (an average of 81 key informants in each of the 30 districts) and 2,119 sites hosting IDPs were assessed at the community level with a population of approximately 468,310 non-displaced households (2,635,787 Individuals) in the districts covered, which is a ratio of 1 IDP to 211 individuals of the host population. The IDP population accounts for 15\% of the total IDP and non-IDP population in the area assessed and 17\% of the total IDP population indicated in the 7th report.

While the sample size still remains small, the findings are indicative and help to corroborate past data reported by the TFPM and findings of assessments that have been conducted by numerous other actors on the needs of IDPs. The full dashboards of the findings for each governorate have been uploaded to the Protection Cluster page of the Humanitarian Response Website.\textsuperscript{15} Some of the main findings include the following:

\textbf{Priority needs:} The identified needs of IDPs vary according to location. However, basic needs feature as the top priorities for IDPs. For example, in the three districts assessed in Sa’ada governorate the top three needs were indicated to be food, shelter/housing and drinking water (as shown in the accompanying chart – chart 2). Nevertheless, the assessments also indicated that, while there are major needs for basic tangible items such as food, shelter and NFIIs, there is also need for less tangible assistance such as providing safety, psychosocial support and education. It is also apparent that needs vary across governorates and even districts to the extent that attention must be paid to the local factors that impact on access to goods and services.

\textbf{Intentions of IDPs:} The majority of IDPs indicated that their intention is to return to their place of origin in the longer-term. However, a large number of IDPs believed that they would continue to be displaced for at least the next three months. However, it is evident that some IDPs believe that they will have no choice but to integrate locally in the longer term.

\textsuperscript{12} The delay in the publication of the data is owing to the need to clean and analyse the data.
\textsuperscript{13} The Location Assessment is implemented based on a sample of locations identified through displacement tracking. The assessment aim to profile the IDP population by capturing cross-sectorial information on the needs, vulnerabilities, intentions, shelter arrangements, safety concerns and sex and age disaggregated data of displaced families living in the assessed locations.
\textsuperscript{14} These assessments were conducted as part of the dedicated displacement tracking activity undertaken by the Yemen Women’s Union (YWU) and the Humanitarian Forum Yemen (HFY), under a partnership agreement with UNHCR. The assessments were conducted in the governorates within UNHCR’s area of responsibility as the co-lead of the TFPM, which are Amant Al Asimah, Amran, Dhamar, Hajjah Hudaydah, Mahwit, Marib, Raymah, Sa’ada and Sana’a.
\textsuperscript{15} These can be accessed through the following link: \url{https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/system/files/documents/files/location_assessment_-_all_goves.pdf}
Non-Food Items (NFIs): Based on the data collected in all 10 governorates there is a clear need for a variety of NFIs, which change from location to location and which seem to be influenced by the local availability of items in the market. There are indications that a variety of items are locally available, as is illustrated in the chart from Marib (chart 3). Access to fuel consistently emerges as limited. Problems associated with obtaining NFIs did not indicate quality to be a major factor although price and distance were.

WASH: Significant problems were indicated across the board in relation to access to water, and WASH facilities with some variation from governorate to governorate and also from district to district as is seen in the chart from Raymah (chart 4). Major problems associated with accessing potable water included distance and cost and, in relation to WASH, the number of available toilets and showers. Issues were also identified with regard to waste disposal.

Food: The major problem related to accessing food that was identified was in relation to price. In addition, the majority of IDPs indicated that the consumption of food has decreased since the commencement of the crisis in March 2015 (as is reflected in the chart from Hajjah – chart 5) and that malnutrition is believed to be in existence.

Health: Access to health assistance varied greatly according to location with a greater range of facilities and services available in city centers with options reducing in outlying districts. An example of this is quite significantly visible in the Hajjah dashboard. Major problems associated with health facilities included distance, cost, and quantity and quality of services. A stark finding was that the percentage of adults and children indicated to be suffering from nervous disorders and depression is extremely high, as shown, for example, in the chart from Al Hudaydah (chart 6).
**Education:** Results were mixed on the topic of school attendance by children between the age ranges of 6 – 17 years. However, where non-school attendance was a factor the main reasons cited included the security situation and distance to schools. In addition, an inability to afford school equipment was also highlighted in some locations as a factor negatively impacting on children pursuing education.

