



DISPLACEMENT TRACKING MATRIX

Nigeria
Round XIII Report
December

2016



IOM Nigeria



BACKGROUND


In response to the need for reliable information on internally displaced persons (IDPs) in conflict-affected parts of Nigeria, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) began implementing its Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) programme in July 2014. The DTM supports the Government of Nigeria and other humanitarian response partners, and allows them undertake IDP assessments in a unified and systematized manner that provides reliable information on the current IDP' situation.

The DTM programme in Nigeria works in close collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs) to highlight the needs of IDPs and returnees in

accessible areas. It also gathers information on the total number of IDPs in each location assessed. Baseline information is gathered at Local Government Area- (LGA) and ward-level and detailed surveys are conducted in camps and camp-like settings. The DTM teams include representatives from NEMA, SEMAs, the Nigerian Red Cross, and IOM. IOM's pioneering programme is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Office (ECHO), and the Government of Germany. NEMA also provides financial support.

Key features of DTM Round XIII Assessment

6 Yet
to reach
LGAs in
Borno



Continued DTM assessment despite volatile security situations on the ground and poor road conditions.

DTM had access to **21** of the 27 LGAs in the worst affected northeastern State of Borno




OVERVIEW

The DTM Round XIII assessment focused on the six northeastern Nigerian states most affected by the ongoing conflict. The six states are Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, and Yobe. The following DTM report covers a total of 106 LGAs and 751 wards.

In Borno, the state hardest hit by the conflict, DTM teams had access to 21 LGAs (110 wards) of the 27 Local Government Areas (LGAs), including areas harder to reach due to continuous insecurity and poor road conditions.

Round XIII Coverage




Total of 106 LGAs & 751 wards

Displacement Severity Map


1,770,444 Internally Displaced Persons

314,574 Households

Number of IDPs Per State of Displacement





Relative proportion of IDP population



Legend

- Inaccessible Area
- Assessed Area
- International Boundary
- Water Bodies



HIGHLIGHTS

National Overview:

 **1,770,444**
Internally Displaced
Persons

- Largest IDP populations are located in


BORNO  ADAMAWA  YOBE 

92% of the total
IDP population

 **314,574**
Households

- **97%** of displacements were due to the
insurgency


 Main cause of
displacement

 **8.2%**
Of the IDP Population
are infants below
1 year old

- In Borno, Maiduguri LGA is hosting the
highest number of IDPs

(473,577)

From October to December 2016:

 **46%**
Of Children in the IDP
Population are Male

- Total number of identified IDPs decreased by
3%, i.e. by 52,097 individuals from last round


 **3%**


55%
Of the IDP
Population
are Children
(0 - 18 Years)

54%
Of Children in the IDP
Population are Female

- **1,039,267** returnees from within and
outside Nigeria recorded since August 2015

 Returns

 **54%**
Of the IDP
Population
are Females

 **7.4%**
Of the IDP
Population
are above
60 years

- Survey of unmet needs showed food is the
predominant unmet need of IDPs **66%**

 Main unmet
need




POPULATION PROFILE

As of December 15, 2016, the estimated number of IDPs in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, and Yobe is **1,770,444** (or **314,574** households). This represents a **3%** decrease from the **1,822,541** IDPs reported in the previous DTM (Round XII, published Oct. 31, 2016) assessment. This decrease shows the continuing trend of

IDPs returning to their LGAs of origin, particularly in the Borno State. Consequently, the estimated number of returnees is **1,039,267**, as identified in this DTM round. This number is up by **80,718** from **958,549** in DTM Round XII.

Total IDP Population Per Round



Four out of six northeastern states showed a downward trend in IDP numbers during the Round XIII assessments, in comparison to the last DTM. Due to communal clashes, Gombe and Taraba states showed a slight increase in IDP numbers, by 684 and 996 respectively. In this DTM round, a decrease in IDP numbers, from the last report, was recorded in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, and Yobe states. The primary reason for this is the increasing trend of IDPs returning to their LGAs of origin, with the DTM assessment thus registering them as 'returnees.' Similarly, Maiduguri Metropolitan Council (MMC), which hosts the highest number of IDPs among all LGAs, saw a significant reduction in the number of IDPs. As many as 55,188 IDPs left MMC to return to their LGA of origin, bringing the estimated population of IDPs in MMC down from 528,765 to 473,577. Similarly, a decrease in the IDP population in Jere and







Konduga LGAs was also recorded; from 344,292 and 95,783 respectively in the previous round to 337,357 and 89,733 respectively in the current round, representing a 2% and 6% decrease respectively, on account of people returning to their LGA of origin thanks to relative improvements in security.

