



**IOM NIGERIA - NORTH-CENTRAL AND NORTH-WEST ZONES
DISPLACEMENT REPORT DECEMBER 2023 | ROUND 12
NEEDS MONITORING**

PUBLISHER

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION

IOM: International Organization for Migration (UN Migration Agency)

No 55 Hassan Musa Katsina Road, Asokoro

Abuja – Nigeria (GMT +1)

Tel.: +234 8085221427

Email: iomnigeriadtm@iom.int

Website: <https://dtm.iom.int>

DISCLAIMER

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an Inter-Governmental Organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to meet the operational challenges of migration, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants. The maps included in this report are illustrative. The representations and the use of borders and geographic names may include errors and do not imply a judgment on the legal status of territories nor acknowledgement of borders by the Organization.

“When quoting, paraphrasing, or in any other way using the information mentioned in this report, the source needs to be stated appropriately as follows: “Source: Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) of the International Organization for Migration (IOM), December 2023.”

© 2023 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.


TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY HIGHLIGHTS.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
METHODOLOGY.....	6
1. DISPLACEMENT OVERVIEW.....	7
2. DISPLACEMENT HIGHLIGHTS BY STATE.....	9
2a: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTH-CENTRAL STATES.....	9
2b: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTH-WEST STATES.....	10
3. DISPLACEMENT DETAILS.....	11
3a: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT.....	11
3b: REASONS FOR DISPLACEMENT.....	11
3c: FREQUENCY OF DISPLACEMENT.....	12
3d: PRIMARY NEEDS.....	12
3e: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATION.....	12
3f: DISPLACEMENT DEMOGRAPHICS.....	12
4. SETTLEMENT AND ACCOMODATION TYPE.....	13
4a: NUMBER OF IDP LOCATIONS AND SITES.....	13
4b: SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION.....	13
5. NEEDS MONITORING.....	16
5a: CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT.....	16
5b: SHELTER.....	16
5c: NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFI).....	17
5d: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE (WASH)	17
5e: FOOD AND NUTRITION.....	20
5f: HEALTH	22
5g: EDUCATION.....	23
5h: LIVELIHOOD	25
5i: PROTECTION.....	26


KEY HIGHLIGHTS


 **179,990**
IDP HHs

 **1,075,893**
IDP Ind.

 **17%**
of the IDPs
are men

 **17%**
of the IDPs
are women

 **21%**
of the IDPs
are boys

 **45%**
of the IDPs
are girls



 **8**
States

 **172**
LGAs



 **851**
Wards

 **1,637**
Locations

IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

  **-25%**
189,643

IDPs in host communities

  **-6%**
886,250

IDPs within the state

 **90%**
963,793

Displaced across a state border

 **10%**
112,100

 **10%**
Decrease
in displaced
population
from DTM
Round 11

Total IDP per Round



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To better understand the scope of displacement and assess the needs of the affected populations, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) is implementing its Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) programme in Nigeria's north-central and north-west regions, in collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and the State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs).

DTM aims to track and monitor displacement and population mobility in the aforementioned regions. This report is an analysis of the data collected during the 12th round at various levels, including information on displacement locations, reasons for displacement, the length of displacement, the intentions and conditions of migrants and internally displaced persons.

This report presents information on the numbers, living conditions and needs of displaced populations in the north-central and north-west regions affected by crisis. The data was collected directly from internally displaced persons (IDPs) in 826 wards located in 172 Local Government Areas (LGAs) across the states of Benue, Nasarawa and Plateau (north-central) and Kaduna, Kano, Sokoto, Katsina and Zamfara (north-west) between 13 September and 24 October 2023.

The main objective of the DTM programme is to support the Government and humanitarian partners by establishing a comprehensive system to collect, analyze and disseminate data on displaced populations (IDPs and returnees) to assist the affected population effectively.