**Protection:** The presence of vulnerable persons has been consistently identified in all governorates such as pregnant women and girls, unaccompanied children, persons with disabilities, female headed households as well as minor headed households. This initial information provides an indication of the types of vulnerability identified and the consequent needs that require further exploration at the household level for a more in-depth understanding of vulnerabilities amongst the displaced population (as reflected in the chart from Mahwit – chart 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pregnant &gt;18</th>
<th>Pregnant &lt;18</th>
<th>Unaccom. children</th>
<th>Physically disabled persons</th>
<th>Female head of HH</th>
<th>Minor head of HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahwit City</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Tawilah</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bani Sad</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Livelihoods:** The main factors affecting livelihoods linked to the crisis are the high cost of tools, equipment and commodities to engage in activities such as farming and trade productive resources and insecurity. While access to markets and the availability of food was indicated, inhibiting factors are a lack of transport options and/or limited economic resources. It was also noted that there is a difficulty in purchasing food owing to the high cost of commodities as is indicated in the chart from Amant Al Asimah (chart 8).
**Shelter:** The data consistently shows that the majority of IDPs are residing with host families while the next highest percentage of IDPs is renting accommodation. This is illustrated by the shelter chart for Dhamar governorate (chart 9). Significant numbers of IDPs are residing in unfinished buildings, collective centres and schools with a very small number residing in other shelter types such as make-shift shelters and tents. A key consideration that emerges from this data is that there is a large percentage of the non-displaced host community that is impacted by displacement, particularly where households are hosting IDPs. One of the major problems cited in relation to shelter is over-crowding. In terms of shelter needs, considering that the assessments we conducted in December, winterization was mentioned by both IDPs and non-displaced host families as a key need with the need for rental subsidies and emergency shelter kits also featuring prominently. An overall assessment of shelter situations in the south is reflected in chart 10.

### Chart 9: Dhamar # of HHs in each shelter type (3 districts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter Type</th>
<th>Number of HHs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With host families</td>
<td>2874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented house</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished and abandoned buildings</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collective shelters</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 10: IOM DTM data: Type of shelter across IOM region of operation

- In village/town, with host families who are relatives (no rent fee)
- In village/town, using rented accommodation
- In village/town, with host families who are not relatives (no rent fee)
- In village/town, using schools, Health facilities, religious building
- In village/town, using private or public building
- In informal settlement (grouped families) in rural areas
- Out of settlement (isolated families)
- In camps
- In informal settlement (grouped families) in urban areas

---

16 DTM assessments were conducted in 12 governorates of Al Jawf, Taizz, Ibb, Al Bayda, Lahj Al Dale’e, Aden, Shabwah, Abyan, Hadramaut, Al Maharah, and Socotra.
Natural Disaster Displacement

While displacement triggered from conflict has occurred on a mass scale since 26 March 2015, displacement triggered from natural phenomena has also occurred. The trigger for displacement can alter the character of displacement and the plight of those who have fled. For this reason, the statistics of natural disaster triggered displacement and return are presented separately and as a distinct number from the conflict-affected displacement statistics.

This report validates that 12,600 IDPs remain displaced as a result of natural disasters. The largest populations were identified in Al Maharah – 4,974 individuals. Following this, Hadramaut (3,516 individuals), Socotra (2,022 individuals), Shabwah (1,440 individuals), Abyan (612 individuals) and Al Jawf (36 individuals) also host IDPs who fled natural disasters. This is further detailed to the district level in Table 5 and visualized in Map 3.