Bama is the LGA where the second largest decrease in IDP numbers was recorded, after Maiduguri MC, followed by Damboa. The reason for the decrease of almost 3,000 in Damboa was due to IDPs reportedly returning to their villages to prepare ahead of the harvesting season. In summary, 6 of the LGAs assessed in Borno State (MMC, Bama, Jere, Konduga, Damboa & Hawul) experienced reductions.

| Round | States covered |
|-------|--|
| I | Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |
| II | Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |
| III | Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |
| IV | Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |
| V | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Nasarawa, Taraba and Yobe |
| VI | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba and Yobe |
| VI I | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara. |
| VIII | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba Yobe and Zamfara. |
| IX | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara |
| X | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara |
| XI | Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara |
| XII | Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |
| XIII | Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe |




Change in IDP figures

| State | Round 12 Total (October 2016) | Round 13 Total (November 2016) | Difference | Direction |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| ADAMAWA  | 170,070 | 152,618 | 17,452 | ↓ |
| BAUCHI  | 58,955 | 57,114 | 1,841 | ↓ |
| BORNO  | 1,392,927 | 1,370,880 | 22,047 | ↓ |
| GOMBE  | 28,296 | 28,980 | 684 | ↑ |
| TARABA  | 47,587 | 48,583 | 996 | ↑ |
| YOBE  | 124,706 | 112,269 | 12,437 | ↓ |
| Total | 1,822,541 | 1,770,444 | 52,097 | ↓ |

The LGAs that saw an increase in IDP numbers include Ngala, with a sharp increase of 24,333 IDPs; Dikwa (increase of 14,282); Monguno (up by 8,960); and Chibok (increment of 7,694 IDPs). The other LGAs with an increase in IDP numbers are Gubio, Mafa, and Nganzai. The movement of IDPs from MMC, Jere and Konduga was the main reason for the increase in numbers of IDPs in Dikwa, Gubio, Mafa, and Ngala. The increase in Monguno and Nganzai was due to the ongoing military offensive in northern Borno. The increase in numbers in Chibok was on account of new areas that were assessed

during this round, in comparison to the last DTM, as a result of improvements in the security situation. Overall, the fluctuation in numbers continued during this assessment period as a result of new wards becoming accessible within LGAs that were previously inaccessible or only partially accessible. The trend of increased mobility continued, particularly among the large number of IDPs who returned to their LGAs of origin or moved to another area to restart farming.




1.2 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

In total, **80,052** people were interviewed to obtain a detailed age and gender breakdown, and vulnerability profile. This sample represents **7%** of the identified IDP population. The results show that **54%** of the IDP population are female and


46% are male. Children under 18 make up **55%** of the IDP population and **48%** of them are under five years old. (Average Household size **5.64**).

Population Profile (Demographic Distribution of IDPs)



DEMOGRAPHICS

DISPLACEMENT REASONS IN THE NORTHEAST, NIGERIA




The vast majority of IDPs (97%) were displaced because of the insurgency; 3% were displaced due to communal clashes in the areas assessed. Adamawa, Borno and Yobe states accounted for the majority of people displaced due to the Boko Haram conflict.

1.3 REASONS OF DISPLACEMENT

1.4 YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT

Most IDPs identified during this assessment were displaced in 2014 (37.5%), 31.8% were displaced in 2015 and 29.5% in 2016, revealing 2014 as the period which witnessed the highest number of displacement of persons in northeastern Nigeria.

