



NIGERIA

DISPLACEMENT TRACKING MATRIX

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Background.....	2
Overview: DTM Round XXII Assessments	3
KEY HIGHLIGHTS	4
1. BASELINE ASSESSEMENT OF DISPLACEMENT.....	5
1A: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA.....	5
1B: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	7
1C: REASON FOR DISPLACEMENT	7
1D: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT	7
1E: MOBILITY	8
1F: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATIONS	8
1G: SETTLEMENT TYPE OF THE DISPLACED POPULATIONS	9
1H: UNMET NEEDS IN IDP SETTLEMENTS	9
2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS	10
2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPs.....	10
2B: SECTOR ANALYSIS	12
CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT (CCCM)	12
SHELTER AND NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)	12
WATER SOURCES	14
PERSONAL HYGIENE FACILITIES	15
FOOD AND NUTRITION	16
HEALTH.....	18
EDUCATION	19
COMMUNICATION	20
LIVELIHOOD.....	22
PROTECTION.....	23
3. RETURNEES.....	25
3A: SHELTER CONDITIONS OF RETURNEES	25
4. METHODOLOGY.....	26



Executive Summary

This report of the Round XXII Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) assessment by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) aims to improve understanding of the scope of internal displacements, returns and the needs of affected populations in conflict-affected states of north-eastern Nigeria. The report covers the period of 18 March to 18 April and reflects trends from the six states most affected by displacement: Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.

Round XXII identified 1,881,198 individuals as displaced in the affected states, representing a six per cent increase (or 98,708 people) in comparison to 1,782,490 individuals identified in Round XXI (published in February 2018). This increase carries on the upward trend in the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) observed recently.

To gain insights into the profiles of IDPs, interviews with five per cent of the identified IDP population — that is 85,519 displaced persons — were conducted during this round of assessments. The information collated and analysed in this report includes the reasons for displacement, places of origin and dwelling types, mobility and unfulfilled needs of the displaced populations.

Additionally, site assessments were carried out in 2,356 sites, with the aim of better understanding the needs of the affected population. These sites included 272 camps and camp-like settings and 2,084 locations where IDPs were residing with host communities. Site assessments include an analysis of sector-wide needs, including shelter and non-food items, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), food and nutrition, health, education, livelihood, security, communication and protection.

Given that the State of Borno is the most affected by conflict-related displacements, this report places a specific focus on data and analyses pertaining to it. Lastly, this report includes analyses on the increasing number of returnees and their shelter conditions.

Background

The escalation of violence between all parties in 2014 resulted in mass displacement throughout north-eastern Nigeria. To better understand the scope of displacement and assess the needs of affected populations, IOM began implementing its DTM programme in September 2014, in collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs).

The main objective of initiating the DTM programme was and remains to support the Government and humanitarian partners by establishing a comprehensive system to collect, analyse and disseminate data on IDPs and returnees in order to provide assistance to the affected population. In each round of assessment, staff from IOM, NEMA, SEMAs and the Nigerian Red Cross Society collate data in the field, including baseline information at Local Government Area and ward-levels, by carrying out detailed assessments in displacement sites, such as camps and collective centers and in sites where communities were hosting IDPs at the time of the assessment.


IOM's DTM programme is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Office (ECHO), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Government of Germany. NEMA also makes financial contributions.



Overview: DTM Round XXII Assessments

Round XXII DTM assessments were conducted from 18 March to 18 April in 110 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe states, covering 796 wards. This represents a steady expansion of the report’s geographic coverage, which grew from 779 wards in Round XIX to 787 wards in Round XX and 794 wards in Round XXI, while operating in an environment with a volatile security situation.

During Round XXII, IOM extended its DTM coverage to two wards in Kaltungo LGA of Gombe State, one ward in Damaturu LGA of Yobe State, one ward each in Magumeri and Bayo LGAs of Borno State, one ward in Alkaleri LGA of Bauchi State and one ward in Yola-North LGA of Adamawa State. DTM assessments were not carried out in one ward of Dikwa LGA in Borno and one ward each in Kirfi, Katagun, Ganjuwa and Darazo LGAs in Bauchi, mainly due to hindered/limited access due to security concerns.



Map 1 : DTM accessibility map

Key Highlights

Round XXII Figures

 **1,881,198**
Displaced individuals

 **357,016**
Displaced households

 **27%**
of the IDP population
are children under 5 years

 **79%**
of the IDP population
are women and children


 **1,441,099**
Returnee individuals

 **240,764**
Returnee households

 **46%**
of the IDP population
are male

 **54%**
of the IDP population
are female

DTM Covered States and Percentage of IDP Population in Northeast Nigeria



- Largest IDP populations are located in **Borno**, **Adamawa** and **Yobe**.
-  **94%** of displacements were due to the ongoing conflict in Northeast Nigeria.

Change in Figures (February to April 2018)

• Total number of identified IDPs increased by **6%**

	DTM Round XXI	DTM Round XXII	Change
	1,782,490	1,881,198	+98,708 


• The number of identified returnees increased by **4%**

	DTM Round XXI	DTM Round XXII	Change
	1,386,229	1,441,099	+54,870 


• Survey of unmet needs showed that food remains the predominant need in majority (**73%**) of IDP sites

	DTM Round XXI	DTM Round XXII	Change
	70%	73%	+3 PPT

IDPs and Returnees Caseload Profiling



Type of Displacement Settings



I. BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF DISPLACEMENT

IA: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA

As of 18 April 2018, the estimated number of IDPs in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe was 1,881,198 (357,016 households), representing a six per cent increase (98,708 people) in comparison to the 1,782,490 individuals identified in Round XXI (published in February 2018).

The recent upward trend comes on the heels of steadily decreasing numbers that were observed between May and December 2017 (Rounds XVI to XX). The increase in the identified number of IDPs is attributable to the arrival of Nigerians from neighboring countries into situations of secondary displacement, as well as communal clashes and population movement on account of military operations.



Figure 1: IDP population per round of DTM assessment

Table 1 shows changes in IDP figures by state. Borno state, the most affected state in north-eastern Nigeria, continues to host the highest number of IDPs pegged at 1,421,600, an increase of 57,061 persons (or 4%) since the last round of assessment.

Adamawa, with 173,152 IDPs, hosts the second highest number of displaced persons, followed by Yobe with 124,909 IDPs. In terms of percentage increase, Yobe witnessed the steepest increment (19%) with 19,598 new arrivals recorded in the state in this round of assessments as against the previous round in February 2018.


State	Round XXI (February 2018)	Round XXII (April 2018)	Change
ADAMAWA	164,150	173,152	9,002 ↑
BAUCHI	53,309	61,055	7,746 ↑
BORNO	1,364,539	1,421,600	57,061 ↑
GOMBE	31,909	35,274	3,365 ↑
TARABA	63,272	65,208	1,936 ↑
YOBE	105,311	124,909	19,598 ↑
Total	1,782,490	1,881,198	98,708 ↑

Table 1: Change in IDP figures by state


In Borno, the highest increase was noted in Kala/Balge Local Government Area where 79,398 people were recorded, an increase of nearly 49 per cent. This increase was largely on account of consolidation of figures and new arrivals. The Local Government Area of Gwoza also recorded a high increase in the number of IDPs (up by 9,116), recording 93,049 IDPs returning from Adamawa, with the presence of assistance acting as a pull factor. Ngala also recorded a large increase in the number of IDPs (14%) on account of returnees from Cameroon and some arrivals from Maiduguri. The LGA that recorded the highest reduction in the number of displaced persons in Borno was Nganzai where the number of IDPs decreasing from 25,638 to 22,859 (11%). This was largely due to people fleeing to other LGAs, reportedly due to military withdrawal/operations.