Table 5: Number of displaced households and individuals per district of displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>IDP Households</th>
<th>IDP Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Ahwar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Zingibar</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jawf</td>
<td>Bart Al Anan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maharah</td>
<td>Al Masilah</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maharah</td>
<td>Sayhut</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ad Dis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Al Mukalla</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ar Raydah Wa Qusayar</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ash Shihr</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Brom Mayfa</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Daw'an</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ghayl Bin Yamin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Hajar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Al Talh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Ar Rawdah</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Ataq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Dhar</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Mayfa'a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Rudum</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socotra</td>
<td>Hidaybu</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socotra</td>
<td>Qulensya Wa Abd Al Kuri</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of these identified IDPs (4,974 individuals) had fled areas of Al Maharah, followed by Hadramaut (3,678 individuals) and Socotra (2,022 individuals). As time has passed since the cyclones, significant populations of return have been observed.
Those displaced from natural disasters in comparison to those fleeing conflict face a different situation once the disaster has ended and, as reflected by the number of households who have already been able to return, may have more chance for return than those displaced by conflict which is ongoing.

The 8th report confirms a return population of 29,106 individuals who are linked with natural disaster related displacement. 82 per cent were identified to have returned to Hadramaut, 10 per cent to Shabwah and 8 per cent to Socotra. This is further detailed to the district level in Table 6 and visualized in Map 3.

Table 6: Number of returnee households and individuals per district of return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>IDP Households</th>
<th>IDP Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ad Dis</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Al Mukalla</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Al Mukalla City</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>7,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Ash Shihr</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Brom Mayfa</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>14,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadramaut</td>
<td>Hajar</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Al Talh</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Ataq</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Dhar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabwah</td>
<td>Rudum</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socotra</td>
<td>Hidaybu</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socotra</td>
<td>Qulensya Wa Abd Al Kuri</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,851</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 3: IDP and Returnee populated locations triggered by natural disasters
Methodology

The 8th report has been compiled based on data on displacement reported by a number of sources. This information has been cross-referenced and triangulated to develop a realistic snapshot of the displaced and returnee populations in Yemen as much as the situation and operational limitations have allowed\(^\text{17}\).

For the 8th report, and where operational capacity has permitted, the TFPM has implemented the harmonized Area Assessment (See Annex 5 for more details) within Yemen. As a result of the TFPM's efforts to harmonize its displacement tracking methodology, the data accuracy has improved.

In areas where the harmonized Area Assessment is yet to be implemented, the previous approach of consolidating information from local partners on the ground was again adopted for this report. Key points in relation to this approach of data management are the following:

- If a district is not mentioned in the data, either the information was not available for this district (no partner was able to access the district) or there was no presence of IDPs in that area.
- If data was received from a partner for a governorate that had been previously reported, validation and verification of information was conducted through a comparative review of the 7th and 6th reports.
- Where new data was provided for this report and included district information with age and sex disaggregated statistics then that data was retained for the report, replacing any previously reported data for the same area.
- Where data was provided for this report for districts in a governorate that had not been reported in the 7th report then that data was added to this report.
- The confidence rating that had been initially adopted in the analysis of the 5th report was also used for the analysis prepared for this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>All information is reported, including full sex and age disaggregation of data and districts of origin and displacement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Partial or no sex and age disaggregated data and full location information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Includes full or partial sex and age disaggregated data but does not contain governorate and/or district of origin or either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Does not contain governorate and/or district of origin or displacement information and has no sex and age disaggregated data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this rating scale, if data for a particular district fell into the Poor category, that data was omitted on the basis that it could not be relied on primarily owing to the fact that the lack of location data and disaggregation leads to the possibility of duplication with other reported districts.

\(^{17}\) Limited access and other operational constraints can limit information-gathering activities leading to a fluctuation in the displacement figure within hard to assess governorates. The limitations include but are not limited to movement restrictions, limited access to locations, a sudden massive wave of displacement, intermittent internet and telephone service, difficulties in communication with key informants due to prevailing insecurity.
## Governorate Statistical Data

### Taizz
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 620,934 individuals (+65,886)\(^{18}\)
  - 103,489 households (+10,981)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 23 out of 23 districts covered
  - Partner data used: IOM DTM
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 23
  - 23 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
  - 0 data carried-over from the 7th report
- **Number of returnees**
  - 2,066 households

### Hajjah
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 367,007 individuals (+13,788)
  - 60,894 households (+1,989)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 97% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 5
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 29 out of 31 districts covered
  - Partner data used: EXU, YWU, NFDHR, UNHCR (PMT) & CSSW
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 600
  - 521 Good/Medium, 79 Low and 0 Poor
  - 595 data carried-over from the 6th and 7th report