BACKGROUND

Nigeria's north-central and north-west regions have been affected by a multidimensional crisis — rooted in historic ethno-social strife — that rekindled in 2013 following the degradation of socioeconomic and environmental conditions. The crisis includes long-standing conflict between ethnic and linguistic groups, tensions between nomadic pastoralists (transhumance) and sedentary farmers, attacks by criminal groups on local populations and banditry/hirabah (kidnappings and grand larcenies along major highways). These tensions cross-cut religious cleavages especially in the state of Plateau (north-central). The situation escalated in January 2018 with the intensification of attacks, resulting in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of individuals. At the end of 2018, one million individuals had been displaced. While many of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been able to return, hundreds of thousands remain displaced due to a lack of security and fear of being attacked *en route* or upon their return to their locations of origin. The crisis continues to displace populations periodically in the states of Benue, Nasarawa and Plateau (north-central), and Kaduna, Kano, Sokoto, Katsina and Zamfara (north-west).

Disputes between herders and farmers are key phenomena in this crisis. The farmers and herders crisis in Nigeria emanates from competing claims to natural resources. These tensions are compounded by exponential population growth, expanding human settlements, land privatization, year-round farming, environmental degradation, weakened traditional conflicts resolution mechanism and climate change. These further weaken the adaptive capacities of involved parties and most often result in tensions between communities that sometimes lead to deadly conflicts.

Another significant phenomenon in the affected regions is communal conflicts between ethnic and language-based communities. These tensions date back to the country's division into states, which separated ethnic and linguistic groups by administrative boundaries. Often, this resulted in the forced cohabitation of often antagonistic groups. Tensions over resources and land, exacerbated by climate change, have escalated into communal conflicts that displace significant numbers of people.

IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) was first implemented in the states of Nasarawa and the Federal Capital Territory in August 2015. After the crisis in north-west and north-central Nigeria escalated in early 2018, supporting the affected populations became paramount. As a result, IOM broadened the reach of DTM to the entire affected area to assess the numbers and trends of displacement, and gain insight into the profiles, needs and vulnerabilities of displaced populations. The information collected seeks to inform the Government of Nigeria and the humanitarian community with an improved understanding of population movement and displacement in the two zones. Likewise, it aims to inform better the humanitarian response and relief provision for the affected population.

METHODOLOGY

Round 12 of DTM data collection in Nigeria's north-west and north-central regions was conducted between 13 September and 24 October 2023. During the activity, DTM deployed teams of enumerators to conduct assessments in 826 wards (down from the 881 wards assessed in Round 11 of DTM assessments), located in 172 LGAs (down from 180 LGAs in Round 11). Eight states were covered, including Benue, Nasarawa and Plateau (north-central) and Kaduna, Kano, Sokoto, Katsina and Zamfara (north-west).

DTM enumerators conducted assessments in 1,637 locations (a decrease of 121 locations compared to Round 11), including 1,549 (95%) locations where IDPs were residing among host communities and 88 (5%) locations categorized as camps/camp-like settings. The reason for the decrease owed to inaccessibility of some locations caused by security. During these assessments, data was collected on population demographics, living conditions and multisectoral needs of displaced populations.

DTM activities in Nigeria's north-central and north-west regions targeted IDPs and aimed to gain a better understanding of displacement figures and trends, the living conditions of the affected populations and the needs and vulnerabilities of these populations. The population categories are defined in this report as follows:

- An **Internally Displaced Person (IDP)** according to DTM definition is 'a person who has been forced to flee or to leave his or her home or place of habitual residence, in particular as a result of, or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who has not crossed an internationally recognized state border.'
- In the context of Nigeria, a **returnee** is defined by DTM as any former IDP who returned to his or her locality of origin (IDP returnee); or any former refugee who returned to his or her country of origin (returnee from abroad).

Return is understood as a physical return and does not imply or suggest that returnees live in a safe environment with dignity and access to sustainable livelihood opportunities or adequate resources. National, gubernatorial and local authorities as well as international and local humanitarian partners, were involved in all the steps of DTM activities. The final results were validated by the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) an agency of the Government of Nigeria.