While the percentage increase in the number of IDPs in Adamawa was marginal (5%), the state nonetheless hosts the second highest numbers of IDPs at 173,152. The LGAs in Adamawa that recorded the highest increases in IDP numbers were Numan (2,754), Demsa (1,722) and Shelling (1,644) as a result of displacements caused by communal clashes.

The most significant change, however, was observed in Yobe's Damaturu LGA where 10,975 more people (61%) were recorded during this round of assessments as compared to the previous round in February 2018, taking the number of IDPs to 28,874. The increase is largely due to ongoing interventions from both the Government and humanitarian actors concentrated in Damaturu Central in addition to the IDPs observed in the newly accessible ward of Sasawa.



Map 2: LGA level displacement severity map



IB: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

A detailed and representative overview of age and sex breakdown was obtained by interviewing a sample of 85,519 persons, representing five per cent of the recorded IDP population in the six most affected states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe. The results are depicted in *Figures 2 and 3* below. The average number of people per household was five individuals.




Figure 2: IDP population by age groups and gender



Figure 3: Percentage of IDP population by age groups

IC: REASON FOR DISPLACEMENT

Insurgency continues to be the main reason for displacement (94%), followed by community clashes which led to the displacement of six per cent of the interviewed individuals. *Figure 5* provides an overview of the reasons for displacement by state.




Figure 4: Percentage of IDPs by reason of displacement




Figure 5: Percentage of IDPs in Northeast Nigeria, by state and cause of displacement

ID: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT

Twenty-four per cent of IDPs were displaced in 2014, a slight change from the 26 per cent reported in the previous round of assessment in February. Similarly, a quarter of the observed population was displaced in 2015 (down from 27% in previous round). *Figure 6* provides details on the year of displacement of IDPs, disaggregated by state.




Figure 6: Year of arrival of IDPs



IE: MOBILITY

Camps and camp-like settings: As per the assessments conducted in displacement sites (camps and camp-like settings), most of the assessed IDPs (65%) have been displaced once, more than a quarter have been displaced twice (27%), 7 per cent have been displaced three times and 1 per cent have been displaced four times. States, however, show variations, with Bauchi reporting the highest percentage of IDPs displaced two or three times at 33 per cent, respectively.

A high 90 per cent of IDPs living in displacement sites said they intended to go back to their places of origin. Those who had no intentions of returning to their place of origin (7%) cited damaged houses' as the main reason. Forty three per cent of IDPs residing in displacement sites said that improved security was the main pull factor for their intention to return, followed by access to land (30%), access to better services (8%), family reunion (5%) and to rebuild their home (4%).

Host communities: Twenty-five per cent of IDPs living within host communities have been displaced more than once, while the majority (75%) have been displaced once.

In comparison to people living in displacement sites, a lower percentage (74%) of displaced people residing with host communities intended to go back to their places of origin. For those with no intentions to return, damages to their houses was cited as their main reason for remaining in displacement sites.

In Borno, 45 per cent of IDPs cited an improved security situation as the main reason for wanting to return, followed by access to better services (22%) and access to land (17%).

IF: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATIONS

Majority of displaced persons are displaced within their own state (*Figure 9 and 10*). Thirty-one per cent of the assessed IDPs are currently living in the LGA where their habitual place of residence was before the displacement. Furthermore, IDPs are originating from the same LGA in 21 per cent of assessed wards.




Figure 7: Frequency of displacement of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings




Figure 8: Frequency of displacement of IDPs by in host community

State of Origin	State of Resettlement						Total
	ADAMAWA	BAUCHI	GOMBE	TARABA	YOBE	BORNO	
ADAMAWA	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
BAUCHI	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BORNO	3%	2%	1%	0%	0%	3%	76%
PLATEAU	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
TARABA	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%
YOBE	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	4%	5%
KADUNA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NASARAWA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
JIGAWA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	9%	3%	2%	3%	7%	76%	100%

Table 2: Origin of IDPs and locations of displacement






Figure 9: State of origin of IDPs




Figure 10: Origin of IDPs and location of displacement

IG: SETTLEMENT TYPE OF THE DISPLACED POPULATIONS

In line with assessments carried out in February 2018, a slight increase was noted in the number of IDPs residing with host communities. Sixty-one per cent of displaced people were living in host communities (Figure 11). In four of the six states, the large majority (over 90%) of the IDPs resides in host communities, however, in Borno and Yobe, 51 per cent and 89 per cent respectively reside in host communities.




Figure 11: IDP settlement type




Figure 12: IDP settlement type by state

IH: UNMET NEEDS IN IDP SETTLEMENTS

In a survey conducted among 26,350 displaced persons, 73 per cent classified food as their main unmet need. Notably, 13 per cent pointed out non-food items (NFIs); six per cent identified shelter; and three per cent highlighted medical services as key unmet needs. These results are consistent with the observed trend during previous assessments. As demonstrated in Table 3, the figures for the need for food stand out as consistently being high over the last few rounds:

DTM Round	Security	Water for washing and cooking	Sanitation and Hygiene	Drinking water	Medical services	Shelter	NFI	Food
Round XX	1%	1%	1%	2%	5%	8%	14%	69%
Round XXI	1%	0%	1%	2%	5%	8%	13%	70%
Round XXII	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	6%	13%	73%

Table 3: Trend of main needs of IDPs (round XX and XXII)

2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS

2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPs

DTM Round XXII site assessments were conducted in 2,356 sites. These sites included 272 camps and camp-like settings as well as 2,084 locations where IDPs were residing with host communities. Assessments in camps and camp-like settings identified 39 per cent of all IDPs, or 727,966 displaced persons (Table 4). This is a marginal increase of three per cent in comparison to the number of IDPs living in displacement sites during the previous assessment in February 2018. 1,153,232 IDPs were identified in host communities, i.e. representing an increase of seven per cent compared to Round XXI.

State	Camps/Camp-like Settings			Host Communities			Total number of IDPs	Total number of Sites
	# IDPs	# Sites	% Sites	# IDPs	# Sites	% Sites		
ADAMAWA	13,595	25	9%	159,557	450	22%	173,152	475
BAUCHI	338	3	1%	60,717	346	17%	61,055	349
BORNO	694,899	214	79%	726,701	447	21%	1,421,600	661
GOMBE			0%	35,274	208	10%	35,274	208
TARABA	5,909	15	6%	59,299	218	10%	65,208	233
YOBE	13,225	15	5%	111,684	415	20%	124,909	430
Total	727,966	272	100%	1,153,232	2,084	100%	1,881,198	2,356

Table 4: Number of sites and IDPs by settlement type and state




Figure 13: Classification of IDP settlements

Camps and camp-like settings: Out of the 272 displacement sites, 60 per cent (down from 62% in February) were classified as collective settlements or centers. Thirty-nine per cent (up from 37% in February) were categorized as camps and less than one per cent were classified as transitional centers. The corresponding percentages for the former two categories in Borno were higher, with 37 per cent of site being categorized as camps and 63 per cent as collective settlements/centers. Almost all camps were spontaneous (95%), while four per cent were planned and nearly one per cent was earmarked for relocation. Similarly, in Borno, 94 per cent were spontaneous sites.

