

Policy Paper

The Use of Government Buildings and Public Facilities as Shelters in Marib Governorate: A Restorative Policy for Reinstating Public Functions and Safeguarding Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)





رابطة أمهات المختطفين
Abductees' Mothers
Association

Policy Paper

The Use of Government Buildings and Public Facilities as Shelters
in Marib Governorate: A Restorative Policy for Reinstating Public
(Functions and Safeguarding Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs

Prepared by
Hani Yahya Mubarak

Contents

Executive Summary	6
Introduction	9
Methodology	11
First: Stakeholder Dialogue Sessions	12
Second: Qualitative Interviews	12
Third: Review of Secondary Sources	12
Fourth: Analysis of Previous Experiences	13
First: The main problem:	14
Background to the Emergence of the Use of Government Buildings and Public Facilities	17
Classification of Inhabitants and Characteristics of Habitancy	18
Analysis of the repercussions and consequences	20
Current Gaps	25
Second: Lessons Learned from Previous Experiences	28
Third: Analysis of Policy Alternatives	34
Comparison of Policy Alternatives and Selection of the Preferred Policy	37
Recommended Policy	43
Components of the Proposed Policy	44
Proposed Implementation Plan	47
Success Indicators	50
Risks and Mitigation Measures	51
Executive Summary	52
Case Study: Restoring the Al-Maneen Health Center in Marib Governorate	53
Methodology	55
Intervention Phases	55
Results and Performance Indicators	56
Lessons Learned	58
Risks and Mitigation Measures	60
Practical Recommendations and a Replicable Model	61
Conclusion	62
Annexes	63



رابطة أمهات المختطفين
Abductees' Mothers
Association

Abductees' Mothers Association (AMA)

The Abductees' Mothers Association (AMA) is a Yemeni women-led human rights organization, which was established in April 2016 by mothers, wives, and female relatives of detainees and forcibly disappeared persons. The Association documents cases of arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance, torture, and other human rights violations, while advocating for truth, justice, accountability, and redress for victims.

Beyond its human rights mandate, AMA actively contributes to peacebuilding, transitional justice, and restorative justice initiatives through policy research, dialogue facilitation, community-based reconciliation initiatives, capacity development, and advocacy. The Association works to preserve collective memory, amplify victims' voices, strengthen community resilience, and promote inclusive and sustainable peace based on justice, accountability, and respect for human dignity.



SAM
Rights & Liberties

SAM Organization for Rights and Liberties

SAM Organization for Rights and Liberties (SAM) is an independent, non-profit Yemeni human rights organization. It was established in January 2016 and officially licensed in December 2017. The organization monitors and documents human rights violations throughout Yemen and works to prevent abuses through advocacy, partnerships with national and international organizations, and engagement with international accountability mechanisms.

SAM also promotes human rights awareness, supports rights-based development, and advocates for accountability and justice for victims of violations committed during the conflict.

DT Institute

DT Institute is a non-profit organization committed to the principle of "Development Done Differently." The Institute designs and implements complex development programs in conflict-affected, fragile, and restricted environments while supporting innovative initiatives that improve people's lives through evidence-based approaches.

Working in partnership with local communities and leaders, DT Institute promotes resilience, inclusive governance, justice, democratic participation, and sustainable development, with the objective of building stronger and more equitable societies capable of overcoming conflict and fragility.

Supporting Peace in Yemen through Accountability, Reconciliation, and Knowledge-Sharing (SPARK)

This policy paper was prepared and published as part of the Supporting Peace in Yemen through Accountability, Reconciliation, and Knowledge-Sharing (SPARK) Program.

SPARK is both a research and implementation program that seeks to translate the principles of transitional justice into practical, community-based action. The program promotes awareness, strengthens local capacities, and supports the application of restorative justice, accountability, and reparations as essential foundations for achieving sustainable peace based on truth, justice, participation, and inclusion.

The program recognizes that justice extends beyond legal accountability; it is also a social and cultural process that contributes to rebuilding social cohesion, restoring public trust, preserving collective memory, and fostering reconciliation through truth-telling, acknowledgment, accountability, apology, and dialogue.

SPARK also supports the Justice4Yemen Pact (J4YP), a coalition of ten Yemeni civil society organizations working collectively to promote transitional justice across Yemen through public awareness, advocacy, capacity-building, community engagement, and policy dialogue. The coalition aims to strengthen the participation of local communities, civil society organizations, and political stakeholders in shaping Yemen's future transitional justice process.

Executive Summary

This policy paper addresses the issue of the use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate, which emerged as a result of large-scale waves of displacement that the governorate has experienced since the outbreak of the conflict, and the unprecedented pressure they have placed on infrastructure and public services. In the absence of adequate alternative shelters, some government facilities were used as temporary accommodations for internally displaced families. This situation evolved into a prolonged reality that has affected the continuity of public services, the performance of state institutions, the rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs), and social cohesion.

The paper argues that the continued use and habitation of government facilities is no longer merely an administrative or property-related issue; rather, it has become a governance and humanitarian challenge that requires balancing the restoration of the public functions of these facilities with the protection of the rights of displaced families. While the continued use of these facilities deprives communities of essential public services, unplanned relocation may expose displaced families to greater vulnerability and repeated displacement.

The paper adopts a participatory qualitative methodology based on stakeholder dialogue sessions, interviews with government and community representatives, analysis of relevant documents and reports, as well as a review of practical experiences in Marib Governorate. The findings demonstrate that the successful restoration of public facilities depends on the availability of appropriate alternative housing, strengthened institutional coordination, trust-building among stakeholders, and the adoption of a participatory approach that takes humanitarian and legal considerations into account.

Based on these findings, the paper recommends adopting a phased policy grounded in the principles of restorative justice. The proposed policy includes conducting a final assessment of the facilities and households concerned, prioritizing relocation, providing appropriate alternative housing before implementation, concluding voluntary agreements, restoring public facilities immediately after they are vacated, and establishing a grievance and monitoring mechanism to protect rights and promote transparency and accountability.

The paper further proposes implementing this policy through successive phases, beginning with assessment and planning, followed by the provision of alternative housing and phased relocation, and concluding with the restoration of public facilities and evaluation of the results. The effectiveness of the policy should be measured through indicators including the number of facilities restored, the continuity of their operation, the proportion of households relocated to safe alternative housing, the level of beneficiary satisfaction, and the reduction in cases of repeated or returned misuse or habitation of public buildings.

The restoration of the Al-Maneen Health Center is presented as a practical model demonstrating that public facilities can be restored through dialogue, trust-building, and coordination among the local authority, the Executive Unit, civil society organizations, and community committees without resorting to forced eviction. The experience confirms that restorative justice is not an alternative to the rule of law, but rather a practical framework for restoring public facilities in a fair manner that preserves the dignity of internally displaced persons, ensures the continuity of public services, and supports peacebuilding and stability.

Introduction

Throughout the years of conflict, Marib Governorate has become one of the principal destinations for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Yemen. Successive waves of displacement have led to an unprecedented increase in the governorate's population, creating significant pressure on infrastructure and basic services. Given the limited availability of alternative resources and shelters, the local authority resorted to using a number of government buildings and public facilities to accommodate displaced families as an exceptional measure necessitated by the humanitarian circumstances at that time.

As the conflict continued for years, this temporary measure gradually evolved into a prolonged reality. A number of health, educational, and administrative facilities remained in residential use, limiting their ability to perform their primary functions and affecting the quality of services provided to both host communities and internally displaced persons. Consequently, the issue has become a multidimensional challenge encompassing humanitarian, legal, and institutional dimensions, requiring solutions that balance the restoration of public facilities with the protection of the most vulnerable groups.

This paper has been prepared under the Supporting Peace in Yemen through Accountability, Reconciliation, and Knowledge-Sharing (SPARK) program, implemented by the Abductees' Mothers Association (AMA) in partnership with SAM Organization for Rights and Liberties (SAM), with support from DT Institute. It aims to analyze the reasons behind the continued use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate; examine its impact on public services, governance, and social cohesion; and propose a practical policy based on the principles of restorative justice as a framework for balancing the restoration of the public functions of government facilities with the protection of the rights of internally displaced persons.

The paper is based on a participatory methodology that combines stakeholder dialogue sessions, qualitative interviews, analysis of relevant documents and reports, and lessons learned from the community initiative that contributed to restoring a number of public facilities. Accordingly, the paper presents a practical roadmap for decision-makers, local authorities, humanitarian organizations, and human rights organizations, outlining actionable measures for the gradual and equitable restoration of public facilities in a manner that strengthens the rule of law, preserves human dignity, and supports peacebuilding efforts.