The data presented in this report was obtained by implementing multiple DTM survey tools (The master list and the needs monitoring tool) at various administrative levels. Each tool targets a different population profile depending on the purpose of the assessment.

LIMITATIONS

- In some north-central and north-west Nigeria LGAs, the security situation remains volatile. Therefore, not all locations were accessible at the time of the assessment. In Zamfara state, some locations in Maru, Shinkafi and Zurmi LGAs were not accessible during this Round.
- The data used for this analysis were estimates obtained through key informant interviews, direct observation and focus group discussions. Thus, to ensure these estimates' reliability, data collection was performed at the lowest administrative level: the site or the host community.
- Some enumerators experienced hesitance and reluctance from internally displaced populations to cooperate with the surveys as data is collected regularly and assistance is limited.
- In Plateau State, internally displaced populations were highly mobile during this time period. As IDPs were actively searching for better living conditions, it was challenging for enumerators to capture all their movements.
- In some LGAs, transportation costs have increased significantly due to banditry and attacks. This made it challenging for DTM enumerators to reach the localities to be assessed and caused delays.
- As a result of the security issues, a ban on motorcycles and trucks was issued in the some locations in the states of Benue and Kaduna. As motorcycles are the means of transportation of the data collectors, this resulted in long waits to find vehicles. Data collectors were forced to come up with alternatives (hiring a *keke napep* or tricycle) which were less effective.
- The poor network in remote locations frequently led to delays in data sharing from the field teams to the office.

I. DISPLACEMENT OVERVIEW

The Round 12 of DTM assessments identified 1,075,893 IDPs in 179,990 households across the eight states covered in north-central and north-west Nigeria, representing a decrease of 114,400 individuals (10%) compared to the 1,190,293 IDPs identified during the last Round of assessments, conducted in December 2022 ([Round 11](#)). While there was a significant increase in displaced persons due to the flood incidents reported in some north-central states such as Benue and Nasarawa, there was a considerable decrease between rounds 11 and 12 due to the inaccessibility of some locations resulting from insecurities in Maru, Shinkafi and Zurmi LGAs in the state of Zamfara, and some locations in Benue state. This demonstrated that the number of IDPs assessed by DTM is highly dependent on the accessibility of the IDP locations during the assessment period and actual displacement numbers were likely to be considerably higher.

In Round 12, out of 1,075,893 IDPs, 189,643 IDPs were residing in camps/camp-like settings (or 18% of the total number of IDPs) and 886,250 IDPs residing among host communities (or 82% of the total amount of IDPs). Fifty-six per cent of IDPs (or 605,701 individuals) were found in the north-west zone, while 44 per cent (or 470,192 individuals) were located in the north-central zone. When considering the number of IDPs per state, Benue was the state where the highest number of IDPs were recorded, with 394,567 individuals (or 37% of the total number of IDPs). Similar to Round 11, Katsina was the state where the second-highest number of IDPs were recorded, followed by Zamfara State. Katsina currently host 244,380 IDPs (or 23% of the total internally displaced population), while in Zamfara, a total number of 159,956 IDPs were recorded (or 15% of the total internally displaced population).



During the field visit of IOM's Chief of Mission and the UNHCR's Country Representative to Ichwa IDP camp in Makurdi LGA, Benue State © IOM 2023/Elijah ELAIGWU

NUMBER OF DISPLACED PERSONS BY STATE



Map 1: IDP population by state

This map is for illustration purposes only. The boundaries and names shown, and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration..

