

# CCCM PRINCIPLED PHASEOUT GUIDELINES



These Guidelines provide a structured approach for CCCM partners in Yemen to effectively phase out and hand over site management responsibilities. Aligned with the Yemen CCCM Cluster Strategy 2025-2027 and global best practices, this document outlines a systematic process across three primary transition pathways: handover to local organizations, handover to local authorities and communities, and site phase-out and closure.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

In 2025, Yemen is facing a severe humanitarian crisis as it enters the tenth year of conflict. Many IDPs have been displaced since the peak of the conflict in 2015-2018, with approximately 1.6 million IDPs still living in 1,896 spontaneous settlements and 401 smaller sites. These sites continue to be overcrowded, lacking access to essential services and infrastructure, and faced with heightened protection risks.

The operating environment presents substantial challenges:

- **Funding constraints:** Reductions in humanitarian funding, including donor fatigue and the suspension of USAID programming in early 2025, have strained service delivery.
- **Capacity limitations:** Local actors and authorities have limited resources and varying levels of technical capacity.
- **Site fragmentation:** Hundreds of small, dispersed sites make consistent monitoring and service mapping challenging.
- **Compounding crises:** Economic contraction, protection risks, and climate hazards disproportionately impact displacement sites.

### 1.2 CLARIFICATION OF KEY TERMINOLOGY

To ensure consistent understanding and approach, the following terms are defined for the purpose of this document:

Term	Definition	Key Characteristics
<b>CCCM Strategic Exit</b>	Planned withdrawal when durable solutions are achieved, or comprehensive handover arrangements are established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aligned with durable solutions and/or local capacity</li><li>• Adequate planning time</li></ul>
<b>Project Exit</b>	Organizational departure from a site due to project-specific constraints before strategic exit conditions are met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Driven by funding/contract end</li><li>• Limited timeframe (accelerated phaseout)</li></ul>

Term	Definition	Key Characteristics
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phaseout focus on critical function continuity and risk mitigation</li> </ul>
<b>National CCCM Exit</b>	Cluster-wide withdrawal from country operations as part of broader humanitarian transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient government capacity</li> <li>Systematic handover to national systems</li> <li>Coordinated across sites and areas</li> </ul>
<b>Site Closure</b>	Complete cessation of site operations with population movement or site transformation into permanent settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical change to site status</li> <li>Population relocation or integration</li> <li>Infrastructure decommissioning or upgrading</li> </ul>
<b>Phaseout</b>	Gradual, planned, and coordinated reduction of specific CCCM activities or services provided at the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be partial or complete</li> <li>May occur within any exit type</li> <li>Often involves responsibility transfer</li> <li>Flexible timeline based on context</li> </ul>
<b>Handover</b>	Formal transfer of site management responsibilities from one actor to another	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge and capacity transfer</li> <li>Asset and resource transfer</li> <li>Documentation and agreement</li> <li>Ongoing support arrangements</li> </ul>

These terms are interrelated but distinct. For example:

- A site closure always involves phaseout but not all phaseouts lead to closure
- Handover is a process that can occur within any of the scenarios
- Handover is a crucial process even in abrupt project exit scenarios

### 1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

These Guidelines aim to assist CCCM partners in Yemen to timely plan, implement, and monitor site phaseout processes in response to prioritization linked with funding cuts. Specifically, they aim to:

- Provide a framework to guide partners, subnational and area-based coordinators , through the process of phasing out site management activities
- Outline procedures for each of the three pathways identified in the Yemen CCCM Cluster Strategy 2025-2027

- Ensure protection and accountability to affected populations throughout the process
- Promote sustainable handovers that maintain essential services and protections

## 1.4 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

All site phaseout activities should adhere to the following principles:

- **Protection mainstreaming:** Ensuring safety, dignity, and rights of displaced populations
- **Age, gender, and diversity mainstreaming:** Addressing specific needs and ensuring inclusive participation
- **Accountability to affected populations:** Maintaining two-way communication channels
- **Do no harm:** Preventing unintended negative consequences
- **Conflict sensitivity:** Considering potential impacts on social cohesion
- **Climate resilience:** Incorporating sustainable and adaptive solutions
- **Transparency:** Sharing sufficient and timely information with relevant stakeholders (IDPs, Local Authorities, the CCCM Cluster...)
- **Coordinated Exit:** Withdrawal from displacement sites must be conducted in close coordination with CCCM actors and other relevant stakeholders. A phased and well-communicated approach is essential to prevent service gaps, mitigate protection risks, and avoid secondary displacement
- **Planned and Sustainable Transition:** A clear, time-bound, and actionable plan must be developed and implemented, prioritizing transitional measures that ensure the continuity of essential services and uphold the dignity and rights of displaced populations throughout the process