Year of Displacement of IDPs



1.5: ORIGIN OF DISPLACEMENT


Most IDPs (77.4%) originated from Borno, followed by Adamawa (8.6%), Yobe (6.3%), and Taraba (2.7%) states. While most IDPs

originating from Borno stayed within the state, some went to Gombe and Yobe, notably, and to other states.

State wise place of origin of IDPs

State of Resettlement


| State of origin | ADAMAWA | BAUCHI | GOMBE | TARABA | YOBE | BORNO | Total |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| ADAMAWA | 102,522 | 2,125 | 1,702 | 2,021 | | 1,227 | 109,597 |
| BAUCHI | | 8,164 | | | | | 8,164 |
| BORNO | 50,096 | 22,202 | 16,773 | 10,571 | 52,524 | 1,363,184 | 1,515,350 |
| GOMBE | | | 199 | | | | 199 |
| PLATEAU | | 13,307 | | | | | 13,307 |
| TARABA | | 4,101 | 102 | 35,663 | | | 39,866 |
| YOBE | | 6,586 | 10,204 | 328 | 59,745 | 6,469 | 83,332 |
| NASARAWA | | 472 | | | | | 472 |
| KADUNA | | 157 | | | | | 157 |
| Total | 152,618 | 57,114 | 28,980 | 48,583 | 110,679 | 1,355,546 | 1,770,444 |



DWELLING TYPE

While the majority of IDPs identified during the assessments continue to live in host communities, with friends and relatives or in rented/donated houses, a modification by DTM in the classification of settlements with

5 or more households (therefore considered as camps or camp-like settings) has led to a variation in the number of sites reported over the last few rounds.



According to Round XIII assessments, 75.7% IDPs stay in host communities and 24.3% stay in camps and camp-like settings. In October, 78% IDPs were staying in a host

community. The state with the highest number of IDPs staying in a host community is Borno, with 967,277 individuals.


| Settlement type | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| State | Host Community | Camp/Camp-Like Settings | Total |
| ADAMAWA | 140,861 | 11,757 | 152,618 |
| BAUCHI | 57,114 | | 57,114 |
| GOMBE | 28,980 | | 28,980 |
| TARABA | 43,826 | 4,757 | 48,583 |
| YOBE | 101,454 | 10,815 | 112,269 |
| BORNO | 967,277 | 403,603 | 1,370,880 |
| Total | 1,339,512 | 430,932 | 1,770,444 |



UNFULFILLED NEEDS

Main Unfulfilled Needs (December, 2016)

- Food
- Non Food Items
- Health
- Shelter
- Potable Water



Food continues to be the biggest unfulfilled need of more than half of the displaced people surveyed, in camps and host communities. A high of 66% people cited food as their biggest unmet need in this round, an increase from the 49.5% in the last DTM assessment. Non-food items (NFI) came in second with 15% citing them as their most unmet need.


Medical services were the primary unmet need for 7% people and shelter was cited as a top need for 6%, while 3% felt water was needed most. The other key unmet needs included sanitation and hygiene (2.2%) and security (0.8%).

It should be noted that unmet needs are a significant driving force behind population movement. Therefore, the need for food could be the biggest reason for the high mobility of the affected people.

Main Unfulfilled Needs (June - December 2016)

| | Drinking Water | Food | Medical Services | NFI | WASH | Security | Shelter | Total |
|--------|----------------|------|------------------|-----|------|----------|---------|-------|
| Jun-16 | 5% | 52% | 7% | 24% | 5% | 1% | 6% | 100% |
| Aug-16 | 4% | 51% | 9% | 20% | 6% | 1% | 9% | 100% |
| Oct-16 | 3% | 60% | 7% | 17% | 5% | 1% | 7% | 100% |
| Dec-16 | 3% | 66% | 7% | 15% | 2% | 1% | 6% | 100% |