2. DISPLACEMENT HIGHLIGHT BY STATE

2a: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTH-CENTRAL AND NORTH-WEST NIGERIA

NORTH-CENTRAL

- Amongst the eight states affected by the crisis, **Benue** continued to host the largest share of internally displaced individuals, with 394,567 IDPs or 37 per cent of the total internally displaced population. This signifies a decrease of almost 19 per cent or 94,678 individuals since Round 11. Of the total internally displaced population living in camps/ camp-like settings in north-central and north-west Nigeria, 64 per cent were found in Benue State. The three LGAs hosting the most significant number of IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria were all in Benue State. Guma (105,154 IDPs) remains the LGA hosting the highest number of IDPs within the assessed areas. Guma LGA was followed by Gwer West LGA (63,083 IDPs) and Agatu LGA (46,135 IDPs).
- In September 2022 and August 2023, the Government of Cameroon decided to open the gates of the Lagdo dam located in the northern province of Cameroon. The opening of the dam, which flows into the river Benue in Nigeria, caused widespread floods in the states where the river flows through. Many properties, farmlands and houses were damaged or destroyed in Benue, resulting in large-scale displacements in the LGAs bordering the river Benue.
- Additionally, it was reported that since April 2021, ongoing clashes between farmer communities and pastoralists have severely impacted the lives of the residents of Guma LGA and led to the forced displacement of many inhabitants of the LGA. As a result of these clashes, two new IDP sites were established in Guma LGA.
- **Plateau** hosted 55,045 IDPs or 5 per cent of the total internally displaced population. This signifies a decrease of 5 per cent or 2,854 individuals since Round 11. The reduction of IDPs can be explained by numerous IDPs relocating to their initial location of displacement due to a lack of access to farmland for cultivation and the restored security situation in their locations of initial displacement. Within the state of Plateau, the highest number of IDPs were located in Mangu LGA with 13,955 individuals, followed by Riyom with 7,123 IDPs and Jos north with 6,995 IDPs.
- Also, in Round 12, **Nasarawa** had one of the lowest numbers of IDPs in the region, with a total of 20,580 individuals (up by 39% or 13,064 individuals since the Round 11). This number represents two per cent of the total number of IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria. About half of the IDPs in the state are located in the LGAs of Karu (6,580 IDPs), Lafia (3,256 IDPs) and Doma (2,579 IDPs). A few IDPs in Nasarawa hope to return home in the foreseeable future as many villages have been burnt down during the violence, leaving IDPs without shelter and food in their locations of origin. Some of the IDPs formerly located in Nasarawa have moved to other states in search of durable accommodation.

State	Round 11 Total (December 2022)			Round 12 Total (September 2023)			Status	Population difference	Percentage difference
	LGA Assessed	Population	Population (%)	LGA Assessed	Population	Population (%)			
Benue	19	489,245	41%	17	394,567	37%	Decrease	-94,678	-19%
Nasarawa	13	33,644	3%	13	20,580	2%	Decrease	-13,064	-39%
Plateau	17	57,899	5%	15	55,045	5%	Decrease	-2,854	-5%
Total	49	580,788	49%	44	470,192	44%	Decrease	-110,596	-19%

Table 1: Changes in the internally displaced population (individuals) by north-central states