## 2. SITE PHASEOUT PATHWAYS

### 2.1 STRATEGIC PATHWAYS

These represent planned, strategic approaches aligned with the Yemen CCCM Cluster Strategy 2025-2027 which identifies three possible pathways for handover and exit:

1. **Handover to local authorities and communities:** Structured transfer of responsibilities to government entities and community-based structures
2. **Handover to local organizations:** Structured transfer of site management responsibilities to capable local NGOs<sup>1</sup> or civil society organizations
3. **Phaseout and closure:** Gradual cessation of site management activities alongside site closure, supporting return or local integration

### 2.2 PATHWAY DETERMINATION

The appropriateness of each pathway should be determined through a thorough assessment of:

- 1- Service and infrastructure sustainability
- 2- Local stakeholder capacities (community committees, local authorities, and local NGOs)
- 3- People's intentions and available options for return/integration/relocation

---

<sup>1</sup> In certain contexts, where national NGOs (NNGOs) lack the necessary capacity and there are limitations in time or resources to support their development, international NGOs (INGOs) may assume site management responsibilities. In such cases, the INGO taking over the site also assumes the responsibility for planning and implementing a transition strategy to eventually hand over site management to a NGO.

The choice of pathway should align with local conditions and stakeholder capacity. **Handover to local organizations** works best where capable NGOs exist and have community acceptance, particularly in sites where continued external management is needed but international presence is reducing. **Handover to authorities and communities** is most suitable where local government demonstrates both readiness and basic capacity to assume responsibilities, and where community structures are strong and representative. **Site transition or closure** pathways are appropriate where population movements are already occurring naturally, land tenure arrangements support formalization, or where return areas have become sufficiently stable and accessible.

The assessment should be conducted in close consultation with site populations, local authorities, and other key stakeholders to ensure contextual appropriateness and acceptance.

### 3. PRE-PHASEOUT ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING

#### 3.1 GAP ANALYSIS AND READINESS ASSESSMENT

Before initiating phaseout activities, partners should ensure:

**Site-level assessment** that includes population figures and vulnerabilities profile, service mapping and critical gaps, infrastructure status and maintenance needs, protection risks and mitigation measures, community governance structures, land tenure and ownership status, integration prospects with surrounding communities, and long-term sustainability of site location and infrastructure.

**Recipient assessment** of the capacity of potential handover recipients (local organizations, authorities, or communities), resource and training needs, and acknowledgment and integration by displaced and host populations.

**Broader context assessment** of security situation in and around the site, options for durable solutions, surrounding services and resources, development opportunities and plans, and social cohesion between displaced and host populations.

These assessments and/or validation of their findings should be done jointly with stakeholders who are involved in the phaseout.

#### 3.2 PRIORITIZATION

The CCCM Cluster should coordinate partners to periodize sites for phaseout based on:

1. Severity classification: The assessment of a site's vulnerability level based on the CCCM Cluster's Severity Score Analysis, which evaluates risks, service gaps, and protection concerns.
2. Availability of handover options and recipient capacity: The presence of capable entities (local organizations, authorities, or community structures) willing and able to assume site management responsibilities.
3. Population intentions and durable solutions options: The collective preference of the site population regarding their future (return, local integration, or resettlement) and the feasibility of these options.
4. Resource constraints and geographical concentration: The allocation of limited CCCM resources based on site distribution patterns and operational efficiency considerations.
5. Strategic alignment with Area-Based Site Management transition: The compatibility of site phaseout with the Yemen CCCM Cluster's phased transition to Area-Based Site Management (ABSM). By aligning site-level exits with ABSM implementation, partners can

avoid duplicate efforts and ensure continuity as management shifts from site-specific to area-level approaches.

6. Potential for sustainable integration into local communities: The likelihood that a site can successfully transform from a temporary displacement setting into a permanent community integrated with surrounding areas.
7. Feasibility of site formalization and infrastructure upgrading: The practical and legal possibility of converting temporary site infrastructure into permanent, sustainable community assets.