Site management support was provided in 92 sites (up from 86 in the last assessment), or 34 per cent, of the 272 displacement sites.

WASH support was provided in 219 (81%) out of 272 sites. Camp coordination support was available in 66 per cent of sites (up from 62%), shelter support in 90 per cent (up from 73%), education support in 66 per cent (up from 57%), and livelihood support in nearly all sites (99%).



No food support was provided in 11 per cent (up from 10%) of sites, while five per cent of sites did not receive protection support. *Figure 15* depicts the different types of site management authorities, with most of the sites (66%) lacking any (*Figure 14*).




Figure 14: Number of sites with site management agency





Figure 15: Type of site management agency

Host communities: Of the 2,084 locations where IDPs were residing with host communities, 1,884 (90%) were private buildings hosting 1,035,332 IDPs. In addition, 178 (9%) were public/government owned buildings hosting 104,446 IDPs and 22 locations (1%) were ancestral homes of extended family members and hosted 13,454 IDPs.



Map 3: Number and location of IDPs by state

2B: SECTOR ANALYSIS



CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT (CCCM)

This round of assessment identified 201 camps and camp-like settings (74% of the total number assessed) that present a camp-governance structure or committee and management support, with 92 of them presenting a site management agency on site (such as site facilitation by humanitarian partners and the existence of camp-governance structures).

Out of the total 272 camps and camp-like settings – including collective centers, camps in open air and transit sites — the large majority of the sites (258, or 95%) were established spontaneously and hosted 139,505 households.

232 camps and camp-like settings (85% of all assessed sites) hosting 142,694 households were presenting registration activity, while no registration exercises had been implemented in 40 camps hosting 3,879 households.

Natural hazards risks, such as exposure to storms, flood and fire, were assessed for 89 camps hosting 56,481 displaced persons. For the majority of the sites, the primary method of waste disposal is burning (181 sites, or 66%), and the use of a garbage pit (41 camps), while 43 sites had no waste disposal system in place.



SHELTER and NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

Camps and camp-like settings: Camps and camp-like settings presented a variety of shelter conditions while prevalent features could be observed in some sites. The most common types of shelter identified in camps and camp-like settings were emergency shelters in 99 (36%) sites, followed by self-made/makeshift shelters in 88 sites (32%). Other types were host family homes (24 sites), government buildings (22 sites), schools (18 sites), individual houses (10 sites), community shelters (8 sites) and health facilities (3 sites).

When analyzing the specific shelter needs of IDPs in camps, it is noted that out of the total 272 camps and camp-like settings, some households are living without shelters in 16 sites (hosting a total of 12,506 families) in the states of Borno (14 sites) and Taraba (2 sites). In those camps, the number of families in need of shelter reaches up to 24 percent of the total number of IDPs on site.

Additionally, households in 190 sites, are living in makeshift shelters. In 60 of these sites, a proportion larger than 75 percent of the total IDPs on site is living in makeshift shelters.

In 161 sites (hosting 131,286 families), there are households living in emergency shelters structures provided by humanitarian actors. Of these, 46 sites have more than 75 percent of IDPs on site who live in these emergency shelters.

Various shelter needs in 254 sites hosting 143,020 families were observed, with the most reported required shelter materials being tarpaulin, timber/ wood and roofing sheets.

Of all the 272 assessed sites, the most needed NFI items are blankets/mats in 50% of the sites, followed by kitchen sets in 21% of the sites and mosquito nets in 15% of sites.




Figure 16: Types of shelter in camps/camp-like settings




Figure 17: Number of sites per state with IDPs with no shelter and those living in emergency and makeshift shelters






Figure 18: Number of camp sites with most needed type of shelter material




Figure 19: Number of camp sites with most needed type of NFI

Host Communities: This round of assessment identified 2,084 host communities, with host family homes being the most common type of shelter for IDPs in those communities. This was the case in 1,935 locations hosting 197,138 households. Other types of shelter observed included individual houses (in 111 sites hosting 196,684 households), makeshift shelters (in 33 sites hosting 3,841 households), emergency shelters (in 2 sites hosting 220 households), and community centers (in 2 sites hosting 44 households), and a government building in 1 site holding 14 households.




Figure 20: Types of shelter in host community sites

On analyzing the shelter needs in host communities, it was noted that 112 locations of the total host communities assessed, hosting 8,859 households, included IDPs who were lacking shelter. In the majority (102) of sites where IDPs lacked shelter, the proportion of IDPs in need of shelter represented less than 25 percent of the total number of IDPs in the respective location.




Figure 21: Number of host community sites with IDPs living with no shelter, and those in emergency and makeshift shelters

804 sites, hosting 121,386 households, include IDPs living in makeshift shelter. Of these, 512 sites have IDPs living in makeshift shelter comprising less than 50 percent of the total number of IDPs in these sites.

246 sites, hosting 43,172 households, host IDPs living in emergency shelters. For 199 of these sites, the proportion of IDPs living in emergency shelters amounts to less than 25 percent of the total IDPs on site.

1,705 (82%) sites, hosting 174,565 IDP families in host communities, have indicated the need for specific shelter items. Among them, 426 sites (20%) need foremost timber/wood, followed by blocks/bricks, followed by blocks/bricks in 357 location sites hosting 25,731 households. Roofing sheets remain the third most needed shelter item in 468 sites hosting 38,067 households. 379 sites hosting 36,439 households had no need for shelter items at the time of the assessment.

Of all the 2,084 sites assessed, the highest need in terms of NFI items was blankets/mats, as observed in 684 sites hosting 88,789 households for blankets/mats, followed by kitchen sets in 632 sites hosting 64,813 households and mattresses in 292 sites hosting 25,426 households.




Figure 22: Number of host community sites with most needed type of shelter material




Figure 23: Number of host community sites with most needed type of NFI





Water sources

Camps and camp-like settings: Piped water continued to be the main source of water in Round XXII of DTM assessment in 53 per cent of sites (up from 52%), followed by hand pumps in 31 per cent (down from 35%) and water trucks in 7 per cent of sites.

In Yobe, which is facing an outbreak of cholera disease, piped water was the main source of drinking water in 60 per cent of sites, followed by hand pumps and protected wells in 13 per cent of sites, respectively. In Borno, where a cholera disease outbreak occurred in recent months, the main source of drinking water was piped water in 60 per cent of sites (up from 56%), followed by hand pumps in 29 per cent of sites and water trucks in seven per cent of sites.

Water sources had been improved in 61 per cent of all assessed sites (Table 5). Similarly, they had been improved in 62 per cent of sites in Borno. The proportion of sites with the main water source located on-site and at a walking distance of less than 10 minutes, decreased to 81 per cent (down from 96%). In Borno, the main source of water was on-site and required less than a 10 minutes' walk in 80 per cent (up from 77%) of sites (Table 6).

As illustrated in Table 7, the vast majority of site residents did not differentiate between drinking and non-drinking water, with 92 per cent (up from 87%) not differentiating overall in all states and almost all IDPs in Borno (98 per cent, up from 93%) not differentiating.