NORTH-WEST

- The state of **Katsina** hosted the largest share of IDPs in north-west Nigeria. In Round 12, an estimated 244,380 IDPs (or 23 per cent of the total internally displaced population) were identified in the state of Katsina. This represents a decrease of 7,888 individuals or 3 per cent since Round 11. In spite of a decrease in the number of IDPs in Bastari LGA, by 5,175 individuals, the LGA had the highest displacement numbers in the state, with a total of 30,352 IDPs or 12 per cent of IDPs in this state.
- Zamfara** hosted the second largest internally displaced population in north-west Nigeria with 159,956 individuals or 15 per cent of the total internally displaced population (up by 2% or 3,540 individuals since the Round 11). The apparent increase in the number of IDPs recorded between Rounds 11 and 12 was mainly due to massive influx into Anka LGA. This was due to a surge in kidnappings and banditry in neighbouring villages. Anka LGA recorded the highest number of IDPs (42,311 individuals or 26% of IDPs) up by 13,143 individuals or 45 per cent, Anka was followed by Gusau LGA (24,914 individuals or 16% of the IDPs) and Shinkafi LGA (14,139 individuals or 9% of the IDPs). Though, DTM enumerators could not access some locations in Maru, Shinkafi and Zurmi LGAs due to security reasons.
- The state of **Kaduna** hosted 117,880 IDPs or 11 per cent of the total internally displaced population (up by 9% or 9,510 individuals since the Round 11). Within Kaduna, Chikun LGA was home to the highest number of IDPs in this state with 25,179 individuals or 21 per cent of IDPs in Kaduna. Lere LGA followed Chikun with 16,934 individuals or 14 per cent of IDPs in the state and Birnin Gwari with 11,935 individuals or 10 per cent of IDPs in this state.
- In the state of **Sokoto**, an estimated 67,936 IDPs were identified, representing six per cent of the total internally displaced population (up by 3% or 2,543 individuals since Round 11). Yabo LGA which was assessed in Round 11 was not assessed in Round 12 due to security reasons. The LGA Goronyo had the highest number of IDPs with 8,278 individuals or 12 per cent of the IDPs in Sokoto (down by 2,886 individuals or 26%), Sabon Birni with 6,021 individuals or 9 per cent of the IDPs in the state (up by 404 individuals or 7%) and Rabah with 4,831 individuals or seven per cent of the total displaced persons in Sokoto (down by 31 individuals or 1%).
- Kano** hosted 15,549 IDPs, or one per cent of the total IDP population (a decrease of 43% or 11,509 individuals since Round 11). The LGA that recorded the highest number of IDPs in Kano State was Tarauni, with 1,782 displaced individuals or 11 per cent of the displaced persons in Kano, followed by Gezawa LGA, with 1,611 individuals or ten per cent of the IDPs in this state.

State	Round 11 Total (December 2022)			Round 12 Total (September 2023)			Status	Population difference	Percentage difference
	LGA Assessed	Population	Population (%)	LGA Assessed	Population	Population (%)			
Kaduna	22	108,370	9%	22	117,880	11%	Increase	9,510	9%
Kano	38	27,058	2%	37	15,549	1%	Decrease	-11,509	-43%
Katsina	34	252,268	21%	34	244,380	23%	Decrease	-7,888	-3%
Sokoto	23	65,393	6%	22	67,936	6%	Increase	2,543	4%
Zamfara	14	156,416	13%	14	159,956	15%	Increase	3,540	2%
Total	131	609,505	51%	129	605,701	56%	Decrease	-3,804	-1%

Table 2: Change in internally displaced population (individuals) by north-western states

3. DISPLACEMENT DETAILS

3a: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT

Twenty-one per cent of the total internally displaced population in north-west and north-central regions reported that they arrived in their current location in 2021. This figure was 30 per cent in Round 11. About 37 per cent of the IDP population was displaced before 2021. Twenty per cent of the total IDP population reported that they arrived in the current location of displacement in 2020. With another 13 per cent of arrivals reported in 2019 and 11 per cent in 2018, it can be concluded that the crisis in Nigeria's north-central and north-west zones has intensified since 2018 and has resulted in accelerated displacement throughout the region.




Figure 1: Year of displacement of IDPs by the state of displacement

3b: REASONS FOR DISPLACEMENT

Similarly to Round 11, armed banditry and kidnapping were reported as the reason for displacement by 44 per cent of the IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria (6% less than Round 11). Communal clashes followed armed banditry and kidnappings, reported as the reason for displacement by 27 per cent of IDPs (2% less than Round 11), and attacks from herdsmen, reported by 19 per cent of IDPs (2% more than Round 11).

Natural disasters such as floods caused by heavy rainfalls and the overflow of river banks were the reasons for displacement in communities situated close to the river Benue in Benue State.






Figure 2: Percentage of IDPs by reason of displacement



Map 2: IDP distribution by state and year of displacement



Map 3: Cause of displacement and percentage of IDP population by state

3c: FREQUENCY OF DISPLACEMENT

Among the IDPs residing in camps/camp-like settings, 34 per cent declared that it was their first displacement, 40 per cent responded that they had been displaced twice and twenty-six per cent stated that they had been displaced for more than two times.