Methodology

This policy paper was prepared as part of the Supporting Peace in Yemen through Accountability, Reconciliation, and Knowledge-Sharing (SPARK) program, implemented by the Abductees' Mothers Association (AMA) in partnership with SAM Organization for Rights and Liberties (SAM), with support from DT Institute, under the Marib Restorative Justice Initiative, which aims to develop sustainable and humane solutions to address the use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities by internally displaced families in Marib Governorate.

The paper adopts a participatory qualitative methodology that combines the analysis of field data, the review of legal and official sources, and the examination of practical experiences with the objective of providing a comprehensive understanding of the issue and developing realistic and actionable policy recommendations.

The methodology is based on four main components::

First: Stakeholder Dialogue Sessions

The paper draws on the analysis of the outcomes of dialogue sessions that brought together representatives of the local authority, internally displaced persons (IDPs), government institutions, civil society organizations, and relevant humanitarian actors. These sessions contributed to exploring the perspectives of different stakeholders on the reasons behind the continued use of government facilities, its implications, and the most appropriate options for addressing the issue in a manner that balances the restoration of public facilities with the protection of the most vulnerable groups.

Second: Qualitative Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a number of officials, experts, and representatives of relevant institutions, including representatives of the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, the Planning and Health Offices, the University of Saba, the local authority, and the Ministry of Local Administration as well as other entities responsible for the management of public facilities and essential services. These interviews contributed to strengthening the institutional and legal understanding of the issue and provided the additional information required for the analysis.

Third: Review of Secondary Sources

The paper is based on a review and analysis of the legislation and regulations governing the management of state property and the use of public facilities, in addition to reports issued by the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, official data, and relevant human rights and humanitarian reports. This review served to support the analysis with legal and institutional evidence.

Fourth: Analysis of Previous Experiences

The paper analyzes previous experiences and interventions implemented in Marib Governorate to address similar issues, with the aim of identifying lessons learned, determining the factors that contributed to success, recognizing the challenges encountered, and building on practices that have proven effective in balancing the restoration of public facilities with the protection of the rights of internally displaced persons.

To enhance the reliability of the findings, the paper employs a data triangulation approach by comparing the results of stakeholder dialogue sessions, interviews, and legal and official sources. This approach helped reduce bias and improve the accuracy of the analysis. The analytical process is further guided by the principles of restorative justice, Do No Harm, community participation, and conflict sensitivity, making the proposed recommendations more realistic and applicable for the local authority and the humanitarian and human rights organizations operating in Marib Governorate.

First: The main problem:

Large-scale displacement to Marib Governorate, particularly during the early years of the conflict, led to the use of a number of government buildings and public facilities as temporary accommodation for internally displaced families in response to an urgent humanitarian need for shelter and protection. As the conflict continued and sustainable housing solutions remained unavailable, this temporary measure evolved into a prolonged reality, leaving some public facilities unable to perform their primary functions in delivering services to the community.

Nearly ten years later, the issue is no longer limited to the use of a number of government buildings. It has become a complex governance and humanitarian challenge. The continued use of a number of health, educational, and administrative facilities has disrupted the provision of essential public services at a time when Marib Governorate is experiencing rapid population growth and a continuous increase in demand for health, education, and local government services.

At the heart of the problem is the disruption of the public function of these facilities. The conversion of health, educational, and administrative facilities into residential accommodations deprives the community of the services for which these facilities were originally established, affects the ability of state institutions to perform their responsibilities, and weakens public confidence in the efficiency of public administration and its responsiveness to people's needs.

At the same time, the issue has humanitarian dimensions that cannot be overlooked. The majority of the families residing in these facilities sought refuge there because of the lack of safe and adequate alternative housing. Consequently, any approach that focuses solely on recovering the buildings without providing appropriate IDP sheltering solutions may worsen the conditions of internally displaced persons and create a new wave of vulnerability and displacement.

The complexity of this issue is further compounded by the overlap of legal, administrative, and humanitarian considerations. The local authority is responsible for restoring public facilities and returning them to operation, while at the same time fulfilling its obligation to protect the rights of internally displaced persons and ensure that they are not exposed to further harm. Accordingly, the issue is not simply about vacating government buildings; rather, it is about restoring the public function of these facilities in a fair, gradual, and sustainable manner.

During the dialogue sessions conducted under the initiative in February 2026, participating stakeholders reached a broad consensus on the importance of launching an organized process for restoring government facilities. They agreed that this process should be preceded by clear measures to provide appropriate alternative housing and should adopt a participatory approach that safeguards the rights of internally displaced persons and minimizes the risk of social tensions.

Field findings indicate that this issue has evolved into a multidimensional challenge encompassing service delivery, as well as governance, social, and security dimensions. It is closely linked to the management of state property, the continuity of public services, the rule of law, and social stability. Therefore, any response based on forced eviction or lacking adequate planning and coordination may produce

adverse consequences, including increased vulnerability among displaced families, weakened prospects for building trust, and the emergence of new disputes over housing and public services.

Field data also showed that the issue of IDP sheltering within public facilities is concentrated in a number of government buildings that provide essential public services, including the following:

Table (1): Major Government Buildings and Public Facilities Used by Internally Displaced Persons as Shelters in Marib Governorate

Facility / Building	Location
Community College Building	Al-Rawdah District
Agriculture and Irrigation Office	Al-Salam Neighborhood
Marib Historical Museum	Marib
Sports Hall	Al-Nasr Camp
Health Center	Al-Maneen
University Dormitory	Marib
University of Saba Region	Marib
Local Council Building	Marib
Youth and Sports House	Marib

Based on the above, this paper seeks to analyze the reasons behind the continuation of this phenomenon; assess its impact on public services, internally displaced persons, and the local community; examine the available alternative policies; and propose a practical policy solution based on the principles of restorative justice. The proposed policy aims to strike a balance between restoring public functions of government facilities, protecting the rights of internally displaced persons, and promoting stability and social cohesion.

Background to the Emergence of the Use of Government Buildings and Public Facilities

The use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate did not emerge as an isolated or random phenomenon. Rather, it resulted from the convergence of two main factors: the emergency humanitarian response to large-scale displacement and the limited institutional capacity to provide safe and sustainable alternative housing. During the early stages of the conflict, the local authority opened a number of public facilities to accommodate internally displaced families as an exceptional measure necessitated by humanitarian circumstances, providing shelter and protection to thousands of families.

As the conflict continued and the number of internally displaced persons increased, this temporary response gradually evolved into a prolonged reality. Some government buildings began serving a residential purpose for which they had not been designed, adversely affecting their ability to perform their primary functions related to health, education, public administration, and other public services. At the same time, internally displaced families faced difficult living conditions in buildings that lacked the basic requirements of adequate housing in terms of privacy, safety, and essential services.

The absence of sustainable alternative housing has been one of the principal factors contributing to the continuation of this situation. Families asked to leave government facilities often have limited options: moving to camps with inadequate infrastructure and high levels of risk or renting accommodations beyond their financial means amidst limited employment opportunities and rising rental costs.

Accordingly, addressing this issue cannot be limited to restoring government buildings alone. It also requires the provision of appropriate alternative housing that enable internally displaced families to relocate in a safe and dignified manner. Relocation without such alternatives may aggravate humanitarian vulnerability and increase the likelihood of new social tensions rather than resolving the problem.

Classification of Inhabitants and Characteristics of Habitancy

Field findings indicate that those sheltering within government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate do not constitute a single category. Rather, they differ in their reasons necessitating habitancy, the nature of their habitancy, and its legal and humanitarian implications. This requires an approach that distinguishes between the different categories, so each case can be addressed through measures appropriate to its specific circumstances, rather than applying a single policy to all cases.

First: Internally Displaced Families Sheltering Within Facilities out of Necessity

This category includes internally displaced families who have taken shelter in government buildings and public facilities after losing their homes, having no suitable alternative housing, and being unable to afford rental accommodation. Field data indicates that more than 800 families are residing in the Community College Building and the Marib Historical Museum alone, reflecting the scale of the humanitarian pressures experienced by Marib Governorate during years of displacement.

The use and habitation of government facilities by this group is not regarded as a deliberate encroachment on state property but rather as a necessity imposed by the circumstances of conflict and displacement. Nevertheless, the continuation of this situation disrupts the primary functions of public facilities and presents a challenge to the local authority requiring them to balance the restoration of the public functions of these facilities with the protection of internally displaced families from homelessness or greater vulnerability.

These families also face difficult living conditions in buildings that are not designed for residential use, characterized by overcrowding, limited privacy, inadequate basic services, and persistent uncertainty regarding possible relocation, all of which negatively affect their psychological and social well-being.