Unfulfilled needs by states







4 RETURNNEES

DTM NIGERIA | Return Assessment

SOURCE: DTM Round XIII
DATE: December, 2016




4. 1 RETURNEE HOUSEHOLDS AND INDIVIDUALS BY STATE AND LGA OF RETURN, DECEMBER 2016

| States/LGA | Households | Individuals | % of identified returns |  |
|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|
| ADAMAWA | 96,643 | 630,004 | 61% |  |
| GOMBI | 5,717 | 47,119 | 5% | |
| HONG | 23,684 | 165,383 | 16% | |
| MADAGALI | 11,774 | 58,870 | 6% | |
| MAIHA | 6,462 | 51,696 | 5% | |
| MICHIKA | 23,950 | 119,750 | 12% | |
| MUBI NORTH | 13,385 | 89,332 | 9% | |
| MUBI SOUTH | 11,671 | 97,854 | 9% | |
| BORNO | 67,485 | 374,739 | 36% |  |
| ASKIRA / UBA | 28,838 | 155,307 | 15% | |
| BAYO | 438 | 2,733 | 0% | |
| BIU | 1,149 | 7,848 | 1% | |
| DIKWA | 312 | 2,200 | 0% | |
| GUBIO | 5,890 | 27,710 | 3% | |
| GWOZA | 3,972 | 12,945 | 1% | |
| HAWUL | 1,626 | 11,334 | 1% | |
| KAGA | 4,602 | 23,009 | 2% | |
| KONDUGA | 4,975 | 28,066 | 3% | |
| MAFA | 793 | 5,217 | 1% | |
| MAGUMERI | 1,181 | 6,500 | 1% | |
| MONGUNO | 5,788 | 46,300 | 4% | |
| NGALA | 6,394 | 37,277 | 4% | |
| NGANZAI | 1,527 | 8,293 | 1% | |
| YOBE | 5,040 | 34,524 | 3% |  |
| GUJBA | 3,280 | 21,323 | 2% | |
| GULANI | 1,760 | 13,201 | 1% | |
| Total | 169,168 | 1,039,267 | 100% | |

IDPs returning to their place of usual residence, before the insurgency began, is a growing trend. The LGAs visited to assess the number of returnees during Round XIII included seven LGAs in Adamawa (Gombi, Hong, Madagali, Maiha, Michika, Mubi North and Mubi South), 14 in Borno (Askira/Uba, Bayo, Biu, Dikwa, Gubio, Gwoza, Hawul, Kaga, Konduga, Mafa, Magumeri, Monguno, Ngala and Nganzai), and two in Yobe (Gujba and Gulani). Most returnees were from Adamawa (61%), followed by Borno (36%) and Yobe (3%). In the Round XII assessment, most returnees were from Adamawa (32%), followed by Borno (25%), and Kano (7%).

Number of Returnees (October 2015 - December 2016)




4.2 SHELTER CONDITION OF RETURNEES


The assessment of the conditions of shelters in the areas of return did not show significant change over time. The situation has remained largely unchanged since assessments began in August 2015, indicating a reason why there are reports of returnees relocating back to other LGAs after personally finding the situation at their place of return unsuitable.

With more areas becoming accessible as far as security is concerned, Round XIII assessments found an increase in the number of partially burned houses in comparison with the previous DTM rounds. This indicates a need for intervention by the humanitarian community in order to make returns sustainable.

SHELTER CONDITIONS IN AREAS OF RETURN




The vast majority of returns recorded (82%) in the current DTM round are in areas where shelters were not damaged during the period of displacement (as shown in the chart at the left).



SHELTER CONDITIONS IN AREAS OF RETURN BY STATE AND NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD


Adamawa

| | No. of HH | % |
|-------------------|-----------|------|
| No Damage | 80,931 | 84% |
| Partially Damaged | 13,599 | 14% |
| Makeshift Shelter | 2,113 | 2% |
| Total | 96,643 | 100% |




Borno

| | No. of HH | % |
|-------------------|-----------|------|
| No Damage | 54,665 | 81% |
| Partially Damaged | 10,351 | 15% |
| Makeshift Shelter | 2,469 | 4% |
| Total | 67,485 | 100% |



Yobe

| | No. of HH | % |
|-------------------|-----------|------|
| No Damage | 2,684 | 53% |
| Partially Damaged | 2,325 | 46% |
| Makeshift Shelter | 31 | 1% |
| Total | 5,040 | 100% |



SITE ASSESSMENT


Round XIII site assessment was carried out in 164 camp and camp-like settings in the states of Adamawa, Borno, Taraba, and

Yobe, an increase of 3 from 161 sites that were visited during the last round.