### Amran
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 295,620 individuals (+49,931)
  - 46,231 households (+5,210)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 76% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 20 out of 20 districts covered
  - Partner data used: EXU branch, YWU branch, NFDHR & UNHCR (PMT)
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 242
  - 36 Good/Medium, 206 Low and 0 Poor
  - 61 data carried-over from the 6th & 7th reports

### Sana'a
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 272,589 individuals (+18,627)
  - 45,039 households (+2,641)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 90% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 5
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 16 out of 16 districts covered
  - Partner data used: EXU, CSSW, UNHCR (PMT) & YWU
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 105
  - 78 Good/Medium, 27 Low and 0 Poor
  - 97 data carried-over from the 6th & 7th reports

---

\(^{18}\) Increases (+) or decreases (-) in the numbers are shown in relation to the 7th report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of IDPs</th>
<th>Number of districts and partners</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sa’ada</td>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>Number of districts and partners</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 245,897 individuals (+7,919)</td>
<td>• 9 out of 15 districts covered</td>
<td>• Total data entry = 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 41,045 households (+1,317)</td>
<td>• Partner data used: YWU &amp; UNHCR (PMT)</td>
<td>• 34 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender and age disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 27 data carried-over from the 4th and 7th report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of gender and age disaggregation data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average family size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanat Al Asimah</td>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>Number of districts and partners</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 211,965 individuals (+108,041)</td>
<td>• 10 out of 10 districts covered</td>
<td>• Total data entry = 927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 32,377 households (+15,002)</td>
<td>• Partner data used: EXU, YWU, INTERSOS,</td>
<td>• 927 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADRA &amp; UNHCR (PMT)</td>
<td>• 18 data carried-over from the 6th &amp; 7th report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender and age disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 27% of gender and age disaggregated data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average family size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamar</td>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>Number of districts and partners</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 118,477 individuals (-4,210)</td>
<td>• 12 out of 12 districts covered</td>
<td>• Total data entry = 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 19,705 households (-927)</td>
<td>• Partner data used: CSSW, UNHCR (PMT), EXU</td>
<td>• 64 Good/Medium, 29 Low and 0 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and YWU</td>
<td>• 21 data carried-over from the 6th &amp; 7th reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender and age disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of gender and age disaggregation data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average family size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hudaydah</td>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>Number of districts and partners</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 113,488 individuals (+53,496)</td>
<td>• 17 out of 26 districts covered</td>
<td>• Total data entry = 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 18,974 households (+8,856)</td>
<td>• Partner data used: UNHCR (PMT) &amp; YWU</td>
<td>• 51 Good/Medium, 28 Low and 0 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 38 data carried-over from the 7th report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender and age disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 99% of gender and age disaggregated data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average family size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibb</td>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>Number of districts and partners</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 111,384 individuals (+7,080)</td>
<td>• 20 out of 20 districts covered</td>
<td>• Total data entry = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 18,564 households (+1,180)</td>
<td>• Partner data used: IOM DTM</td>
<td>• 23 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 0 data carried-over from the 7th report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender and age disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of gender and age disaggregated data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average family size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of returnees

- 359 households
### Marib
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 95,869 individuals (+35,219)
  - 15,676 households (+5,464)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 97% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 14 out of 14 districts covered
  - Partner data used: Sama, UNHCR (PMT) & YWU
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 66
  - 42 Good/Medium, 24 Low and 0 Poor
  - 55 data carried-over from the 6th & 7th report

### Lahj
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 52,866 individuals (+2,034)
  - 8,811 households (+339)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 15 out of 15 districts covered
  - Partner data used: IOM DTM
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 15
  - 15 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
  - 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

### Al Mahwit
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 49,588 individuals (-10,344)
  - 8,265 households (-1,762)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 9 out of 9 districts covered
  - Partner data used: CSSW, UNHCR (PMT) & YWU
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 37
  - 15 Good/Medium, 22 Low and 0 Poor
  - 31 data carried-over from the 6th and 7th report