Second: Influential Individuals and Entities Occupying Public Facilities

This category includes individuals or entities that have used their influence to occupy certain government buildings and public facilities or to use them for purposes unrelated to the humanitarian response. These include some administrative offices, the Youth and Sports House, the Sports Hall, and buildings belonging to the Technical Training Institute, which had previously been used to accommodate injured people.

This type of occupancy differs fundamentally from that of internally displaced families as it is not driven by humanitarian necessity or the loss of housing, but rather by the abuse of influence or the unlawful use of public facilities.

Although the local authority has succeeded in recovering a number of these facilities in recent years, those that remain occupied still require legal and administrative measures to restore state property, strengthen the rule of law, and prevent the unlawful occupation of public facilities from recurring.

Table (2): Classification Matrix of Inhabitants of Government Buildings and Public Facilities

Inhabitant Category	Reason for Habitancy	Legal and Institutional Implications	Proposed Policy Response
Internally displaced families sheltering within facilities out of necessity	Humanitarian need and the absence of suitable alternative housing	Inhabitancy driven by necessity, resulting in the disruption of the public function of the facility	Gradual restoration of public facilities based on the provision of alternative housing, dialogue, and the avoidance of forced eviction
Influential individuals and occupying entities	Abuse of influence or unlawful use of public facilities	Violation of the rule of law and disruption of the functioning of public institutions	Restore public facilities in accordance with the law and take the necessary measures to prevent their unlawful reoccupation

Analysis of the repercussions and consequences

The continued use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate is not merely an administrative challenge related to the recovery of state property. Rather, it represents a complex issue with service delivery, legal, humanitarian, social, economic, and security dimensions. As this situation persists, its consequences extend beyond the disruption of public facilities to affect the ability of state institutions to perform their functions, public confidence in these institutions, relations between host communities and internally displaced persons (IDPs), and prospects for stability and peacebuilding.

The main implications are outlined below:

First: Impact on Public Service Delivery

The disruption of public services is the most immediate consequence of the continued use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities. The value of the public facilities lies in the services they provide to the community rather than in the building itself. When an educational, health, or administrative facility is converted into residential accommodation, the community is deprived of essential services needed by both citizens and internally displaced persons.

In the education sector, the continued use of facilities, such as the Community College Building, as shelters has disrupted technical and vocational education programmes and reduced opportunities that prepare young people for the labour market, thereby negatively affecting local development and prospects for economic integration.

In the health sector, the use and habitation of health facilities has reduced access to primary healthcare services, increased pressure on hospitals, raised the cost of medical treatment, and delayed access to healthcare services. These impacts are particularly severe for the most vulnerable groups, especially women, children, older persons, and persons with disabilities.

In the administrative sector, the use and habitation of government buildings has weakened the ability of public institutions to perform their responsibilities, deliver services, and maintain official records, thereby reducing the efficiency of public administration and the level of public satisfaction.

Accordingly, the continued use and habitation of government facilities not only disrupts public buildings but also limits the State's ability to fulfil its responsibility to provide public services and undermines public confidence in its institutions.

Second: Impact on Social Cohesion and Relations between Internally Displaced Persons and Host Communities

The continued use of some government facilities has created underlying tensions between host communities and internally displaced persons, particularly where the facilities in which IDPs are sheltering provide essential services such as education, healthcare, and administrative services.

On the one hand, host communities may perceive the continued use of these facilities as shelters as preventing them from benefiting from the services the facilities were originally established for. On the other hand, internally displaced persons live with constant concern over the possible loss of their shelter in the absence of appropriate alternative housing. The continuation of this situation may reinforce negative perceptions between the two groups, placing responsibility on displaced persons for the disruption of public services, even though their presence in these facilities is a direct consequence of conflict and displacement.

Therefore, the success of any policy addressing this issue depends on preserving social cohesion, strengthening trust between host communities and internally displaced persons, and avoiding any measures that could deepen divisions or create new grievances.

Third: Humanitarian Impact on Internally Displaced Families

Despite the negative effects that the use of government buildings as shelters has on public facilities, internally displaced families residing in these buildings face extremely difficult humanitarian conditions. These facilities were not designed to serve as permanent housing and, in many cases, lack privacy, basic services, safety standards, and an environment suitable for family life.

These families also live in a constant state of uncertainty due to fears of relocation, while appropriate alternative housing remain limited. Consequently, any effort to restore public facilities that is not preceded by clear arrangements providing safe alternatives may result in displaced families moving into even more vulnerable conditions rather than resolving the problem.

Accordingly, restoring the public functions of government facilities should go hand in hand with protecting the dignity of internally displaced persons and their right to safe housing, thereby ensuring a balance between humanitarian considerations and the need to restore public services.

Fourth: Economic and Development Impact

The continued use of government buildings and public facilities results in both direct and indirect economic and development losses. On the one hand, the inappropriate use of public buildings accelerates their deterioration and increases the cost of maintenance and rehabilitation. On the other hand, the disruption of educational and health facilities weakens investment in human capital; limits opportunities for education, training, and employment; and increases the economic burden on families, local authorities, and humanitarian organizations.

Accordingly, the continued use and habitation of these facilities not only represents a loss of state assets but also limits the governorate's ability to transition from humanitarian response to sustainable development.

Fifth: Security Impact and the Risk of Local Conflicts

The longer government facilities remain being used in this manner without a clear solution, the greater the likelihood of local disputes over the right to use these buildings, priorities for restoring public services, relocation procedures, and provision of alternative housing. Such disputes may escalate into public protests or community confrontations if the process is not managed through a participatory approach that is conflict-sensitive and protects the rights of all parties.

Sixth: Impact on the Principles of Restorative Justice

This issue demonstrates the importance of adopting a restorative justice approach as a framework for addressing the harm suffered by all parties, rather than limiting the response to the recovery of government buildings from a purely administrative or legal perspective. The State has been affected by the disruption of its public facilities and host communities have suffered from the decline in public services. Simultaneously, internally displaced persons have borne the consequences of conflict and the lack of adequate housing, and may face further harm if relocation takes place without appropriate alternatives.

Accordingly, restorative justice is based on a participatory process that brings together the local authority, representatives of internally displaced persons, host communities, and humanitarian actors with the aim of reaching balanced solutions that restore the public functions of government facilities, protect the rights of affected groups, and reduce the humanitarian and social consequences of relocation. This is achieved by providing safe alternative housing, restoring public services, giving priority to the most vulnerable groups, and promoting community participation throughout all stages of implementation, as illustrated in the following table.

Table (3): Matrix of Affected Stakeholders, the Harms Experienced, and Proposed Restorative Measures to Address Their Harms

Affected Stakeholder	Nature of the Harm	Proposed Restorative Measure
The State and the Local Authority	Disruption of public facilities, reduced institutional capacity to deliver services, and loss of control over certain public assets.	Gradually and systematically restore public facilities; rehabilitate and reactivate them; and strengthen institutional coordination to ensure the sustainability of public services.
Host Communities	Reduced access to education, healthcare, and administrative services, and increased risk of social tensions.	Engage host communities in setting priorities for relocation and restoration of public facilities; ensure the resumption of services in affected areas; and strengthen community communication mechanisms.
Internally Displaced Families	Loss of housing stability, risk of relocation without safe alternative housing, and increased livelihood vulnerability.	Provide appropriate and safe alternative housing before relocation; support the relocation process; ensure that relocation is voluntary and phased; and establish grievance and protection mechanisms.
The Most Vulnerable Groups (female-headed households, persons with disabilities, older persons, and extremely poor households)	Increased vulnerability, limited access to housing and basic services, and reduced ability to meet relocation or rental costs.	Give priority to these groups in the provision of alternative housing and support programmes; provide the necessary humanitarian and social assistance; and ensure that their specific needs are addressed throughout all stages of implementation.

According to this approach, restoring government buildings becomes part of a broader reform process aimed at restoring public services, rebuilding trust, and strengthening the rule of law, without creating new grievances or holding internally displaced persons responsible for the circumstances imposed by the conflict.

Current Gaps

An assessment of the current situation reveals that efforts to address the use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate continue to face a number of institutional and organizational gaps that limit the effectiveness of restoring and reactivating public facilities. One of the most significant gaps is the absence of an approved policy that clearly defines intervention criteria, relocation priorities, roles and responsibilities, as well as coordination, monitoring, and accountability mechanisms among the relevant stakeholders.