Figure 3: Frequency of displacement in camp/camp-like settings

Sixty-three per cent of IDPs residing among host communities said that they were displaced only once. Eighteen per cent of IDPs in host communities were displaced twice and 19 per cent mentioned that they were displaced more than twice.




Figure 4: Frequency of displacement in host communities.

3d: PRIMARY NEEDS

Similarly to the previous rounds, food was the most urgent need for IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria. Across all the locations assessed, food was reported as the primary need for IDPs in 72 per cent of locations. Food was followed by non-food items (NFIs) in 13 per cent of locations and shelter was reported by six per cent of locations. In four per cent of the locations assessed, potable water was reported as the primary need of IDPs, while medical services were reported by three per cent of the locations assessed.




Figure 5: Primary needs of IDPs

3e: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATION

Similarly to Round 11, the majority or 77 per cent of IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria were displaced within the borders of their state of origin. Twenty-three per cent of the internally displaced population crossed a state border for safety and security. The states with the largest out-of-state internally displaced population were Kano (82% of IDPs originating from a different state), Kaduna (33% of IDPs originating from a different state), and Nasarawa (25% of IDPs originating from a different state). These are also the states where more IDPs are reported to have fled their locations of origin due to the insurgency in north-east Nigeria and armed banditry in Katsina.




Figure 6: State of origin, displacement and percentage of IDPs per state




Figure 7: States of origin, state of displacement and percentage of IDP per state

3f: DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

The majority or 61 per cent of IDPs were female, while 39 per cent of IDPs were male. Most IDPs or 65 per cent were under 18 years old.




Figure 8: IDPs by age group and sex

4. SETTLEMENT AND ACCOMMODATION TYPE

4a: NUMBER AND LOCATIONS OF SITES

A total of 1,637 locations (down from 1,758 locations to Round 11) were assessed across the eight states covered by DTM assessments during Round 12. These included 1,549 locations where IDPs were residing among host communities (down from 1,652 in Round 11) and 88 locations categorised as camps or camp-like settings (down from 106 in Round 11). Katsina (367 locations), Kaduna (292 locations) and Benue (211 locations) were the states where comparatively a high number of locations was assessed.




Figure 9: Internally displaced population and number per settlement type




Figure 10: IDP settlement type by state

4b: SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION

Out of the total locations assessed, camps/camp-like settings (including collective settlements and transitional centres) accounted for five per cent of the total locations assessed, while 95 per cent were locations where IDPs reside among host communities. Only 33 per cent of camps/camp-like settings were formal sites. The great majority, or 67 per cent, of camps/camp-like settings in north-central and north-west Nigeria, were informal sites.

Of the 88 camps/camp-like settings, 65 were categorised as camps, 21 as collective settlements, and two as transitional centres. Furthermore, 70 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings were located on government-owned land or public structures, while 28 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings were located on private properties. The predominant form of land ownership in host communities was identified as private ownership, constituting 71 per cent of the assessed locations.





Figure 11: IDP population by settlement type

NUMBER OF DISPLACED PERSONS BY LGA




Map 4: IDPs by LGA and Significant site type by state

State	Camps/camp-like settings			Host communities			Total number of IDPs	Total number of Sites
	# IDPs	# Sites	% Sites	# IDPs	# Sites	% Sites		
Benue	120,640	26	30%	273,927	185	12%	394,567	211
Kaduna	29	2	2%	117,851	290	19%	117,880	292
Kano	294	7	8%	15,255	165	11%	15,549	172
Katsina	4,700	7	8%	239,680	360	23%	244,380	367
Nasarawa	2,096	7	8%	18,484	152	10%	20,580	159
Plateau	1,097	6	7%	53,948	146	9%	55,045	152
Sokoto	16,843	19	22%	51,093	136	9%	67,936	155
Zamfara	43,944	14	16%	116,012	115	7%	159,956	129
Total	189,643	88	100%	886,250	1,549	100%	1,075,893	1,637

Table 3: Number of IDPs and sites assessed per settlement type

MAJOR CAUSES OF DISPLACEMENT BY LGA



Map 5: Major cause of displacement by LGA

5. NEEDS MONITORING

5a: CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT

Out of the 106 camps/camp-like settings assessed during the Round 12 of DTM assessments in north-central and north-west Nigeria, only 35 per cent had the support of a Site Management Agency (SMA), while 65 per cent still needed an SMA. Of the camps/camp-like settings with an SMA on site, the SMA was run by the Government in 74 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings.