Site Classifications

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Camp</p> <p>Open-air settlements, usually made-up of tents, where IDPs find accommodation</p> | <p>Collective Settlement</p> <p>Pre-existing buildings and structures used for collective and communal settlements of the displaced population</p> | <p>Transitional Centre</p> <p>Centers which provide short term/temporary accommodation for the displaced population</p> |
|---|---|--|

IDP Sites Per State




Number and Type of Sites



IDP Site Type

| Site type | Number Of sites | Households (HH) | Number of individuals | Percentage of individuals |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Camp | 22 | 7,006 | 37,305 | 8.7% |
| Collective Settlement | 140 | 72,467 | 390,788 | 90.7% |
| Transitional Centre | 2 | 458 | 2,839 | 0.7% |
| Total | 164 | 79,931 | 430,932 | 100% |





The greatest number of camps was identified in Borno State (126), followed by Adamawa (21), Taraba (12), and Yobe (5) with 430,932 individuals or 79,931 households. The sites assessed during this exercise have been classified in three categories:

- Camp: open-air settlements, usually made-up of tents, where IDPs find accommodation;
- Collective centers/settlement: pre-existing buildings and structures used for collective and communal settlements of the displaced population; and
- Transitional centers: centers that provide short-term/temporary accommodation for the displaced population.

The majority of sites were classified as collective settlements (140), including government buildings (25, down from 32 sites in the last DTM assessment) and schools (22, down from 30 sites in last assessment).

Most of the sites were classified as 'spontaneous' (93%), followed by only 7% that were 'planned' and none were 'pre-identified.'

In terms of land-ownership, only 2% of sites are community-owned, 15% are private buildings and most (83%) are located on lands owned by the public or government.

While Borno has the greatest number of sites, most were informal (98 out of the 126 sites in Borno were informal and 18 out of 21 in Adamawa were informal). Out of 5 sites in Yobe, three were informal. Lastly, Taraba had no formal sites: all 12 sites in the state were informal.

SECTORAL ANALYSIS




Shelter & NFI


6.1

Of the 140 collective settlements sites, most were self-made tents (50), followed by government structures (25, down from 32 sites in the last DTM assessment) and schools (22, down from 30 sites in last assessment). The decrease in number of schools acting as sites for IDPs could be, as per the declared intention of the government, to relocate IDPs from schools. However, overall, Schools continue to host most of the IDPs residing in camps or camp-like settings.. 29.4% of IDPs surveyed were residing in 22 school sites, followed by 24.9% living in self-made tents and 19.6% in government buildings.


Type of shelter in IDP sites




HH Living Outside (no shelter)



% of HH Living in Makeshift Shelters



% of HH With Access To Safe Cooking Facilities




Out of the 78,578 households that were assessed in camps across the three states (Yobe – 2,000, Borno-74,164 and Adamawa – 2,414), a significant number of households are living in the open without any form of shelter. In Borno, 10% are living in the open, and 2% in Adamawa are without any shelter.

In only 28 sites, less than 25% of IDP households were living within solid walls and 53 sites had no household living within solid walls. Electricity was available in less than 25% of IDP households in 16 sites while 130 sites had no electricity.

The most needed non-food item (NFI) were blanket and mats in 100 sites, followed by mosquito nets in 23 sites, kitchen sets in 22, and plastic sheeting in 13 sites. Kitchen sets were the second most needed NFI of respondents in 49 sites, followed by blankets/mats (37) and mosquito nets (32).

No household had mosquito nets in 14 sites and less than 25% of IDP households having mosquito nets in 48 sites. Lastly, only 33% of IDP households had access to safe cooking facilities in the most conflict-affected state, Borno, and 45% had safe cooking facilities in Adamawa.