In 51 per cent of displacement sites, the average amount of water available per person per day was 10 to 15 liters, in 26 per cent (up from 17%) of sites five to 10 liters of water was available per person per day and in a bit over a fifth of sites (21 %, down from 31%), the available quantity of water was above 15 liters per person. The picture in Borno more or less reflected the overall scenario (Table 8). Drinking water was potable in 92 per cent (up from 88%) of sites with Borno faring relatively better at 96 per cent (up from 93%).




Figure 24: Main water sources in camps/camp-like settings

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	56%	44%
BORNO	38%	62%
TARABA	40%	60%
YOBE	20%	80%
BAUCHI	33%	67%
OVERALL	39%	61%

Table 5: Percentage of sites reporting improvement to water points in camps and camp-like settings

	Off-site (<10 mn)	Off-site (>10 mn)	On-site (<10 mn)
ADAMAWA	4%	0%	96%
BORNO	18%	2%	80%
TARABA	40%	13%	47%
YOBE	13%	0%	87%
BAUCHI	0%	0%	100%
OVERALL	17%	2%	81%

Table 6: Distance to main water source in camps/camp-like settings

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	60%	40%
BORNO	98%	2%
TARABA	73%	27%
YOBE	87%	13%
BAUCHI	67%	33%
OVERALL	92%	8%

Table 7: Percentage of sites where IDPs differentiate between drinking and non-drinking water in camps/camp-like settings

	<5 ltr	>15 ltr	10 - 15 ltr	5 - 10 ltr
ADAMAWA	0%	28%	60%	12%
BORNO	2%	15%	55%	28%
TARABA	0%	40%	20%	40%
YOBE	0%	73%	13%	13%
BAUCHI	0%	33%	33%	33%
OVERALL	1%	21%	51%	26%

Table 8: Average amount of water available per person per day in camps/camp-like settings

Host Communities: For slightly over half of the sites (51%, down from 53%) where IDPs were residing with host communities, hand pumps were the main source of drinking water. In 20 per cent of sites (21% in Round XXI), piped water was the main source of drinking water, followed by protected wells in 11 per cent of sites and unprotected wells in 11 per cent of sites.

As demonstrated in the previous round of assessments, piped water was the main source of drinking water for IDPs in 45 per cent of sites in Borno. Hand pumps were the second main source of drinking water at 27 per cent (down from 36%) of sites in Borno, followed by unprotected wells in 16 per cent (up from 10%) of sites.




Figure 25: Main water sources in host communities



Mirroring the situation in camps and camp-like settings, the sites' main source of water was on-site and at less than a 10 minutes' walk away in 74 per cent (down from 73%) of sites (86% in Borno), followed by on-site water sources located at a distance of more than 10 minutes' walk in six per cent of sites. The main water source was off-site but at less than a 10 minutes' walk from the site in five per cent of sites.

Water points had been improved in 57 per cent of all assessed sites, specifically 70 per cent in Yobe, 62 per cent in Adamawa and 52 per cent in Borno. This is consistent with findings of the previous DTM round.

An increasing number of displaced persons in host communities are differentiating between drinking and non-drinking water: while only 20 per cent of residents were differentiating between drinking and non-drinking water during the August round of assessment, this number increased to 45 per cent in December, 48 per cent during the February round of assessment and 56 per cent in this round of assessment. Contrasting this development, Borno state residents are differentiating between drinking and non-drinking water in only 18 per cent (up from 14%) of host community sites (*Table 11*).

In 45 per cent (down from 47%) of sites, 10 to 15 liters of water were available per person per day; 30 per cent (up from 27%) of sites reported access to more than 15 liters of water per person per day; and in 23 per cent of site five to 10 liters per person were available per day. The average amount of water available to over half of the IDPs in Borno is between 10 and 15 liters per day (*Table 12*).

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	38%	62%
BORNO	48%	52%
TARABA	59%	41%
YOBE	30%	70%
BAUCHI	36%	64%
GOMBE	63%	37%
OVERALL	43%	57%

Table 10: Percentage of sites reporting improvement of water points in host communities

	Off-site	Off-site	On-site (<10	On-site
ADAMAWA	13%	6%	69%	12%
BORNO	5%	3%	86%	6%
TARABA	54%	32%	10%	4%
YOBE	9%	3%	84%	4%
BAUCHI	5%	1%	87%	7%
GOMBE	3%	3%	86%	8%
OVERALL	13%	6%	74%	7%

Table 9: Distance to main water source in host communities

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	31%	69%
BORNO	82%	18%
TARABA	55%	45%
YOBE	73%	27%
BAUCHI	32%	68%
GOMBE	64%	36%
OVERALL	56%	44%

Table 11: Percentage of sites where IDPs differentiate between drinking and non-drinking water in host communities

	<5 ltr	>15 ltr	10 - 15 ltr	5 - 10 ltr
ADAMAWA	1%	12%	71%	16%
BORNO	0%	20%	51%	29%
TARABA	1%	42%	36%	21%
YOBE	3%	63%	24%	10%
BAUCHI	5%	20%	33%	42%
GOMBE	2%	25%	49%	24%
OVERALL	2%	30%	45%	23%

Table 12: Average amount of water available per person per day in host communities

Personal Hygiene Facilities

Camps and camp-like settings: In 89 per cent of displacement sites (down from 92% recorded in the February round of assessment and 94% recorded during the December round of assessment), toilets were labelled as 'not hygienic'. In 10 per cent (up from 7%) of sites, toilets were reported to be in good conditions. Similar figures were obtained for the state of Borno (*Table 13*). Hand washing stations were found in 21 per cent (up from 19%) of sites but six per cent lacked either soap or water arrangements. Hand washing practices were evidenced in 26 per cent (up from 24%) of sites only, although hygiene promotion campaigns had taken place in 68 per cent (up from 63%) of displacement sites.

Separate toilets for male and female IDPs were available in 36 per cent of sites; this figure is similar in Borno state. The percentage of sites without separate bathing areas for women and men increased from 36 per cent in Round XXI to 59 per cent during the latest round, and 46 per cent (down from 55%) of toilets did not lock from the inside. In 69 per cent (up from 67%) of sites, waste was burned and 16 per cent of the identified sites lacked a waste disposal mechanism. A garbage pit had been established in 15 per cent (down from 17%) of sites.

	Good (Hygienic)	Non usable	Not so good (Not hygienic)
ADAMAWA	12%	0%	88%
BORNO	10%	0%	90%
TARABA	20%	13%	67%
YOBE	0%	0%	100%
BAUCHI	33%	0%	67%
OVERALL	10%	1%	89%

Table 13: Condition of toilets in camps/camp-like settings by state




Figure 26: Availability of targeted hygiene promotion campaigns

Open defecation was evidenced in 38 per cent of sites, and functioning drainage systems were evidenced in only 12 per cent of the sites.




Figure 27: Main garbage disposal mechanism in camps/camp-like settings

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	60%	40%
BORNO	64%	36%
TARABA	80%	20%
YOBE	47%	53%
BAUCHI	100%	0%
OVERALL	64%	36%

Table 14: Availability of separate male and female toilet areas in camps/camp-like settings by state

Host Communities: Rates of access to clean toilets were lower in sites where IDPs were residing with host communities. In ninety seven per cent of sites, toilets were rated as not hygienic, in one per cent of sites toilets were not usable and in only two per cent of sites toilets were hygienic.