Figure 12: Presence and type of site management agency

5b: SHELTER

1. Camps/camp-like settings

In 26 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, roofing sheets were reported as the most needed type of shelter material. Roofing sheets were followed by block/bricks reported in 25 per cent, timber/wood and tarpaulin were reported in 23 and 16 per cent respectively. Shelter reinforcement kits were reported in five per cent of camp/camp-like settings as the most needed shelter materials.




Figure 13: Percentage of camps/camp-like settings with the most needed type of shelter materials

2. Host communities

The most common shelter types for IDPs hosted within the local communities were the houses of host families (reported in 91% of the locations assessed). Host family houses were followed by rented houses, reported in 4 per cent of locations, and preexisting structures (partitioned), reported in one per cent of the locations assessed.




Figure 14: Types of shelter in host community sites

During Round 12th round of assessment, the need for block/bricks was reported in 33 per cent of locations where IDPs were residing among host communities. Most of the IDPs living in host communities needed roofing sheets and timber/wood, (reported in 26% and 23% of the locations respectively). Shelter reinforcement kits were reported as the most needed shelter material in eight per cent of the locations.




Figure 15: Percentage of host communities sites with the most needed type of shelter materials



Internally displaced persons in Ichwa camp in North bank II ward of Makurdi LGA, Benue State. © IOM 2023/Elijah ELAIGWU.

5c: NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

I. Camps/camp-like settings

The most pressing NFI need in camps/camp-like settings were mattresses (reported in 35% of the sites, down by 7% since Round 11), followed by blankets/mats (reported in 26% of the sites), followed by mosquito nets (reported in 17% of the sites assessed) and hygiene kits (reported in 3% of the sites assessed) and hygiene kits (reported in 3% of the sites assessed) and hygiene kits (reported in 3% of the sites assessed).




Figure 16: Percentage of most needed NFIs in camp/camp-like settings. of the sites).

2. Host communities

Similarly to Round 11, the most important NFI need for IDPs displaced among host communities were mattresses, reported in 34 per cent of the locations (up by 3 per cent), followed by blankets/mats (reported in 26 per cent of locations), mosquito nets (reported in 19 per cent of locations) and kitchen sets (reported in 8 per cent of locations).




Figure 17: Percentage of most needed NFIs in host community locations

5d: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE (WASH)

I. Camp/camp-like settings

Distance to a primary water source: In 52 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, the main water sources were located on-site and within a 30 minutes walking distance. Twenty-five per cent were off-site water sources but less than 30 minutes walking distance, while 14 per cent were on-site water sources but more than 30 minutes walking distance. In total, nine per cent of camps/camp-like settings have water sources located off-site and more than 30 minutes away.




Figure 18: Distance to the main water source in camps/camp-like settings

Amount of water available per day and per person: In 43 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings over 15 litres of water was available per person per day. Similarly to Round 11, in 38 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, between 10 and 15 litres of water were available per person daily. In all of the camps/camp-like settings of the State of Kaduna, over 15 litres of water was available per person per day. In 19 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, between 5 and 10 litres of water were available per person per day.

In Katsina and Nasarawa states, over 15 litres of water were available per day for 86 per cent of the camp/camp-like settings.




Figure 19: Average amount of water available per person per day in camps/camp-like settings

Conditions of latrines: Latrines were considered unhygienic in 91 per cent of camps/camp-like settings assessed. In Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa and Zamfara, all latrines were reported to be unhygienic. The latrines were not usable at all in 8 per cent of the camps. Only in one per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, latrines have been reported in good and hygienic condition.