Another major gap is the weakness of the database on families residing in government facilities. Comprehensive and up-to-date information on the number of households, their levels of vulnerability, their needs, and alternative housing options are not available. This limits the ability to prioritize interventions and reduces the capacity of the relevant authorities to design equitable solutions that respond to the needs of the most affected groups.

Another key gap is the absence of an institutional framework that integrates humanitarian considerations with the requirements for restoring public facilities. Progress achieved in addressing this issue has often relied more on coordination initiatives and mediation efforts than on a clear government policy supported by stable implementation mechanisms. As a result, interventions remain uneven, slow, and less sustainable.

A further gap relates to the limited measures available to protect public facilities after they have been restored. The absence of clear plans for their immediate reactivation, maintenance, and protection may result in future use as shelters or informal use, undermining the impact of the relocation process and recreating the problem.

Accordingly, the principal challenge lies not merely in the continued use and habitation of government buildings but in the absence of an integrated system to manage the transition from use as emergency shelters to the institutional restoration of public facilities. Addressing this challenge requires a comprehensive framework that combines reliable data, effective planning, adequate financing, institutional coordination, the provision of alternative housing, and the sustainable reactivation of public facilities.

Stakeholders

The issue of the use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate involves a wide range of stakeholders with overlapping roles and responsibilities. The success of any policy to address this issue therefore depends on effective institutional coordination that clearly defines the responsibilities of each stakeholder and strengthens complementarity among them.

The local authority leads the decision-making process and oversees policy implementation by approving the necessary measures, setting priorities, and ensuring compliance with the relevant legal and regulatory frameworks. The Planning and International Cooperation Office plays a key role in coordinating support with donors and organizations and aligning interventions with the governorate's humanitarian and development priorities.

The Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps plays a central role in registering households, assessing levels of vulnerability, managing data, and coordinating alternative housing. Meanwhile, the government entities responsible for the facilities are responsible for preparing rehabilitation and operational plans and identifying the technical and financial requirements necessary to restore public services.

Humanitarian organizations provide support in the areas of shelter, protection, relocation assistance, and case management for the most vulnerable groups. Community committees and community leaders contribute by building trust, facilitating dialogue and mediation, reducing community tensions, and strengthening public acceptance of the measures being implemented.

Internally displaced families remain the group most directly affected by the outcomes of this policy. They should therefore be actively involved throughout the planning and implementation process, kept informed of the proposed measures, and protected from forced eviction or relocation to more vulnerable living conditions.

Accordingly, the successful implementation of the proposed policy requires a clear allocation of responsibilities, with each stakeholder assigned specific tasks, timelines, and monitoring and accountability mechanisms. This approach will ensure coordination among three main pillars: the restoration of public facilities, the protection of internally displaced families, and the reactivation of public services. Maintaining a balance among these three pillars is essential for achieving sustainable outcomes.

Table (4): Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Primary Role
Local Authority in Marib Governorate	Lead implementation, approve the policy, issue the necessary decisions, and ensure compliance with the legal framework
Planning and International Cooperation Office	Coordinate support with donors and organizations and align interventions with local priorities
Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps	Register households, assess vulnerability, manage data, and coordinate housing alternatives
Government Entities Responsible for Public Facilities	Prepare rehabilitation and operational plans and identify technical and financial requirements
Humanitarian Organizations	Provide shelter assistance, protection, relocation support, and case management for the most vulnerable groups
Community Committees and Community Leaders	Support dialogue, mediation, trust-building, and social cohesion
Internally Displaced Families	Participate in consultations, provide relevant information, and relocate in an organized manner once safe housing alternatives are available

In light of the above, addressing this issue requires a shift from managing a humanitarian response to managing comprehensive public policy. This can be achieved through the adoption of an integrated institutional framework based on coordination among relevant stakeholders, the use of reliable data, adequate financing, and meaningful community participation. Such an approach will support the restoration of public facilities, protect the rights of internally displaced persons, and ensure the sustainability of policy outcomes.

Second: Lessons Learned from Previous Experiences

Analyzing previous experiences provides an essential foundation for developing public policies. It goes beyond evaluating past interventions to understanding the factors that contributed to their success or failure and drawing lessons to inform future policy design. In the case of Marib Governorate, field experience has shown that the limited success of relocation efforts was not solely due to a lack of political will, but also due to the interaction of humanitarian, institutional, and financial factors resulting from prolonged displacement and the transformation of many temporary shelters into long-term places of residence.

Experience has also demonstrated that restoring public facilities cannot be achieved simply by vacating buildings. Rather, it requires managing a comprehensive transition process that begins with assessment and consultation, proceeds through the provision of appropriate alternative housing, and concludes with the reactivation of public facilities and measures to prevent their repeated misuse or habitation by vulnerable IDPs.

First: The Absence of Adequate Housing Alternatives

Experience has shown that the availability of appropriate alternative housing is a fundamental prerequisite for the success of any relocation process. Although internally displaced families recognize the importance of restoring public facilities, they cannot leave these facilities unless suitable alternatives that provide a minimum level of safety and stability are made available. Relocating families to sites that lack basic services cannot be considered a solution; rather, it merely transfers them from one vulnerable situation to another that is even more precarious.

The relocation of displaced families from Bat'ha Al-Mail provides a clear example. In this case, relocation of families to a site lacking basic services created new challenges instead of resolving the problem. Data from the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps also highlights the significant gap between existing needs and available resources, with thousands of families requiring shelter assistance, emergency shelter materials, and housing units. This demonstrates that successful relocation depends on the ability of the relevant stakeholders to provide appropriate alternative housing before implementation begins.

Second: The Funding Gap

Experience has shown that limited funding represents one of the most significant obstacles to implementing sustainable solutions. It has constrained the ability of the local authority and humanitarian organizations to provide alternative housing, prepare new relocation sites, and deliver relocation assistance to affected families.

Accordingly, any relocation plan must be linked to the availability of adequate funding for shelter, infrastructure, protection services, and case management. Without these resources, the problem will simply be transferred from government facilities to new displacement locations where vulnerability may be even greater.

Third: The Expansion of Their Use as Shelters over Time

Experience indicates that the use of government facilities as shelters often begins with a limited number of families but gradually expands due to social connections, insufficient oversight, and the absence of early registration. Over time, temporary inhabitancy becomes a long-term pattern that is increasingly difficult to address, while the number of sheltering families grows and the cost of providing alternative housing continues to rise.

This experience underscores the importance of early intervention, comprehensive household registration, and the adoption of a clear reference date for freezing beneficiary lists in order to prevent further expansion during the preparation and implementation of solutions.

Fourth: Safeguards for Voluntary Relocation

Experience demonstrates that describing a relocation process as voluntary does not in itself guarantee that it is genuinely voluntary. A voluntary process must be based on the free and informed consent of affected families, preceded by meaningful consultations, the provision of appropriate alternative housing, and safeguards against any form of pressure.

Accordingly, any future policy should include clear procedures for prior notification, consultation, accessible grievance mechanisms, and measures prohibiting the use of public services, humanitarian assistance, or any other form of pressure to compel families to leave.

Fifth: Institutional Coordination

Experience has shown that the multiplicity of actors, overlapping mandates, and the absence of a single lead institution have reduced the effectiveness of previous interventions and delayed their implementation.

The successful implementation of the proposed policy therefore requires a clear institutional coordination mechanism led by the local authority, bringing together the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, the government entities responsible for public facilities, humanitarian organizations, and representatives of host communities and internally displaced persons, with clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and follow-up mechanisms.

Summary of Lessons Learned

Previous experience demonstrates that the limited success of relocation efforts has not resulted from a single factor, but rather from the combined effect of three principal challenges: the absence of appropriate alternative housing, limited funding, and weak institutional coordination. Consequently, any policy that addresses only one of these factors in isolation is likely to have limited impact and may reproduce the problem in another form.

The experiences also confirm that the successful restoration of public facilities depends on managing a comprehensive transition process that responds to humanitarian needs and is based on advance planning, partnership among relevant stakeholders, and the participation of internally displaced persons in developing solutions. Such an approach makes it possible to restore the public functions of government facilities without creating new grievances or undermining social stability.