Similarly, in the case of Borno, most toilets (98 per cent, up from 96%) were classified as 'not hygienic', while toilets were either hygienic or not usable in one per cent of sites, respectively (Table 15). Only five per cent (up from 4%) of sites had separate male and female toilets, six per cent had separate bathing areas and 11 per cent of toilets could be locked from inside.

Burning was the main method of garbage disposal among 54 per cent (down from 58%) of sites, and 51 per cent had garbage disposal problems.

In eight per cent (up from 7%) of sites, hand washing stations were not equipped with soap or water. Consistent with the observed situation in camps and camp-like settings, the practice of hand washing was not evidenced in most (88%) sites, although hygiene promotion campaigns had been conducted in 24 per cent (down from 25%) of sites.

Open defecation was evidenced in 46 per cent (up from 43%) of sites overall, and in 61 per cent (up from 57%) of sites in Borno.

Drainage was working in 10 per cent (down from 12%) of sites.

	Good (Hygienic)	Non usable	Not so good (Not hygienic)
ADAMAWA	5%	2%	93%
BORNO	1%	1%	98%
TARABA	4%	4%	92%
YOBE	1%	0%	99%
BAUCHI	0%	1%	98%
GOMBE	2%	1%	97%
OVERALL	2%	1%	97%

Table 15: Condition of toilets in host communities




Figure 28: Availability of targeted hygiene promotion campaigns




Figure 29: Main garbage disposal mechanism in host communities

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	94%	6%
BORNO	94%	6%
TARABA	90%	10%
YOBE	95%	5%
BAUCHI	98%	2%
GOMBE	100%	0%
OVERALL	95%	5%

Table 16: Availability of separate male and female toilet areas in host communities by state

Food and Nutrition

Camps and camp-like settings: The majority of the IDPs (89%) residing in displacement sites had access to food on-site (same proportion as that reported in the February round of assessment), six per cent had access to food off-site, while four per cent (up from 5% in February and 3% in December) did not have access to food. The situation across the state is shown in Figure 30.

Ninety two per cent of displacement sites had access to markets. The frequency of cash or voucher distribution was irregular in 72 per cent (up from 70%) of displacement sites, while it took place once a month in 17 per cent of sites, and never took place in four per cent (down from 5%) of sites. As shown in Table 17, in Borno, two per cent of sites never received food or cash assistance.

Cash was mainly used to obtain food (in 55 per cent of sites, up from 51%), followed by food distribution (40%). Only four per cent of sites hosted IDPs who were growing crops. People in 54 per cent (up from 50%) of sites in Borno received cash while 44 per cent (down from 46%) of sites in this state relied on food distribution.




Figure 30: Access to food in camps/camp-like settings

In 78 per cent (up from 71%) of sites, screening for malnutrition was reported. No blanket supplementary feeding of children was reported in 32 per cent (down from 49%) of sites, and no distribution of micronutrient powders was evidenced in 51 per cent (down from 69%) of sites.

No supplementary feeding for the elderly was reported in the vast majority of sites (92%). Supplementary feeding for pregnant and lactating women was found in 51 per cent of sites (down from 66%). In 47 per cent of sites (up from 36%), counselling on infant and young child feeding practices was available.

Host Communities: Compared to the population in displacement sites, the number of people with access to food on-site continues to be lower for IDPs residing in host communities.

At the same time, the number of sites with access to food on-site increased from 58 to 60 per cent. 22 per cent had access to food off-site and 18 per cent lacked access to food. The situation was slightly better in Borno, as shown in *Figure 31*.

A high 95 per cent (up from 93%) sites had access to markets, although the frequency of obtaining food or cash vouchers was irregular in 73 per cent (down from 77%) of sites. Food or cash voucher distribution took place once a month in seven per cent of sites, while it did never take place in 18 per cent of sites. No site received food or cash on a daily basis and 70 per cent (down from 73%) of sites in Borno did not benefit from regular distribution (*Table 18*).

Cultivation is higher among IDPs living with host communities and was observed in 52 per cent of sites assessed. The situation in Borno closely mirrored the overall figures.

Malnutrition screening was reported in 31 per cent (no change from last round of assessment) of assessed sites in host communities. Blanket supplementary feeding was not evidenced in 78 per cent (down from 82%) of sites, while supplementary feeding for lactating and pregnant women lacked in 85 per cent of site. Supplementary feeding for the elderly was evidenced in less than one per cent of sites. Counselling on infant and young child feeding practices was lacking in 84 per cent of sites, and micronutrient power distribution and supplementary feeding was not observed in 79 per cent of sites.

	Every 2 weeks	Irregular	Never	Once a month	Once a week	Twice a week	Everyday
ADAMAWA	0%	76%	8%	4%	8%	0%	4%
BORNO	1%	73%	2%	19%	4%	1%	0%
TARABA	0%	60%	33%	0%	0%	7%	0%
YOBE	0%	67%	0%	13%	13%	7%	0%
BAUCHI	0%	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
OVERALL	0%	72%	4%	17%	5%	2%	0%

Table 17: Frequency of food or cash distribution in camps/camp-like settings




Figure 31: Access to food in host communities

	Irregular	Never	Once a month	Twice a week	Once a week
ADAMAWA	70%	28%	1%	1%	0%
BORNO	70%	15%	13%	0%	1%
TARABA	43%	56%	1%	0%	0%
YOBE	69%	6%	19%	1%	5%
BAUCHI	92%	7%	0%	1%	0%
GOMBE	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%
OVERALL	73%	18%	7%	1%	1%

Table 18: Frequency of food or cash distribution in host communities





Camps and camp-like settings: Malaria continues to be the most prevalent health problem in 57 per cent (down from 69%) of displacement sites, followed by fever in 16 per cent (down from 12%) of sites, cough in 13 per cent and diarrhea in 11 per cent of sites. The scenario by state is presented in *Table 19*.

	Cough	Diarrhea	Fever	Malaria	Malnutrition	RTI	Skin disease	Wound infection
ADAMAWA	0%	24%	16%	52%	4%	0%	4%	0%
BORNO	14%	7%	14%	62%	0%	1%	1%	0%
TARABA	7%	27%	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
YOBE	27%	27%	20%	20%	6%	0%	0%	0%
BAUCHI	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
OVERALL	13%	11%	16%	57%	1%	1%	1%	0%

Table 19: Common health problems in camps/camp-like settings

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	40%	60%
BORNO	13%	87%
TARABA	7%	93%
YOBE	20%	80%
BAUCHI	33%	67%
OVERALL	15%	85%

Table 20: Regular access to medicine in camps/camp-like settings

Regular access to medicine was evidenced in 85 per cent (up from 76%) of sites, with similar percentages reported in Borno. Virtually all (99%) of sites had access to health facilities; 65 per cent (up from 62%) of sites included health facilities on-site and within three kilometers of distance; 27 per cent had access to health facilities off-site but within three kilometers of distance; and three per cent of sites had access to health facilities on-site but located more than three kilometers away. The situation in Borno state is similar (*Figure 32*).

International humanitarian actors were the main providers of health facilities for IDP sites in 51 per cent of sites, followed by the Government in 28 per cent (up from 25%) and local NGOs in 13 per cent of sites. Again, the situation was similar in Borno (*Figure 33*).