### Raymah
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 43,074 individuals (-1,221)
  - 7,186 households (-439)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 97% of gender and age disaggregated data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 6 out of 6 districts covered
  - Partner data used: UNHCR (PMT) & YWU
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 33
  - 0 Good/Medium, 33 Low and 0 Poor
  - 27 data carried-over from the 6th & 7th report

### Al Jawf
- **Number of IDPs**
  - 33,354 individuals (-9,162)
  - 5,559 households (-1,524)
- **Gender and age disaggregation**
  - 100% of gender and age disaggregation data collected
- **Average family size**
  - 6
- **Number of districts and partners**
  - 12 out of 12 districts covered
  - Partner data used: IOM DTM
- **Methodology**
  - Total data entry = 18
  - 18 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
  - 0 data carried-over from the 7th report
- **Number of returnees**
  - 887 households
### Al Bayda

**Number of IDPs**
- 33,246 individuals (-10,230)
- 5,541 households (-1,705)

**Gender and age disaggregation**
- 100% of gender and age disaggregation data collected

**Average family size**
- 6

**Number of districts and partners**
- 20 out of 20 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

**Methodology**
- Total data entry = 20
- 20 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

**Number of returnees**
- 360 households

### Al Dhalee

**Number of IDPs**
- 27,654 individuals (+2,418)
- 4,609 households (+403)

**Gender and age disaggregation**
- 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected

**Average family size**
- 6

**Number of districts and partners**
- 9 out of 9 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

**Methodology**
- Total data entry = 10
- 10 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

**Number of returnees**
- 4,255 households

### Aden

**Number of IDPs**
- 25,566 individuals (-270)
- 4,261 households (-45)

**Gender and age disaggregation**
- 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected

**Average family size**
- 6

**Number of districts and partners**
- 8 out of 8 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

**Methodology**
- Total data entry = 8
- 8 Good/Medium data, 0 low and 0 poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

**Number of returnees**
- 50,152 households

### Abyan

**Number of IDPs**
- 23,148 individuals (-306)
- 3,858 households (-51)

**Gender and age disaggregation**
- 100% of gender and age disaggregation data collected

**Average family size**
- 6

**Number of districts and partners**
- 11 out of 11 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

**Methodology**
- Total data entry = 11
- 11 Good/Medium, 0 low and 0 poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 6th report

**Number of returnees**
- 1,657 households
Shabwah

Number of IDPs
- 8,514 individuals (+1,908)
- 1,419 households (+318)

Gender and age disaggregation
- 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected

Average family size
- 6

Number of districts and partners
- 17 out of 17 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

Methodology
- Total data entry = 17
- 17 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

Number of returnees
- 3,845 households

Hadramaut

Number of IDPs
- 3,798 individuals (-4,908)
- 633 households (-818)

Gender and age disaggregation
- 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected

Average family size
- 5

Number of districts and partners
- 15 out of 30 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

Methodology
- Total data entry = 15
- 15 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

Number of returnees
- 4,163 households

Al Maharah

Number of IDPs
- 1878 individuals (+42)
- 313 households (+7)

Gender and age disaggregation
- 100% of gender and age disaggregated data collected

Average family size
- 6

Number of districts and partners
- 9 out of 9 districts covered
- Partner data used: IOM DTM

Methodology
- Total data entry = 9
- 9 Good/Medium, 0 Low and 0 Poor
- 0 data carried-over from the 7th report

Operational Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Abyan</th>
<th>Aden</th>
<th>AlBayda</th>
<th>AlHajjah</th>
<th>AlHudaydah</th>
<th>AlJawf</th>
<th>Amanat Al Asimah</th>
<th>Amran</th>
<th>Dhamar</th>
<th>Hadramaut</th>
<th>Hajjah</th>
<th>Ibb</th>
<th>Lahij</th>
<th>Marib</th>
<th>Raymah</th>
<th>Saada</th>
<th>Sanaa</th>
<th>Shabwah</th>
<th>Taizz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch of YWU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exu Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFDHR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sama AL Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR (PMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>