Table (5): Lessons Learned and Their Implications for the Proposed Policy

Lesson Learned	What Happened in Previous Experiences	What Should Be Done in the Future
No relocation without a prepared alternative housing	Displaced families from Bat'ha Al-Mail were relocated to a site lacking basic services	Prepare the alternative site before relocation, including water, sanitation, protection, and essential services
Engage internally displaced persons in decision-making	Unilateral decisions led to resistance, rejection, and fear of relocation	Involve representatives of internally displaced persons at every stage, from registration to selecting alternative housing and scheduling relocation
Early registration and freezing of beneficiary lists	The number of beneficiaries increased when solution initiatives or relocation plans were announced	Conduct early registration, establish a clear reference date, and prevent any expansion of inhabitancy during implementation
Link relocation to available funding	Limited funding for humanitarian response plans reduced the ability to provide alternative housing	Do not initiate any relocation process until funding is secured for shelter, transportation, protection, and rehabilitation
Rapid reactivation of public facilities	Some buildings remained vacant or were used as shelters again after relocation	Rehabilitate and reactivate facilities within weeks, supported by a protection plan to prevent repeated use of public facilities and government buildings as shelters

Lesson Learned	What Happened in Previous Experiences	What Should Be Done in the Future
Independent monitoring mechanism	Effective intervention was absent in some crises, such as the Al-Arq Camp crisis	Establish an independent monitoring committee with the authority to follow up and intervene immediately in cases of violations or implementation delays
End fragmented decision-making	Decision-making was dispersed among multiple actors with overlapping mandates	Designate a single lead institution to manage the process, with clearly defined roles for all partners
Prevent coercive relocation practices	Pressure through service restrictions or security measures was used to encourage families to leave	Prohibit the suspension of services and the use of force, while relying on dialogue, mediation, and protection safeguards
Protect social cohesion	Some practices generated tensions between host communities and internally displaced persons	Manage the process through a restorative approach that balances the State's right to restore public facilities with the right of internally displaced persons to adequate shelter
Rebuild trust	Repeated unfulfilled commitments weakened the confidence of families in government institutions and humanitarian organizations	Announce a clear implementation plan with a defined timeline, allocated resources, and transparent grievance and accountability mechanisms

Third: Analysis of Policy Alternatives

Based on the findings of the study and the outcomes of the dialogue sessions involving the local authority, the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, government institutions, humanitarian organizations, representatives of the local community, and internally displaced persons (IDPs), it is evident that maintaining the current situation is no longer a sustainable option. The continued use of government buildings and public facilities disrupts public services, increases the cost of rehabilitation, and weakens the capacity of public institutions to perform their functions. At the same time, any hasty intervention may result in negative humanitarian and social consequences.

Against this background, the paper examines four policy alternatives that differ in terms of feasibility, cost, public acceptance, and implementation potential.

Alternative One: Maintaining the Status Quo

This alternative is based on continuing to treat the use of government buildings as a temporary reality and postponing any relocation measures until humanitarian conditions improve or sufficient funding becomes available to provide housing alternatives.

While this option may help avoid tensions in the short term, it perpetuates the disruption of public facilities, increases the future cost of rehabilitation, transforms temporary inhabitancy into a permanent reality, and weakens public confidence in the State's ability to restore its public facilities.

Accordingly, this alternative does not represent a sustainable policy option. Rather, it may only serve as a temporary measure during the preparation phase of a comprehensive solution, but not as a long-term policy.

Alternative Two: Administrative and Legal Eviction

This alternative seeks to restore government buildings through administrative or judicial decisions, with the support of security authorities, where necessary, to enforce eviction orders.

Its principal advantage lies in the rapid recovery of public facilities and the reinforcement of state authority and the rule of law. However, implementing this approach in the absence of appropriate alternative housing may lead to secondary displacement, worsen humanitarian conditions, increase tensions between internally displaced persons and the local authority, and conflict with the principles of protection and Do No Harm.

Accordingly, this alternative is not recommended for addressing the situation of internally displaced families. However, it may be applied in cases involving the unlawful occupation of public facilities by individuals or entities that do not qualify as internally displaced persons, provided that all legal procedures are fully observed.

Alternative Three: Temporary Legal Regularization

This alternative seeks to regulate the use of government facilities through temporary agreements or legal arrangements that allow the continued use of certain buildings in return for specific obligations.

Although this option may help reduce tensions in the short term, it does not address the root cause of the problem. Instead, it perpetuates the disruption of the public functions of government facilities and may create precedents that could be interpreted as legitimizing the use of state property. It may also lead to unequal treatment between those who are able to meet financial obligations and those who are not.

Therefore, this alternative may be considered only as a limited transitional measure in exceptional circumstances. It is not suitable as the basis for a public policy aimed at restoring facilities that provide essential public services.

Alternative Four: A Comprehensive Restorative Approach (Recommended Alternative)

This alternative approaches the issue as a multidimensional challenge encompassing humanitarian, legal, and institutional dimensions. It seeks to achieve a balance between restoring the public functions of government facilities, protecting the rights of internally displaced persons, and preserving social cohesion.

The approach is based on a comprehensive assessment of households and public facilities, the classification of vulnerability levels, the prioritization of relocation, the provision of appropriate housing alternatives before implementation, the conclusion of voluntary agreements, and the rehabilitation and reactivation of public facilities immediately after they are restored. It also includes the establishment of monitoring and protection mechanisms to prevent the repeated use of government buildings and public facilities as shelters.

Furthermore, the approach relies on dialogue, community mediation, the principles of restorative justice and Do No Harm, ensuring that all relevant stakeholders participate in the design and implementation of solutions while strengthening trust between the local authority, host communities, and internally displaced persons.

This alternative represents the most balanced and sustainable policy option, as it combines legal legitimacy, humanitarian protection, public acceptance, and institutional feasibility. It provides a practical framework for restoring public facilities without creating new harm or generating additional conflicts.

Comparison of Policy Alternatives and Selection of the Preferred Policy

To support the selection of the most appropriate public policy for addressing the use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate, it is not sufficient to present the available alternatives descriptively. Rather, they should be compared against clear criteria that enable decision-makers to assess the feasibility, acceptability, risks, and sustainability of each option. Based on field findings and the outcomes of stakeholder consultations, the proposed policy alternatives can be compared as follows:

Table (6): Comparison of Policy Alternatives and Selection of the Preferred Policy

Policy Alternative	Underlying Approach	Potential Advantages	Risks and Limitations	Level of Acceptance and Sustainability
Maintaining the Status Quo	Postponing relocation and informally adapting to the current use of public facilities	Temporarily reduces the risk of secondary displacement and avoids direct confrontation	Perpetuates the disruption of public facilities, increases rehabilitation costs, and weakens state authority	Temporary acceptance, but not sustainable
Strict Eviction	Immediate recovery of public buildings through administrative decisions and security measures	Rapid restoration of formal control over public facilities	High risk of confrontation, secondary displacement, rights violations, and loss of public trust	Low acceptance and limited sustainability
Financial Regularization	Regulating inhabancy through rental agreements or financial settlements	May generate limited financial revenue and avoid direct confrontation	Legitimizes the use of state property, disrupts the public function of facilities, and benefits influential actors more than vulnerable groups	Selective acceptance and very limited sustainability
Restorative Approach (Recommended Alternative)	Phased voluntary relocation following the provision of housing alternatives and the restoration of public facilities	Balances the State's rights with the dignity of internally displaced persons and reduces social tensions	Requires funding, institutional coordination, and sustained commitment	Highest level of acceptance and sustainability



The comparison demonstrates that the strict eviction approach, despite its apparent speed, entails significant humanitarian and security risks that may outweigh its potential benefits. Likewise, the financial regularization approach fails to address the root cause of the problem and may instead legitimize the continued use of public property, effectively transforming public facilities from community assets into rented premises.

By contrast, the comprehensive restorative approach is better positioned to balance legal requirements, the rights of internally displaced persons, and the needs of the host community. It therefore represents the most appropriate and sustainable policy option.

Comparison of the Costs and Benefits of Relocation Policies

A cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that restoring government buildings is not merely a financial or administrative burden; it is an investment in restoring the functions of the State and improving public service delivery. However, the nature of the costs and benefits differs depending on the category of inhabitants. The relocation of influential actors presents different challenges and policy requirements from those associated with the relocation of internally displaced families sheltering within public facilities out of necessity.

Table (7): Comparison of the Costs and Benefits of Relocation Policies

Assessment Criterion	Cost of Relocation / Required Investment	Expected Economic and Service Benefits
Relocation of Influential Actors	Political and security costs requiring clear political commitment, strengthened oversight mechanisms, engagement of the Public Prosecution responsible for public funds, and the impartial enforcement of the law	Institutional and governance gains through restoring the rule of law, protecting public property, reducing the costs of renting alternative government premises, and strengthening public confidence in the fairness of public authorities
Relocation of Internally Displaced Persons	Financial and humanitarian costs associated with providing safe alternative housing, adequately equipped camps, or temporary rental assistance, together with transportation, protection services, and case management for the most vulnerable households	Significant service delivery and development benefits through the restoration of health, education, and administrative facilities, expanded access to public services, and reduced pressure on alternative facilities and central hospitals

This analysis shows that, although the restorative relocation of internally displaced persons requires greater financial investment at the outset, it carries significantly lower risks than either forced eviction or maintaining the status quo. Establishing safe alternative housing or providing transitional assistance may appear costly in the short term, but it prevents greater long-term losses associated with homelessness, social tensions, disrupted public services, and the deterioration of public buildings.