Figure 32: Location of health facility in camps/camp-like settings




Figure 33: Main health providers in camps/camp-like settings

Host communities: Malaria was the most prevalent health problem in 59 per cent of sites (up from 47%). Borno mirrored the overall situation, as illustrated in *Table 21*. Fever was the second most prominent health issue in 16 per cent (down from 24%) of sites, followed by cough in 10 per cent (down from 18%) of sites.

	Cough	Diarrhea	Fever	Malaria	Malnutrition	RTI	Skin disease	Wound infection
ADAMAWA	15%	4%	11%	64%	3%	2%	1%	0%
BORNO	13%	5%	19%	62%	0%	1%	0%	0%
TARABA	7%	3%	33%	44%	9%	2%	1%	0%
YOBE	6%	7%	13%	52%	8%	11%	4%	0%
BAUCHI	8%	7%	14%	70%	1%	1%	0%	0%
GOMBE	7%	13%	12%	54%	12%	0%	0%	0%
OVERALL	10%	6%	16%	59%	5%	3%	1%	0%

Table 21: Most common health problems in host communities

	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	54%	46%
BORNO	32%	68%
TARABA	12%	88%
YOBE	58%	42%
BAUCHI	16%	84%
GOMBE	32%	68%
OVERALL	37%	63%

Table 22: Regular access to medicine in host communities



Regular access to medicine was evidenced in 66 per cent (up from 60%) of sites, with 68 per cent (up from 56%) of sites in Borno reporting regular access. Access to health facilities existed in 99 per cent in sites where IDPs were living with host communities. The percentage for Borno was similar to the overall percentages (Table 22).

In 56 per cent of sites (up from 52%), health facilities were on-site and within three kilometers (Figure 34). For 26 per cent (down from 29%) of sites, health facilities were off-site but located within three kilometers and in nine per cent the health facilities were on-site but at more than three kilometers of a distance.

The Government was the main provider of health care for IDP sites in 65 per cent (up from 59%) of sites, followed by local clinics in 20 per cent (down from 24%) of sites and international NGOs in eight per cent (down from 12%) of sites. The situation in Borno differed from the overall trend as a result of a higher presence of INGOs in that state (Figure 35).




Figure 34: Location of health facility in host communities




Figure 35: Main health providers in host communities

Education

Camps and camp-like settings: Access to (formal or informal) education services was recorded in 98 per cent (up from 95%) of displacement sites. The scenario in Borno was similar (Figure 36).

In 66 per cent of sites (up from 57%), formal or informal education facilities existed on-site, while they were located off-site in 33 per cent of sites (down from 39%). The distance to education facilities was less than one kilometer in 68 per cent (up from 58%) of sites, less than two kilometers in 24 per cent (down from 32%) of sites and less than five kilometers in six per cent of sites.

In 35 per cent of sites, less than 75 per cent of children were attending schools. In Borno state, the percentage of sites with less than 75 per cent of children in schools was 37 per cent. In 33 per cent of sites, less than 50 per cent of the children were attending schools, while in 20 per cent of sites less than a quarter of the children were attending schools. In nine per cent of sites, more than 75 per cent of children were attending school. The scenario in Borno mirrored the overall picture (Table 23).




Figure 36: Access to formal/informal education services in camps/camp-like settings

	<25%	25%-50%	51%-75%	>75%	None
ADAMAWA	36%	24%	28%	8%	4%
BORNO	17%	35%	37%	8%	3%
TARABA	33%	20%	27%	13%	7%
YOBE	20%	33%	27%	20%	0%
BAUCHI	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%
OVERALL	20%	33%	35%	9%	3%

Table 23: Percentage of children attending school in camps/camp-like setting

The high costs associated with school constituted the biggest deterrent for school attendance in 60 per cent of sites (down from 68%). The other reasons preventing school attendance were the lack of teachers in 14 per cent of sites (up from 9%), and lack of school supplies in 12 per cent of sites.

Host Communities: In sites where IDPs are residing with host communities, access to education services was recorded in 97 per cent of sites. In 72 per cent (up from 69%) of sites, formal or informal education facilities existed on-site, while they were located off-site in 26 per cent (down from 29%). The distance to education facilities was less than one kilometer in 60 per cent of sites (significant increase from 46% in Round XXI), between one and two kilometers in 32 per cent (down from 45%), and between two and five kilometers in six per cent of sites.

In 41 per cent of sites, less than half of the children were attending schools. This figure was 54 per cent in Borno while in 28 per cent of sites, between 50 and 75 per cent of children were attending schools. Less than 25 per cent of children were enrolled in schools in 18 per cent (down from 21%) of sites. Concurrent with findings from Round XXI, no children were attending school in three per cent of sites. The scenario in Borno was different from the overall picture (Table 24).

In 78 per cent of sites, the main reason preventing school attendance were the high costs and fees involved.




Figure 37: Access to formal/informal education services in host communities

	<25%	20% - 50%	50% - 75%	>75%	None
ADAMAWA	22%	41%	19%	12%	6%
BORNO	12%	54%	28%	4%	2%
TARABA	56%	25%	6%	12%	1%
YOBE	14%	43%	31%	8%	3%
BAUCHI	4%	40%	39%	16%	1%
GOMBE	11%	28%	45%	15%	2%
OVERALL	18%	41%	28%	10%	3%

Table 24: Percentage of children attending school in host communities

Communication

Camps and camp-like settings: In a continued deviation from the trend observed in the past, friends and neighbors were once again cited as the most trusted source of information (54%). Local/community leaders were cited as the second most trusted source of information in 36 per cent of sites, followed by religious leaders for four per cent of sites.

	<25%	25% - 50%	51% - 75%	>75%	None
ADAMAWA	80%	8%	4%	0%	8%
BORNO	68%	27%	2%	0%	3%
TARABA	53%	7%	20%	20%	0%
YOBE	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
BAUCHI	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%
OVERALL	67%	25%	4%	1%	3%

Table 25: Access to functioning radio in camps/camp-like settings




Figure 38: Most trusted source of information for IDPs in camps/camp-like settings



In 67 per cent of sites (up from 66%), less than 25 per cent of IDPs had access to functioning radios, while in 26 per cent of sites less than half of the displaced persons had access to functioning radios. In four per cent of sites, between 50 and 75 per cent of sites had access to functioning radios. In only one per cent of sites, the proportion of proportion of respondents in possession of functioning radios was larger than 75 per cent. The scenario in Borno was similar to other overall status (Table 25).




Figure 39: Most important topic for IDPs camps/camp-like settings

The main subject matters IDPs wanted to receive information on included: distributions (mentioned in 56% of sites), other relief assistance (15% of sites), safety and security (13%) of sites and situation in areas of origin in eight per cent of sites.

Host Communities: For displaced persons living in host communities, local/community leaders were cited as the most trusted source of information in 39 per cent of sites (representing a decrease from 43% in previous round). Friends and neighbors were the second most popular source of information (35%), followed by religious leaders in 14 per cent of sites.




Figure 40: Most trusted source of information in host communities

In 44 per cent of sites, less than 25 per cent of the IDP population had access to functioning radios, while in 39 per cent of sites less than 50 per cent of displaced persons had access to functioning radios, and in 11 per cent of sites, between 50 and 75 per cent of sites had access to functioning radios. Similarly to the results obtained for IDPs in camps and camp-like settings, in only five per cent of sites did more than 75 per cent of respondents have access to functioning radios. The scenario in Borno differed slightly from the overall scenario in the five other states as it included a lower percentage of sites with more than 50% or 75% of functioning radios in host communities (Table 26).