Sites should be prioritized for exit to optimize the use of limited CCCM resources while ensuring protection outcomes. High-priority sites for exit are those with lower severity of needs where handover recipients exist and population movements align with available/potential durable solutions, these represent opportunities to transition resources to more sustainable local management. Geographic efficiency also drives prioritization: isolated sites that require disproportionate resources to manage, or conversely, clustered sites that can benefit from coordinated exits and shared capacity building investments.

Lower-priority sites for exit are those with critical protection needs, absence of capable handover recipients, or significant protection risks that would worsen without continued CCCM presence. However, even high-severity sites may require exit due to project constraints and could necessitate gap management and advocacy for alternative coverage before strategic handover approaches are viable.

### 3.3 PHASEOUT PLAN CHECKLIST

Each site phaseout plan should include:

#### **Core Components:**

- Clear objectives and expected outcomes
- Timeline with phased approach ( minimum 3 months recommended)
- Roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, including identification of functions that will remain community-led post exit
- Communication strategy for transparent information sharing
- Budget for transition activities
- Monitoring and evaluation framework
- Contingency plans for potential challenges
- Long-term vision for site transformation or closure
- Integration strategy with municipal services and governance structures

#### **Key deliverables required:**

- Updated SMT Profiles (site profile with updated population figures, service map and gap analysis)
- Capacity assessment of handover recipients
- Training and capacity building plan, in coordination with the CCT and YDR CBT
- Assets and infrastructure inventory
- Handover documentation of management responsibilities
- Community engagement strategy
- Site transition/integration roadmap
- Land tenure and HLP documentation, if any

### 3.4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

**Establish a Site Phaseout Committee** with representation from:

- CCCM partner(s) and site management teams
- Relevant local authorities
- CCCM Subnational Coordinator, and Area-Based Coordinator where present
- Community leaders and representatives (ensuring gender balance and inclusion of marginalized groups)
- Service providers
- Protection actors
- Other: relevant municipal planning authorities, development actors and local civil society

This committee should meet as needed throughout the phaseout process to ensure coordinated planning, implementation, and monitoring. Their key responsibilities and functions are:

#### **1. Coordinated Planning**

- Oversee and ensure the preparation of comprehensive phaseout plans
- Incorporate input from all representative stakeholders
- Develop strategies that align with community needs and capacities

#### **2. Implementation Monitoring**

- Oversee execution of phaseout activities
- Ensure actions are aligned with the approved phaseout plan
- Track progress against established timelines and milestones

#### **3. Stakeholder Consultation**

- Serve as the main forum for stakeholder engagement throughout the phaseout process
- Facilitate communication with site populations, local authorities, and service providers
- Ensure two-way communication is maintained with affected populations

#### **4. Issue Resolution**

- Address operational challenges arising during the phaseout process
- Resolve protection concerns and safeguarding issues
- Adapt strategies as necessary to overcome obstacles

#### **5. Accountability and Inclusion**

- Ensure community voices are represented in decision-making processes
- Prioritize inclusion of women and marginalized groups
- Maintain transparency in all committee operations

## 4. IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES BY PATHWAY

### 4.1 PATHWAY 1: HANDOVER TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND COMMUNITIES

Phase	Key Activities
<b>Engagement</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Identify appropriate government (Executive Unit; MoSAL...) focal points and community structures</li><li>2. Assess capacity to assume site management responsibilities</li><li>3. Develop joint vision for site management</li><li>4. Address potential conflicts of interest or protection concerns</li></ol>
<b>Capacity Building</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Train local authorities and committees (based on need) on humanitarian principles and protection standards, site management basics, coordination mechanisms, community engagement approaches.</li><li>2. Strengthen community governance structures by ensuring representative and inclusive committees, clear terms of reference, decision-making processes, and community-based conflict resolution mechanisms.</li><li>3. Provide tools and resources for ongoing management</li></ol>
<b>Formal Handover</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Develop memorandum of understanding with authorities</li><li>2. Ensure community management committee with clear mandate</li><li>3. Transfer assets and resources with proper documentation</li><li>4. Connect authorities and committees to ongoing service providers</li><li>5. Create sustainability plan for continued services</li></ol>