By contrast, in the case of influential actors, the principal cost is not financial but political and institutional, as it depends on the willingness and ability of the authorities to enforce the law fairly and without discrimination.

Comparison of Expected Impacts: Forced Eviction versus Voluntary Restorative Relocation

The importance of adopting a restorative approach becomes even clearer when comparing the consequences of forced eviction with those of voluntary restorative relocation. Forced eviction may produce rapid results in vacating public buildings, but it often leaves long-lasting negative effects on public trust and social cohesion. Voluntary restorative relocation, while requiring more time, coordination, and financial resources, provides an opportunity to resolve the issue without creating a new humanitarian crisis.

Table (8): Comparison of the Impacts of Forced Eviction and Voluntary Restorative Relocation

Type of Relocation	Immediate Impacts	Strategic and Long-Term Impacts
Forced Eviction	Risk of confrontation, increased fear and psychological distress, relocation of families to more vulnerable conditions, and a higher likelihood of homelessness and secondary displacement	Loss of confidence in the local authority, deepened perceptions of injustice, increased tensions between internally displaced persons and host communities, and the potential emergence of prolonged legal and social disputes
Voluntary Restorative Relocation	Preserves the dignity of affected families, provides safe alternative housing, reduces resistance, and enables households to relocate in an organized and supported manner	Strengthens social cohesion, restores public services with community support, reinforces partnership between the State and citizens, and reduces the likelihood of repeated use of public facilities and government buildings as shelters

Accordingly, the difference between the two approaches lies not only in the method of implementation, but also in the underlying philosophy of public policy. The central question is whether the State seeks to address the issue through a model of removal and coercion or through a process of remedy and redress. A restorative approach does not diminish the authority of the law; rather, it enables the law to be applied in a manner that is more just, effective, and publicly accepted.

Summary of the Comparison of Policy Alternatives

Based on the above analysis, the comprehensive restorative approach represents the most appropriate policy for addressing the use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate because it achieves the best balance among four fundamental objectives:

- Restoring the State's authority to manage its public property and facilities
- Protecting internally displaced persons from forced eviction and secondary displacement
- Restoring public services for the benefit of both host communities and internally displaced persons
- Promoting social cohesion and preventing relocation from becoming a source of conflict

Nevertheless, adopting a restorative approach should not be interpreted as implementing a rigid policy that cannot be adapted. Rather, it should be implemented through a flexible framework that allows for periodic review and adjustment in response to changes in available funding, the availability of alternative housing, the willingness of families to relocate, and the readiness of public facilities to resume operation. The most effective policy is not merely the one that appears theoretically sound, but the one that incorporates a monitoring mechanism capable of adjusting implementation as circumstances evolve.

Recommended Policy

This paper recommends adopting a phased voluntary relocation policy based on the provision of alternative housing as the policy option most capable of achieving a balance between restoring the public functions of government facilities, protecting the rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs), and promoting social cohesion in Marib Governorate.

This policy is based on the recognition that the use and habitation of government buildings and public facilities is not merely an administrative or legal issue. Rather, it represents a humanitarian and institutional challenge resulting from protracted displacement, the limited availability of alternative housing, and the increasing pressure on public services. Addressing this issue therefore requires a comprehensive approach that takes humanitarian considerations into account alongside the need to restore public facilities.

The proposed policy is founded on organizing the safe and gradual relocation of internally displaced families in a manner that ensures the restoration and reactivation of public facilities without exposing families to greater vulnerability or secondary displacement. It is further guided by the principles of restorative justice, partnership, Do No Harm, and accountability, thereby strengthening trust between the local authority, internally displaced persons, and host communities while creating the conditions for more sustainable outcomes.



Components of the Proposed Policy

Final Registration and Closure of Beneficiary Lists

Implementation begins with a final field registration of all government buildings and public facilities currently in use, together with the families residing in them. This process should be carried out with the participation of the local authority, the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, the government entities responsible for the facilities, humanitarian organizations, and representatives of host communities and internally displaced persons.

The purpose of this exercise is to establish a comprehensive database containing information on the number of households, levels of vulnerability, specific needs, and available alternative housing. Final beneficiary lists should then be adopted based on a clearly defined reference date, after which no additional beneficiaries should be registered, thereby preventing further expansion of IDP habitancy during implementation.

Prioritizing the Restoration of Public Facilities

The relocation process should be implemented according to clearly defined priorities based on the importance of each facility in delivering public services, the availability of suitable alternative housing, the number of resident families, and the complexity of each case.

Priority should be given to health, education, and administrative facilities that have the greatest direct impact on the community. Implementation should begin with the least complex cases in order to test implementation mechanisms and draw lessons before moving to more complex situations.

Providing Housing Alternatives before Relocation

The proposed policy is based on the principle of “No Relocation without an Appropriate Alternative.” Accordingly, safe and adequate alternative housing must be provided before any relocation takes place. These alternatives may include transitional housing units, planned residential settlements, or temporary rental assistance, depending on the needs of affected families and the resources available.

Alternative housing should meet minimum standards for safety, water supply, sanitation, protection, and access to essential services, while taking into account the specific needs of women, children, older persons, and persons with disabilities.

Voluntary Agreements

The relocation process should be implemented through written voluntary agreements between the implementing authorities and beneficiary families. These agreements should clearly specify the responsibilities of each party, the location of alternative housing, the type and duration of assistance, and the mechanisms for follow-up and grievance redress.

This measure contributes to strengthening transparency, building trust, reducing disputes, and ensuring that the rights and responsibilities of all parties are clearly defined.

Rehabilitation and Reactivation of Public Facilities

The implementation of relocation should be directly linked to the rehabilitation and reactivation of the restored public facilities through a clear implementation plan that defines responsibilities, required resources, and reopening schedules. This will ensure the restoration of public services and prevent the repeated use of government buildings as shelters.

Protection and Accountability

The proposed policy includes the establishment of an independent complaints and grievance mechanism that enables internally displaced families and host communities to report any violations or failure to comply with agreed procedures, while ensuring timely responses and corrective action.

The policy also prohibits any practices that could result in forced eviction, including the use of force, threats, the suspension of services, or any direct or indirect pressure on affected families. This is intended to ensure that the relocation process is carried out in a manner that respects human dignity and upholds protection principles.

Table (9): Components of the Proposed Policy

Component	Objective
Final Registration and Closure of Beneficiary Lists	Establish a comprehensive database and prevent further expansion of individuals sheltering within these buildings
Prioritization of Public Facilities	Begin with the facilities that are most important and most ready for restoration
Provision of Alternative Housing	Ensure safe relocation and prevent secondary displacement
Voluntary Agreements	Strengthen trust and ensure clarity of responsibilities and commitments
Rehabilitation and Reactivation	Restore public services and prevent the repeated use of public facilities as shelters
Protection and Accountability	Safeguard rights and ensure fair implementation

Proposed Implementation Plan

This paper proposes implementing the recommended policy through four interconnected phases over a period of six to nine months, depending on the availability of funding, the readiness of alternative housing, and the level of coordination among the relevant stakeholders. The phases are as follows:

Phase One: Registration and Classification

The process begins with a comprehensive assessment of government buildings and public facilities currently in use, identification of the government entities responsible for them, and the development of a comprehensive database of the households sheltering within these facilities. The database should include information on levels of vulnerability, specific needs, and available alternative housing. This phase also includes the adoption of final beneficiary lists, the establishment of a reference date to freeze those lists, and the preparation of a priority matrix identifying the public facilities targeted for relocation.

Phase Two: Preparation of Housing Alternatives

This phase focuses on providing safe and appropriate alternative housing for the targeted families through transitional housing units, adequately prepared relocation sites, or temporary rental assistance programmes. These alternatives should be linked to essential services, including water supply, sanitation, protection, education, and healthcare, to ensure a safe transition and prevent the emergence of a new humanitarian crisis.

Phase Three: Phased Relocation

Relocation should be carried out gradually, beginning with facilities that have the highest service priority and with the least complex cases. This phased approach allows implementation mechanisms to be tested, challenges to be addressed as they arise, tensions to be minimized, and procedures to be refined before progressing to more complex stages.