	<25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	>75%	None
ADAMAWA	61%	24%	9%	3%	3%
BORNO	53%	41%	4%	1%	1%
TARABA	53%	35%	5%	4%	3%
YOBE	20%	52%	16%	11%	1%
BAUCHI	33%	40%	18%	9%	0%
GOMBE	49%	36%	13%	1%	1%
OVERALL	44%	38%	11%	5%	2%

Table 26: Access to functioning radio in host communities

The main topics IDPs in host communities wanted to receive information on included: distributions (in 44 per cent of sites), followed by the situation in the area of origin (in 18 per cent of sites), information on other relief assistance (in 16 per cent of sites) and safety and security (in 11 per cent of sites).




Figure 41: Most important topic for IDPs in camps/camp-like settings




LIVELIHOOD

Camps and camp-like settings: Daily labor was the occupation of the majority of IDPs in 26 per cent of displacement sites (down from 29%). Petty trade was the main source of livelihood in 26 per cent of sites, followed by farming in 23 per cent (down from 28%) of sites, and collecting firewood in 18 per cent of sites.

Access to income generating activities was found in almost all sites, while the presence of livestock was recorded in 83 per cent (up from 68%) of sites, and access to land for cultivation was found in 58 per cent (down from 65%) of sites.

	Agro-pastoralism	Collecting firewood	Daily labourer	Farming	Fishing	None	Pastoralism	Petty trade
ADAMAWA	4%	0%	44%	48%	0%	4%	0%	0%
BORNO	1%	22%	26%	19%	1%	0%	1%	30%
TARABA	0%	0%	27%	33%	7%	0%	0%	33%
YOBE	7%	7%	33%	27%	7%	0%	13%	6%
BAUCHI	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%
OVERALL	2%	18%	28%	23%	1%	0%	2%	26%

Table 27: Livelihood activities of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

Host Communities: In contrast to IDPs living in displacement camps, where daily laborer was the most common occupation, the majority of IDPs living with host communities engaged in farming, with this proportion increasing from 56 to 61 per cent during this round of assessment.

Access to income generating activities was found in nearly all sites. Livestock was found in 89 per cent of sites and similarly, access to land for cultivation was evidenced in 89 per cent of sites in which IDP households lived with host communities.

	Agro-pastoralism	Collecting firewood	Daily labourer	Farming	Fishing	None	Pastoralism	Petty trade
ADAMAWA	10%	0%	13%	69%	1%	0%	0%	7%
BORNO	1%	6%	15%	44%	0%	0%	0%	33%
TARABA	1%	0%	13%	70%	3%	0%	0%	12%
YOBE	6%	3%	11%	63%	4%	0%	2%	12%
BAUCHI	3%	3%	12%	68%	0%	0%	0%	14%
GOMBE	0%	5%	17%	50%	3%	0%	2%	23%
OVERALL	4%	3%	13%	61%	2%	0%	1%	17%

Table 28: Most common form of livelihood activity in host communities



PROTECTION

Camps and camp-like settings: Security was provided in 95 per cent of evaluated sites. In Borno state, this was the case for 100 per cent of sites (*Figure 42*). Security was self-organized in 56 per cent (up from 54%) of sites across the six north-eastern Nigerian states, followed by the military acting as another important provider of security (22%) as well as the police and local authorities (7%, respectively; *Figure 43*).

IDPs in 89 per cent (down from 93%) of sites did not experience any security incident. Four per cent of sites reported incidents of theft as well as friction among residents, respectively, while IDPs in one per cent of sites cited instances of friction between residents of displacement sites.

The proportion of sites reporting no incident of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) decreased from 94 per cent to 86 per cent of sites. Eleven per cent of sites reported instances of domestic violence (up from 5%), which was the leading form of reported GBV. No cases of physical violence were reported in 96 per cent (up from 94%) of sites.

Incidents of physical or emotional abuse of children were reported in eight per cent of displacement sites, while no incident was reported in 89 per cent of sites.

Significantly, 18 per cent of sites did not report any problems in receiving support.

This is a marked difference from the 37 per cent of displacement sites that had reportedly not experienced any problems in receiving support in the last round of assessment in February. Mirroring this trend, IDPs in 71 per cent (up from 53%) of sites said that the assistance provided was insufficient for those entitled. Fighting between recipients was reported in three per cent of sites and three per cent of sites reported that assistance did not respond to actual needs.




Figure 42: Security provided in camps/camp-like settings



Figure 43: Main security providers in camps/camp-like settings

	Assistance did not respond to the actual need	Assistance was physically inadequate for most vulnerable	Fighting between recipients at distribution points	Non-affected groups are given humanitarian assistance	None	Not enough assistance for all entitled	Some specific groups are excluded	Lack of documentation
ADAMAWA	16%	0%	16%	0%	32%	36%	0%	0%
BORNO	2%	1%	2%	0%	13%	81%	0%	1%
TARABA	0%	13%	0%	7%	40%	40%	0%	0%
YOBE	0%	13%	0%	0%	53%	20%	7%	0%
BAUCHI	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%
OVERALL	3%	3%	3%	0%	18%	71%	1%	1%

Table 29: Challenges faced in receiving support in camps/camp-like settings by state

There were 62 recreational places available to children in the sites assessed, up from 30 places in the last round of assessment in February. Out of these, 18 (down from 22) recreational places were located in Borno. There were 25 recreational places for women (up from 13 recorded in last round of assessment), 18 of which were in Borno.

The majority of IDPs have identity cards (76%), with the proportion being the highest in Borno where 82 per cent of displaced people owned identity cards. Referral mechanisms for incidents were not in place in 35 per cent (down from 72%) of sites. Women felt unsafe in 98 per cent (down from 96%) of sites, and children in 98 per cent. Men felt unsafe in 99 per cent of sites.

Relationships between IDPs were reported as being good in 91 per cent (down from 93%) of sites, and relationships with surrounding host communities were described as good in 94 per cent of sites.

Lighting did not exist in 77 per cent of sites (up from 76%), while it was reported as inadequate in 19 per cent of sites.

Further, two per cent of sites offered travel opportunities for better living conditions.



Host Communities: In sites where assessed IDPs were living in host communities, 86 per cent (down from 89%) had some form of security.

Local authorities were identified as the main providers of security in 24 per cent of sites, followed by self-organized security in 21 per cent of sites and security provided by police in 16 per cent of sites.

In host communities, no security incidents were reported in 76 per cent (up from 74%) of sites. Theft was the most commonly reported type of security incident in 15 per cent (down from 18%) of sites, followed by friction amongst site residents in four per cent of sites, and crime in two per cent of sites.

In 91 per cent (up from 88%) of sites, no incident of GBV was reported. As observed in the analysis of camp and camp-like situations, domestic violence was identified as the main type of GBV incident reported in eight per cent (down from 9%) of sites. In 92 per cent (up from 90%) of sites, no case of physical violence was reported. No child protection incident was reported in 89 per cent of sites.

In 61 per cent (up from 59%) of sites, assistance provided was reportedly not adequate for all those entitled, and in five per cent of sites it was inadequate for the most vulnerable. IDPs in 24 per cent (down from 28%) of sites reported not experiencing any problem in receiving assistance.