Most needed NFIs in IDP Camps (Borno, Adamawa, Yobe)





WASH


6.2

- In the majority of sites (107), the main water source is located on-site within a 10-minute walk. This represents an increase from the figures of 92 and 69 recorded in the last two assessments, respectively.
- In 31 sites, down from 46, the main water source is located off-site but within a 10-minute walk and in 26 sites, a water source is located off-site and requires more than a 10-minute walk to reach it. In 60 sites, the water source is over 50% operational. When asked if the water points could be improved, 81 out of 164 sites responded in the affirmative.
- Hand pumps are the main source of non-drinking water in the majority (72) of the sites surveyed, followed by piped water (63), and water truck (12). Piped water was the main source of drinking water, followed by hand pump at 71 and water truck at 11.
- The average quantity of water available per individual per day in 56 sites was between 5 and 10 liters; in another 56 sites, it was between 10 and 15 liters / ind; 39 sites had more than 15 liters/ind, and 11 sites had less than 5 liters/ind.
- In the majority of sites, 140 out of 164, water was potable and in 24 sites it was not. The main complaint cited at 15 sites was that the water had an unpleasant taste and in 23 sites,


the quality of water was a problem.

- In the majority of sites, 130, the condition of toilets was not good or hygienic. In 19 sites, it was hygienic but in 14 sites toilets were unusable. 104 sites had no separate toilets for men and women, 98 had no separate bathing area, and 95 had no latch for locking the toilet/bathroom from the inside.
- Burning was identified as the main garbage disposal means in 63 sites, garbage pits were found in 45 sites, whereas 54 sites had no waste disposal system. Not surprisingly, in 108 sites garbage and solid waste disposal was cited as a problem.
- Though hand-washing stations were found in majority of sites, 133, they had no soap or water inside. In a high of 136 sites, no evidence of hand-washing practices at critical times was found and 112 sites had no hygiene promotion campaigns.
- Open-defecation was found to be rampant. 103 sites had evidence of open-defecation, while 60 did not. Another key issue was non-functioning drainage system, 153 sites had no drainage system.

Access to Main Water Source




Access to potable water



Functioning toilets

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| ADAMAWA | 367 |
| FORMAL | 231 |
| INFORMAL | 136 |
| BORNO | 5,148 |
| FORMAL | 3,386 |
| INFORMAL | 1,762 |
| TARABA | 22 |
| INFORMAL | 22 |
| YOBE | 158 |
| FORMAL | 104 |
| INFORMAL | 54 |
| Total | 5,695 |

Condition of Toilets on site





Food and Nutrition

6.3

Of the 164 sites accessed, 141 sites had access to food, which was either on or off-site. Most, 99, had access to food on or off site and 42 had access to food off-site. 23 sites had no access to food. There has been a steady increase in the availability of food at sites over the last two assessment periods.

In terms of frequency of distribution of food, it was irregular in 102 sites, down from 109 sites in the previous assessment, never in 24, twice a week in 4 sites, once a month in 7 sites, every two weeks in 7 sites and once a week in 3 sites. In 17 sites, up from 10 sites in the last assessment, the distribution of food was daily.

128 sites had easy access to markets near site and 32 did not. This is significant as cash is increasingly becoming the most common source of obtaining food. Over the last two assessments, cash has been gaining ground over food distribution as the most common means to obtain food. It rose from 72 to 80 in this round of assessment. Food distribution was next at 56, followed by no source at 11, cultivation at 10, and lastly host community at 7.


Screening for malnutrition was ongoing in 77 sites, up from 62 in the last round and 27 in round before. There was no screening in 86 sites. Blanket supplementary feeding for children continued to be low, with the programme running in only 28 sites. Micronutrient power distribution was recorded in 21 sites, down from 36 sites in previous assessment, and none in 140 sites.

Similarly, target supplementary feeding for lactating mothers was found in 42 sites, up from 12 sites in the last round, and none in 122 sites. Nutrition counselling was ongoing in 13 sites, down from 25 sites in last round, and none in 148 sites. Lastly, supplementary feeding for elderly was found in only 4 sites, down from 6 sites in last assessment, and none in 12 sites.