Phase Four: Rehabilitation, Reactivation, and Follow-up

This phase includes the rehabilitation, protection, and reactivation of the restored public facilities so that they can resume their original functions. At the same time, the conditions of families relocated to alternative housing should be monitored, the sustainability of the solutions assessed, and periodic reports prepared to document implementation progress, the number of facilities restored, the number of beneficiary households, levels of beneficiary satisfaction, and complaints received together with the actions taken to address them.

Table (10): Proposed Implementation Plan

Phase	Key Activities	Lead Stakeholders
Registration and Classification	Register public facilities and households, assess vulnerability, finalize beneficiary lists, and establish implementation priorities	Local Authority, Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, Government Entities Responsible for Public Facilities, Humanitarian Organizations
Preparation of Alternative Housing	Provide alternative housing and ensure access to essential services	Local Authority, Humanitarian Organizations, Donors
Phased Relocation	Implement relocation according to established priorities, monitor the transition process, and address implementation challenges	Local Authority, Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, Community Committees
Rehabilitation, Reactivation, and Follow-up	Reactivate public facilities, monitor implementation, evaluate progress, and prepare periodic reports	Government Entities Responsible for Public Facilities, Local Authority, Follow-up Committee



Success Indicators

The success of the proposed policy will be measured through a set of indicators that assess both the effectiveness of restoring public facilities and the protection of the rights of internally displaced persons, thereby ensuring a balanced evaluation of policy outcomes.

Table (11): Success Indicators and Measurement Methods

No.	Indicator	What It Measures
1	Number of public facilities restored and reactivated	The extent to which the public functions of government facilities have been restored
2	Percentage of families relocated to safe alternative housing	The level of protection against secondary displacement
3	Rate of public facilities that are not used again as shelters after six months	The sustainability of the implemented solutions
4	Number of complaints addressed through the grievance and accountability mechanism	The effectiveness of the complaints and accountability mechanism
5	Level of satisfaction among internally displaced families and host communities	Public acceptance of the proposed policy
6	Average time between relocation and the reactivation of public facilities	The effectiveness of coordination between implementation and the restoration of public services
7	Percentage of the most vulnerable households receiving assistance	The fairness of targeting and the extent to which the needs of the most vulnerable groups are addressed

Risks and Mitigation Measures

Although the restorative approach represents the most balanced policy option, its implementation may face a number of challenges that require proactive measures to reduce their potential impact and support successful and sustainable implementation.

The most significant risks include limited funding, the lack of ready alternative housing, the reluctance of some families to relocate, the return to use of public facilities as shelters after their restoration, delays in rehabilitation works, overlapping mandates among implementing stakeholders, and the possibility of pressure or interference that could obstruct implementation.

Table (12): Risk Matrix and Mitigation Measures

No.	Risk	Proposed Mitigation Measures
1	Increase in the number of resident households during implementation	Establish a reference date and freeze beneficiary lists from the outset of implementation
2	Reluctance of some families to relocate	Provide a comprehensive support package that includes transportation, temporary rental assistance, and essential services, while strengthening community dialogue
3	Limited funding	Link implementation to the availability of secured funding and strengthen coordination with donors and humanitarian organizations
4	Repeated or return to use of public facilities as shelters after relocation	Reactivate public facilities promptly and ensure their administrative protection shortly after they are restored
5	Delays in rehabilitation	Prepare a rehabilitation plan, including the required resources and implementation timeline, before relocation begins
6	Violations or undue pressure during implementation	Establish an independent complaints mechanism and an oversight committee with clearly defined authority
7	Overlapping roles among implementing stakeholders	Designate a lead institution to coordinate the process and clearly define the roles and responsibilities of all partners

Executive Summary

This paper recommends adopting a phased voluntary relocation policy based on the provision of alternative housing as the most appropriate option for addressing the use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate in a balanced and sustainable manner. The policy is founded on the principle that the restoration of public facilities should not result in new humanitarian harm, while the protection of internally displaced persons should not come at the expense of the continued disruption of public services and state institutions.

The proposed policy follows an integrated implementation process that begins with the comprehensive registration of affected households and public facilities, the establishment of implementation priorities, the provision of appropriate alternative housing, and the conclusion of voluntary agreements. This is followed by the rehabilitation and reactivation of public facilities, supported by protection, monitoring, and accountability mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of outcomes and reduce the risk of repeated or returned use of the buildings and facilities as shelters.

Accordingly, this policy is more than a framework for the relocation of families from government buildings. It provides a practical model for managing one of the most complex displacement challenges in Marib Governorate by balancing the rule of law, the protection of rights, the restoration of public services, and the strengthening of trust between the State and society, thereby contributing to stability and peacebuilding in the governorate.

Case Study:

Restoring the Al-Maneen Health Center in Marib Governorate

The restoration of the Al-Maneen Health Center provides a practical example of implementing the policy recommended in this paper. The initiative successfully restored the operation of a vital health facility through a restorative approach based on dialogue, the provision of alternative housing, and partnership among government institutions, humanitarian organizations, and local communities.



The initiative was implemented as part of the Restorative Justice Initiative carried out by the Abductees' Mothers Association, in partnership with SAM Organization for Rights and Liberties, with support from the DT Institute, under the Supporting Peace in Yemen through Accountability, Reconciliation, and Knowledge-Sharing (SPARK) program. The initiative aimed to identify sustainable and humanitarian solutions to address the use of government buildings by internally displaced families.

The initiative resulted in the voluntary and organized relocation of families from the Al-Maneen Health Center in which three internally displaced families were moved to appropriate alternative housing. This enabled the rehabilitation and reactivation of the Health Center within three months of the relocation, restoring primary healthcare services for approximately 33,000 residents and internally displaced persons without resorting to forced eviction or causing harm to the displaced families.

This experience represents a practical model that balances the restoration of public facilities by the State with the protection of the dignity of internally displaced persons. It also demonstrates that complex challenges can be addressed through dialogue, institutional coordination, and the provision of appropriate alternative housing.

Methodology

This case study is based on a participatory methodology that included the analysis of field data and the organization of coordination meetings with the relevant stakeholders, including the Public Health and Population Office, the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, the local authority, community committees, humanitarian organizations, and representatives of internally displaced families.

A joint field assessment was also conducted to register the families sheltering in the Health Center, document their social conditions, and establish final beneficiary lists. This process produced a comprehensive database that informed planning and implementation. In addition, relevant reports and data were reviewed to ensure the accuracy of the procedures and their consistency with the principles of restorative justice.

Intervention Phases

Phase One: Registration and Planning

The initiative began with a comprehensive registration of the families sheltering in the Al-Maneen Health Center and an assessment of their social and economic conditions. The Health Center was identified as a priority for relocation because of its importance in providing primary healthcare services to a large segment of the population. At the same time, consultation meetings were held with the resident families to build trust, explain the proposed housing alternatives, and receive their feedback.

Phase Two: Provision of Alternative Housing

The initiative coordinated with the local authority and humanitarian partners to provide three fully equipped transitional housing units, together with essential assistance, including water and sanitation services, relief supplies, and basic household furniture. These measures ensured a safe transition while preserving the dignity and stability of the affected families.

Phase Three: Voluntary Relocation

The families signed voluntary agreements specifying the location of the alternative housing, the assistance to be provided, and the follow-up arrangements. The relocation process was carried out voluntarily and in an organized manner without the use of coercion or pressure. Throughout implementation, dialogue and community mediation were used to build trust and facilitate a final agreement on vacating the Health Center.

Phase Four: Rehabilitation and Reactivation

Following the relocation, the Public Health Office assumed responsibility for the building and began maintenance, rehabilitation, and refurbishment works. These activities were completed over a period of three months, after which the Health Center resumed the provision of primary healthcare services. The responsible authorities also introduced administrative measures to prevent future use of the building as a shelter, thereby safeguarding the long-term sustainability of the restored public service.

Results and Performance Indicators

The restoration of the Al-Maneen Health Center produced tangible results at both the service delivery and humanitarian levels. The following performance indicators demonstrate the effectiveness of the restorative approach in achieving the objectives of the initiative:

Relocated Households: Three internally displaced families sheltering in the Al-Maneen Health Center were voluntarily relocated after signing comprehensive voluntary relocation agreements and were moved to appropriate alternative housing.

Implementation Period: The entire process took approximately five months, beginning with planning, registration, and coordination, and concluding with the reactivation of the health center. This was consistent with the implementation timeline established for the initiative.

Alternative Housing: The implementing partners provided three fully equipped transitional housing units in a safe location, together with essential assistance for the relocated families. Follow-up assessments indicated that the families were satisfied with the alternative housing, considering them suitable accommodations that offered improved privacy and stability.