In 89 per cent of sites, no child abuse was reported, although five per cent of sites reported incidents of child labor/forced begging. There were 124 recreational spaces for children in all assessed sites (up from 81), 28 of which were located in Borno. In total, there were 27 social places for women, out of which three were in Borno.




Figure 44: Security provided in host communities



Figure 45: Main security providers in host communities

	Assistance did not respond to the actual need	Assistance was physically inadequate for most vulnerable	Fighting between recipients at distribution points	Non-affected groups are given humanitarian assistance	None	Not enough assistance for all entitled	Some specific groups are excluded	Interference in distribution of aid
ADAMAWA	4%	5%	11%	1%	32%	47%	0%	0%
BORNO	3%	3%	1%	0%	19%	74%	0%	0%
TARABA	2%	10%	0%	1%	44%	42%	0%	0%
YOBE	1%	10%	0%	4%	16%	66%	1%	1%
BAUCHI	1%	2%	1%	7%	22%	64%	1%	2%
GOMBE	3%	2%	2%	1%	16%	74%	0%	0%
OVERALL	3%	5%	3%	3%	24%	62%	0%	0%

Table 30: Challenges faced in receiving support in host communities by state

In contrast to the people living in displacement sites, in the case of host communities, the percentage of people living without an identity card (54%) was higher than those owning one.

Referral mechanisms were in place in 35 per cent (down from 45%) of sites. In 96 per cent of sites, women said they felt unsafe. Men felt unsafe in 96 per cent of sites and children felt unsafe in 96 per cent of sites. Relations between IDPs were described as good in 92 per cent (down from 95%) of sites and excellent in four per cent of sites. Similarly, relations with host communities were good in 95 per cent of sites, excellent in three per cent and not poor in two per cent of sites.

Fifty seven per cent of sites had lighting in the camp, albeit inadequate, while forty-three per cent of sites were reported to have no lighting facilities established.



3. RETURNEES

The number of returnees continued to increase during the DTM Round XXII assessment: a total of 1,441,099 returnees were recorded, an increase of four per cent (54,870 persons) in comparison with the number recorded in the February DTM assessment. The increase was in line with the upward trend observed since DTM started recording data on returnees in August 2015 (Figure 46).

Among all returnees, 92 per cent were displaced persons returning from countries around the Lake Chad region. In Borno, 94 per cent of returnees were internally displaced persons and others were refugees returning from neighbouring countries.

In addition, six new wards were assessed during this round of assessment. Two of the newly assessed wards were in Demsa and Song Local Government Areas of Adamawa, three in Damaturu in Yobe and one in Kala Balge in Borno.

The highest increase of 8,349 people was observed in Damaturu in Yobe on account of interventions from both the Government and humanitarian actors focusing on Damaturu Central. Numan in Adamawa also witnessed a steep increase in number, with 7,630 persons recorded as returnees in this round of assessment, taking the total number of returnees in the state to 14,490. The population of returnees went up to 24,021 on account of 5,578 new returnees.

The LGA with the highest number of returnees was Askira/Uba in Borno, with 167,784 returnees, followed by Adamawa’s Hong LGA with 166,745 returnees and Michika LGA with 144,208 returnees.

Adamawa has the highest number of returnees with 716,078 returnees, or 50 per cent of all returnees identified in this round of assessment.





Figure 46: Trend of population return by assessment round

	Round XXI (Feb 2018)	Round XXII (Apr 2018)	Change
ADAMAWA	702,857	716,078	+13,221
BORNO	585,315	608,664	+23,349
YOBE	98,057	116,357	+18,300
Total	1,386,229	1,441,099	+54,870

Table 31: Number of returnees by state, during Round XXI and XXII



Map 4: Number of returnees by state

3A: SHELTER CONDITION OF RETURNEES

Shelter conditions were assessed for 240,764 returnees (17% of the total identified returnee population). Seventy four per cent of the shelters assessed were not damaged, 22 per cent (up from 21%) were partially damaged and four per cent (down from 5%) were makeshift shelters. Borno, the state in north-eastern Nigeria that is most affected by conflict, had the highest proportion of returnees residing in makeshift shelters (7%).




Figure 47: Conditions of shelters in areas of return



METHODOLOGY

The data collected in this report has been obtained through the implementation of different DTM tools used by enumerators at various administrative levels. The type of respondent for each tool is different as each focuses on different population types:

TOOLS FOR IDPs

Local Government Area Profile-IDP: This is an assessment conducted with key informants at the LGA level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on IDPs and includes: displaced population estimates (households and individuals), date of arrival, location of origin, reason(s) for displacement and type of displacement locations (host communities, camps, camp-like settings, etc.). The assessment also records contact information of key informants and organizations assisting IDPs in the LGA. The main outcome of this assessment is a list of wards where IDP presence has been identified. This list will be used as a reference to continue the assessment at ward level (see “ward-level profile for IDPs”).

Ward level Profile-IDP: This is an assessment conducted at ward level. The type of information collected at this level includes: displaced population estimates (households and individuals), time of arrival, location of origin, reasons of displacement and type of displacement locations. The assessment also includes information on displacement originating from the ward, as well as a demographic calculator based on a sample of assessed IDPs in host communities, camps and camp-like settings. The results of the ward level profile are used to verify the information collected at LGA level. The ward assessment is carried out in all wards that had previously been identified as having IDP populations in the LGA list.

Site assessment: This is undertaken in identified IDP locations (camps, camp-like settings and host communities) to capture detailed information on the key services available. Site assessment forms are used to record the exact location and name of a site, accessibility constraints, size and type of the site, availability of registrations, and the likelihood of natural hazards putting the site at risk. The form also captures details about the IDP population, including their place of origin, and demographic information on the number of households disaggregated by age and sex, as well as information on IDPs with specific vulnerabilities. Furthermore, the form captures details on access to services in different sectors: shelter and NFI, WASH, food, nutrition, health, education, livelihood, communication, and protection. The information is captured through interviews with representatives of the site and other key informants, including IDP representatives.

TOOLS FOR RETURNEES

Local Government Area Profile-Returnees: This implies an assessment conducted with key informants at the LGA level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on returnees and includes: returnee population estimates (households and individuals), date of return, location of origin and initial reasons of displacement. The main outcome of this assessment is a list of wards where returnee presence has been identified. This list will be used as a reference to continue the assessment at ward level (see “ward level profile for returnees”).

Ward level Profile-returnee: The ward level profile is an assessment that is conducted at ward level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on returnees and includes information on: returnee population estimates (households and individuals), date of return, location of origin and reasons for initial displacement. The results of this type of assessment are used to verify the information collected at LGA level. The ward assessment is carried out in all wards that had been identified as having returnee populations in the LGA list.

Data is collected via interviews with key informants such as representatives of the administration, community leaders, religious leaders, and humanitarian aid workers. To ensure data accuracy, assessments are conducted and cross-checked with a number of key informant. The accuracy of the data also relies on the regularity and continuity of the assessments and field visits that are conducted every six weeks.

The depiction and use of boundaries, geographic names, and related data shown on maps and included in this report are not warranted to be error free nor do they imply judgment on the legal status of any territory, or any endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries by IOM.

Contacts:
IOM: Henry KWENIN, DTM Project Coordinator
hkwenin@iom.int +234 9038852524

NEMA: Alhassan NUHU, Director, Disaster Risk Reduction
alhassannuhu@yahoo.com +234 8035925885

<http://www.nigeria.iom.int/dtm>