Access to Food and Frequency of Distribution

| States | Access to food | No of Sites |
|---------|----------------|-------------|
| ADAMAWA | Yes, on site | 19 |
| | Yes, off site | 2 |
| | No | 0 |
| BORNO | Yes, on site | 73 |
| | Yes, off site | 38 |
| | No | 15 |
| TARABA | Yes, on site | 3 |
| | Yes, off site | 2 |
| | No | 7 |
| YOBE | Yes, on site | 4 |
| | No | 1 |

Frequency of food distribution is mostly irregular in majority of the sites (109)



Health

6.4


Malaria continues to be the most prevalent health problem in most of the 164 sites assessed. 112 sites cited malaria as the most common ailment, followed by fever in 16 sites.

95 sites (up from 76 in the last DTM round) reported to have regular access to health facilities, against 140 sites that had some kind of access to medical facilities.

Most sites (73) had on-site health facilities within a range of 3 km. 50 sites had off-site medical facilities that were within 3 km and 24 had no access to any medical facilities at all.

The main service provider at 48 sites was a non-government organization (NGO), while government was the main provider in 41 sites (up from 36 sites in previous assessment) and 33 were run by international NGO.


Most Prevalent Health Problems In IDP Camps



Access To Health Facility



Main Health Provider




Education

6.5


In the 164 sites accessed, 123 (up from 99 in the last assessment and 67 in the assessment before) had access to formal and informal education facilities and 41 did not. In the majority of sites, education facilities were located off site (69, up from 59 in last assessment), 58 were on-site, and 35 had none. The nearest education facility is within 1km in 80 sites (down from 100 sites in last round), and 33 sites had education facilities at a distance of 2 km.

In 41 sites children are not attending any form of school.

Location of Education Facilities




Access To Education Services



% of children attending school in camps

| Row Labels | <25% | <50% | <75% | >75% | None | Unknown | Total |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| ADAMAWA | 5 | 9 | 6 | | 1 | | 21 |
| BORNO | 34 | 23 | 17 | 13 | 36 | 3 | 126 |
| TARABA | 4 | 2 | 4 | | 2 | | 12 |
| YOBE | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 5 |
| Total | 44 | 35 | 28 | 13 | 41 | 3 | 164 |





Livelihood


6.6

Small scale agricultural practices were the most common type of occupation in 47 sites, followed by working as daily labourers (44), petty trade (40), and collecting firewood in 25 sites.

A high of 126 sites reported they had access to income-generating activities, and 50,889 households said they had source of income.

Livestock was seen in only 70 sites out of the 164 sites assessed. Whereas 74 sites reported that IDPs had no land for cultivation and 89 sites said they had.

Common Types of Occupation





Communication

6.7

Radio (54, up from 44 in last assessment) overtook local leaders (39), and family and friends (36) to become the source of information for most residents. Mobile phone followed at 19, site management (i.e. humanitarian actors or government staff) was cited in 11 (up from 7 in last assessment) sites; and only 5 sites mentioned authorities as a source of information. Safety and security were the main issues displaced people wanted to know about in 66 sites, followed by the situation in their place of origin in 56 sites and information on distribution in 20 sites.

In 29 sites, respondents complained of serious problems due to lack of information.

Sources of Information



Domestic violence was the most common kind of gender-based violence (GBV) reported in 29 sites in 8 sites. No GBV incidents were reported in 122 sites. Early or forced marriage (2) and forced family separation (5) were the most common type of physical violence reported. Forced recruitment was reported in one site.

Incidents of children involved in forced labour/forced begging were reported in 19 sites; physical and emotional abuse of children was reported in 11 sites, and 8 sites reported incidents of child separation from their caregiver. There were five cases of child missing and no additional cases relating to the well-being of children were reported in 120 sites.

In 79 sites, respondents reported that there was no problem in receiving humanitarian aid during distribution; 54 sites reported that the assistance provided during distribution was inadequate, 13 sites (down from 21 sites in last assessment) reported tension among recipients at humanitarian distribution points and six sites reported that the assistance was inadequate for the most vulnerable people.