Reactivation of the Health Center: The Al-Maneen Health Center was rehabilitated and resumed operations within three months of the relocation, enabling it to restore primary healthcare services for approximately 33,000 residents and internally displaced persons. The Ministry of Public Health and Population Office also plans to progressively expand the center by introducing additional specialized services and units to strengthen its capacity to respond to the area's healthcare needs.

Beneficiary Satisfaction: Field monitoring indicated a high level of satisfaction among internally displaced families, host communities, and the relevant stakeholders. The relocated families confirmed that they had received the necessary support throughout the relocation process, while members of the local community described the implementation process as fair and peaceful, noting that it successfully balanced the restoration of the public facility with the protection of the rights of internally displaced families.

Table (13): Results of Policy Implementation at the Al-Maneen Health Center

Phase	Key Activities	Performance Indicators	Results
Registration and Planning	Registration of displaced households and adoption of the final beneficiary lists	Three internally displaced families registered	Final beneficiary lists were adopted, and no additional households were added
Provision of Alternative Housing	Preparation of three transitional housing units and provision of essential assistance	Three fully equipped transitional housing units provided	Families relocated to appropriate alternative housing
Voluntary Relocation	Signing of voluntary agreements and implementation of the relocation process	100% of the families successfully relocated	Relocation was completed without the use of force or coercion
Rehabilitation and Reactivation	Maintenance and rehabilitation of the health center and the resumption of primary healthcare services	Reactivation period: Three months	The health center resumed operations three months after the relocation, restoring primary healthcare services for approximately 33,000 residents and internally displaced persons

Lessons Learned

The restoration of the Al-Maneen Health Center provides a number of practical lessons that can inform efforts to address the use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate and other conflict-affected areas. The most important lessons include the following:

Providing Alternative Housing before Relocation: The experience confirmed that the success of relocation depends on the availability of appropriate alternative housing before implementation begins. The provision of three fully equipped transitional housing units helped build trust and encouraged families to relocate voluntarily. By contrast, attempting relocation without suitable alternatives would likely have resulted in resistance or the emergence of new humanitarian challenges.

Early Registration and Final Beneficiary Lists: The early registration process and the adoption of closed beneficiary lists proved essential for ensuring orderly implementation and preventing the addition of new cases during the negotiation process. This contributed to limiting the expansion of inhabitancy and ensuring fair targeting.

Adopting a Restorative Approach: The experience demonstrated that dialogue, community mediation, and voluntary agreements are more effective than coercive measures in addressing this type of challenge. These approaches helped balance the restoration of the public facility with the protection of the rights of internally displaced families while strengthening trust among all stakeholders.

Linking Relocation to the Reactivation of the Facility: The initiative highlighted the importance of beginning maintenance and rehabilitation immediately after the restoration of the facility. This enabled the Al-Maneen Health Center to resume operations within three months, restoring primary healthcare services for the local community and internally displaced persons.

Effective Institutional Coordination: Close coordination among the local authority, the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps, the Public Health Office, humanitarian organizations, and community committees was one of the principal factors behind the success of the initiative. Clearly defined roles and timely decision-making contributed significantly to effective implementation.

Respect for Human Dignity: Addressing the needs of internally displaced families, respecting their privacy, and involving them throughout the implementation process strengthened acceptance of the proposed solutions and reinforced the perception that the relocation process was conducted in a manner that respected their dignity and rights.

Risks and Mitigation Measures

Although the experience was successful, replicating this model will require preparedness to address a number of potential risks through proactive measures that reduce their impact and increase the likelihood of successful implementation. The principal risks include the following:

Limited Funding: The success of voluntary relocation depends on the availability of adequate funding to provide alternative housing and the accompanying support. Accordingly, any relocation process should be linked to funding secured in advance of implementation, while coordination with donors and humanitarian organizations should be strengthened.

Reluctance of Some Families to Relocate: Some families may be hesitant to relocate if they are not confident that the proposed alternative housing are suitable. This risk can be mitigated through early dialogue, the provision of appropriate support packages, and the establishment of an independent mechanism to review and address objections in a fair and transparent manner.

Repeated or Returned Use of Public Facilities as Shelters: Restored public facilities may be used as shelters again in the future if adequate protection measures are not put in place and the facilities are not reactivated promptly. To mitigate this risk, restored facilities should be secured, relocation should be directly linked to maintenance and reactivation activities, and regular field monitoring should continue after implementation.

Practical Recommendations and a Replicable Model

Based on the results of the Al-Maneen Health Center experience, this paper recommends adopting this model in addressing the use of other government buildings and public facilities, while taking into account the specific circumstances of each case. This can be achieved through the following measures:

Strengthen dialogue and community mediation mechanisms by establishing local committees that include representatives of the local authority, humanitarian organizations, host communities, and internally displaced persons to manage relocation processes through a participatory approach.

Invest in sustainable housing solutions by expanding transitional housing programmes and promoting the development of permanent residential communities for the most vulnerable groups, thereby reducing the continued use of public facilities for residential purposes.

Strengthen the institutional and legal framework by standardizing procedures for the restoration of government buildings and public facilities and establishing clear implementation mechanisms that ensure the fair application of the law while safeguarding humanitarian rights.

Enhance monitoring and evaluation systems by establishing independent mechanisms to monitor the implementation of relocation processes, assess their impact, receive complaints, and address any challenges that arise during implementation.

Conclusion

The use of government buildings and public facilities in Marib Governorate reflects challenges that extend beyond an administrative or legal issue. It is a manifestation of the consequences of protracted displacement, the limited availability of alternative housing, and the increasing pressure on public services. Addressing this issue therefore requires a balanced public policy that takes humanitarian considerations into account while enabling state institutions to restore their public functions.

This paper argues that the restoration of public facilities should not come at the expense of the rights of internally displaced persons, just as the protection of internally displaced persons should not result in the continued disruption of public services. Accordingly, a phased voluntary relocation policy based on the provision of alternative housing represents the most appropriate approach for achieving this balance. The policy combines comprehensive registration, appropriate alternative housing, community dialogue, voluntary agreements, the rehabilitation and reactivation of public facilities, and effective protection and monitoring mechanisms.

The experience of Al-Maneen Health Center further demonstrates that the restorative approach is not merely a theoretical concept, but a practical and replicable model. It has shown that public facilities can be restored peacefully while preserving the dignity of internally displaced families, strengthening trust between the State and society, and restoring essential public services.

The paper therefore recommends that the local authority, government institutions, and humanitarian organizations adopt this model as a reference framework for addressing the use of government buildings and public facilities, while adapting it to the specific circumstances of each case. Such an approach will contribute to restoring public services, strengthening the rule of law, and supporting peacebuilding and stability in Marib Governorate.

Annexes

Annex (1): Proposed Implementation Pathways Matrix

Pathway	Main Action	Tool / Mechanism	Implementing Entity
Technical Pathway	Final registration and adoption of beneficiary lists	Updated database	Local Authority and the Executive Unit for the Management of IDP Camps
Housing Pathway	Provision of alternative housing	Transitional housing units, residential settlements, temporary rental assistance	Humanitarian Organizations, Planning and International Cooperation Office, and Development Partners
Negotiation Pathway	Implementation of voluntary relocation	Dialogue, community mediation, and voluntary agreements	Local Authority, Community Committees, and Initiative Implementing Partners
Service Delivery Pathway	Rehabilitation and reactivation of public facilities	Maintenance works, operational plans, and administrative protection measures	Government Entities Responsible for Public Facilities
Oversight Pathway	Monitoring and accountability	Complaints mechanism, monitoring reports, and oversight committee	Local Authority, Oversight Bodies, and Partners

Annex (2): Comparison of Performance Indicators (Before and After Policy Implementation)

Indicator	Current Situation	Target Situation after Policy Implementation
Status of Public Facilities	Out of service or being used as shelters	Restored and providing services to the community
Situation of Internally Displaced Families	Emergency inhabitancy under unstable conditions	Relocated to safe and stable alternative housing
Access to Public Services	Limited due to the disruption of public facilities	Improved access to health, education, and administrative services
Public Confidence in Institutions	Declining trust due to disrupted public services	Strengthened trust between the community and the local authority
Management of State Property	Continued inhabitancy and limited recovery of public facilities	Restoration of public facilities and strengthened rule of law
Cost of Intervention	Accumulated service delivery and social losses	A planned investment that delivers sustainable results



www.ama-ye.org



abducteesmother



رابطة أمهات المختطفين
Abductees' Mothers
Association



SAM
Rights & Liberties



Justice4Yemen Pact
ميثاق العدالة لليمن



DT Institute