### 4.2 PATHWAY 2: HANDOVER TO LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Phase	Key Activities
<b>Selection</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Identify potential local organizations</li><li>2. Conduct organizational capacity assessments</li><li>3. Verify legal registration status and organizational structure</li><li>4. Evaluate financial capacity and sustainability</li><li>5. Consult with site population and authorities on acceptability</li></ol>
<b>Capacity Building</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Develop tailored capacity building plan based on assessment findings</li><li>2. Provide training on CCCM core competencies (based on need), including coordination and service monitoring, community participation and governance, information management, protection mainstreaming, and CFM</li><li>3. Implement mentoring and accompaniment program (based on need)</li></ol>

Phase	Key Activities
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Conduct joint management period with gradual transfer of responsibilities</li> <li>5. Provide technical support packages and resources</li> </ol>
<b>Formal Handover</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop handover agreement specifying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles and responsibilities</li> <li>• Standards and expectations</li> <li>• Resources and assets transferred</li> <li>• Ongoing support mechanisms</li> <li>• Monitoring framework</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Conduct formal handover event with all stakeholders</li> <li>3. Transfer documentation and information management products and systems</li> <li>4. Establish follow-up support schedule</li> </ol>

#### 4.3 PATHWAY 3: PHASE-OUT AND CLOSURE

Site closure should follow the Global [Camp Closure Guidelines](#). General guidance for Yemen can be summarized as such:

Approach	Key Activities	Considerations
<b>Site Transition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land tenure formalization</li> <li>• Infrastructure upgrading for permanence</li> <li>• Municipal service integration</li> <li>• Social and economic integration promotion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal planning alignment</li> <li>• Host community relations</li> <li>• Legal framework compliance</li> <li>• Resource mobilization</li> </ul>
<b>Site Closure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Return/relocation information provision</li> <li>• Return/relocation assistance</li> <li>• Documentation support</li> <li>• Vulnerable individual case management</li> <li>• Infrastructure decommissioning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary movement principles</li> <li>• Protection during movement</li> <li>• Environmental rehabilitation</li> <li>• Asset disposition planning</li> </ul>



## 5. CLUSTER GAP MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

In situations where strategic exit pathways cannot be (fully) realized, the following Cluster response mechanisms are considered:

Gap Type	Response Mechanism
<b>Total Site Management Gap</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mobilization of a Cluster partners to fill the gap based on priority, including through ABSM</li></ul>
<b>Partial Function Gaps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Function-specific partner assignments (such as critical maintenance)</li><li>• Remote technical assistance where departed partners or cluster partners provide ongoing phone/WhatsApp support for problem-solving and guidance to communities or remaining actors</li><li>• Simplified coordination mechanisms with basic approaches communities can manage (monthly calls, WhatsApp groups)</li></ul>
<b>Critical Protection Gaps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advocacy with Protection Cluster, including for protection partner expansion, community protection network strengthening, mobile protection team coverage, and/or emergency referral pathway activation</li></ul>

## 6. CONTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1 AREA-BASED SITE MANAGEMENT (ABSM) INTEGRATION

Where possible, the phaseout process should align with the Yemen CCCM Cluster's transition to ABSM:

1. **ABSM Preparatory Phase:**
  - Coordinate phaseout planning with ABSM training and tool development
  - Identify sites within potential ABSM areas for strategic handovers
2. **ABSM Piloting Phase (2025–2026):**
  - Implement site phaseouts within pilot ABSM areas
  - Document lessons learned to inform wider rollout
3. **ABSM Rollout Phase (2026–2027):**
  - Scale phaseouts based on refined guidance
  - Integrate handover recipients into ABSM structures

### 6.2 GOVERNANCE REALITIES AND LOCALIZATION

1. Adapt handover approaches to the different governance contexts.
2. Strengthen localization pathways:
  - Prioritize national NGOs with demonstrated capacity

- Build on existing community governance structures
- Link with CCCM Capacity Building initiatives

### 6.3 RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS

1. Develop cost-effective handover approaches such as clustering similar sites for economies of scale in training, utilizing existing community resources and capacities, and implementing phased reduction of activities rather than abrupt withdrawals
2. Address critical funding gaps through advocacy for transition funding from donors, identifying potential funding for handover recipients, and exploring community-based resourcing mechanisms.

### 6.4 CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. Incorporate seasonal considerations into phaseout timing such as planning handovers outside of flood seasons, considering agricultural calendars for community capacity, and assessing climate risks to site infrastructure sustainability.
2. Ensure environmental sustainability, such as by including environmental rehabilitation in site decommissioning, addressing waste management and water conservation needs.