There are 42 (up from 34 in last DTM assessment) recreational places for children in the sites assessed and 24 (up from 16) social places for women. Some other highlights include:

- A higher number of sites (91) reported that the majority of IDPs had no identification documents with them; 72 sites reported that the majority of IDPs based there have such documents.
- 88 (down from 105 in the last assessment) sites reported no referral mechanism in place for incidents.
- In 160 sites, women feel safe, in 159 sites children feel safe, and in 161 sites men feel safe.
- Overall, all sites reported well to excellent relationships between IDPs (148) and 15 said the relationship was excellent.
- 146 sites described the relationship between IDPs and the host community as good and only 3 said it was poor.


In 136 sites, formal and informal security is being provided, while in 28, there is no form of security provided. Security-related incidents were reported in 48 sites, while 116 sites reported no security incidents. Theft was the most common form of security incident.

The most common form of security in the majority of sites (68) was self-organized, followed by military providing security in 45 sites, police in 6 sites and none in 28 sites. As many as 131 sites have no lighting in communal places, in 21 sites, the lighting is inadequate and adequate in only 12 sites.

Main Security Providers on Site

| Security Provider | No of Sites |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Community Leaders | 8 |
| Local Authorities | 7 |
| Military | 45 |
| None | 28 |
| Police | 6 |
| Religious Leaders | 1 |
| Self organized | 68 |
| Political Leaders | 1 |
| Total | 164 |

Common types of security incidents



METHODOLOGY

The DTM activities are being implemented according to the methodology endorsed by the Government of Nigeria and carried out by teams composed of members of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA), the Nigerian Red Cross Society and IOM. Humanitarian partners in the field are also participating in the assessment on an ad hoc basis. Data are collected following these steps:

Local Government Area- (LGA) level location assessment:

An assessment is conducted with key informants at LGA-level. The type of information collected at this level includes: displaced population estimates, with household and individual level estimates, the identification of wards within the LGA with displaced populations and the type of displacement locations, reason for displacement, time of arrival of IDPs, and location of origin. The assessment also captures if IDPs have originated from the LGA and records the contact information of key informants and organizations that assist IDPs in the area. The information is collected through interviews with key informants, who can be representatives of the LGA administration, IDP community leaders, religious leaders, ward leaders, and NGO or humanitarian aid workers. The results of the LGA assessments, most importantly the indication of the presence of displaced households in specified wards/villages, disaggregated by those displaced in host communities and those displaced in camp-like settings, are used to advise whether to continue assessments at the ward/village-level.

Ward/village-level location assessments:

Assessments are conducted with key informants at the ward/village-level. The information collected includes: estimates on the number of displaced households and individuals living in the ward, details on the location and type of residence of displaced households (host community – free or renting, camp-like settings – formal and informal), reason for displacement, areas of origin, and length of displacement. The assessment also includes information on displacement originating from the ward, as well as a demographic calculator based on a sample of IDPs in host communities and camp-like settings. Interviews are conducted with key informants, such as ward leaders, representatives of the

LGA administration, IDP community leaders, religious leaders, and NGO or humanitarian aid workers. The results of the ward/village assessments are used to verify the information collected at LGA-level. The ward/village-level location assessments are conducted in all the wards identified as having IDP populations during the LGA assessment.

Site assessments:

The site assessments are undertaken in identified IDP sites (in camps and camp-like settings) with a minimum size of 5 households or 20 people to capture detailed information on the key services available. Site assessment forms are used to record the exact location and name of a site/location, accessibility constraints, size and type of the site/location, whether registration is available, details about the site management agency (in camps and camp-like sites) and if natural hazards put the site/location at risk. The form also captures details about the IDP population there, including their place of origin, and demographic information on the number of households with a breakdown by age and sex, as well as information on IDPs with specific vulnerabilities. The form also captures details on key 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 management agency and other key informants, including IDP representatives.

Registration:

The registration exercise establishes the profile of IDPs by collecting detailed information at household-level. The data is captured through an individual interview with the head of household and include information on individual household members, displacement history, education, livelihood, return intention, assistance received and needs as well as on vulnerability. This exercise is conducted in camps, camp-like sites and host communities.



DTM

Nigeria



Contacts:

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Henry KWENIN, DTM Project Officer
hkwenin@iom.int +234 9038852524

National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)

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

Additional information on IOM Nigeria products can be found on:

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