Figure 20: Condition of latrines in camps/camp-like settings by state

Availability of gender-separated latrines: Seventy-four per cent of camps/camp-like settings do not have separate latrines for men and women. In 36 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, separate latrines were reported for men and women.




Figure 21: Availability of gender-separated latrines in camps/camp-like settings

Waste disposal: Similarly to previous Rounds of assessments, waste burning was reported as the most common waste disposal mechanism in camps/camp-like settings across north-central and north-west Nigeria. The practice was reported in 56 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings. In 22 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, garbage pits were reported as the main waste disposal mechanism and in 23 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, no waste disposal system was established.




Figure 22: Main garbage disposal mechanism in camps/camp-like settings

Evidence of open defecation: In 24 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, it was reported that nobody lives in areas where open defecation was evident. In 51 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, it was reported that only a few IDPs lived in areas where open defecation was evident.




Figure 23: Percentage of IDPs in camp/camp-like settings residing in areas of open defecation

2. Host communities

Distance to the primary water sources: In 93 per cent of locations where IDPs were residing among host communities, the main water sources were on-site (73% were less than a 30-minutes walking distance, while 20% were more than a 30-minutes walking distance). In seven per cent of locations where IDPs were residing among host communities, water sources were located off-site (6% were located less than a 30-minutes walking distance, and 1% were more than a 30-minutes walking distance).




Figure 24: Distance to the main water source in host communities

Amount of water available per day and per person: In 49 per cent of the locations where IDPs were residing among host communities, over 15 litres of water were available per person per day. In 32 per cent of the locations, between 10 and 15 litres of water were available per person per day, and in 17 per cent, between 5 and 10 litres of water were available per person per day.




Figure 25: Average amount of water available per person and per day in host community

Conditions of latrines: Latrines were considered unhygienic in 92 per cent of locations where IDPs were residing among host communities. In the state of Sokoto, 97 per cent of latrines were reported to be unhygienic. Latrines were not usable at all in five per cent of the locations. Only in two per cent of the locations have latrines been reported in good and hygienic condition.




Figure 26: Condition of latrines in host communities by state

Availability of gender-separated latrines: Ninety-four per cent of locations where IDPs were residing among host communities do not have separated latrines for men and women. In only six per cent of assessed locations, separated latrines for men and women were reported.




Figure 27: Condition of latrines in host communities by state

Waste disposal: During the Round 12 assessments, like the previous rounds, waste burning was reported as the main garbage disposal mechanism in locations where IDPs were residing among host communities. The practice was reported in 61 per cent of the locations assessed. In 20 per cent of the locations, garbage pits were reported as the main waste disposal mechanism (similar to Round 11), and in 18 per cent of the locations assessed, no waste disposal system was established.




Figure 28: Main garbage disposal mechanism in host communities.

Evidence of open defecation: In 15 per cent of the host community locations, it was reported that nobody lives in areas where open defecation was evident. In 46 per cent of the host community locations, it was reported that only a few IDPs lived in areas where open defecation was evident.




Figure 29: Evidence of open defecation in host communities by state



Sensitization activity in Aila host community in Egba Ward, Agatu LGA. Benue State © IOM 2023/Vincent BAKO



Biometric capturing of IDPs in Agagbe IDP camp, Mbachohon Ward, Gwer West LGA, Benue State. © IOM 2023/Abel UGADA



Biometric registration in Anyin IDP camp, Logo LGA in Benue State. © IOM 2023/Abel UGADA

5e: FOOD AND NUTRITION

I. Camps/camp-like settings

Access to food: While food was the most reported primary need for IDPs in north-central and north-west Nigeria, no food support was provided in 52 per cent of camps/camp-like settings. Food support was available off-site in 11 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, while food support was available on-site in 36 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings.

In the camps/camp-like settings in the state of Kano, no food support was provided at all, while in the state of Kaduna, food support was reported to be available in all of the camps/camp-like settings assessed.




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

Frequency of distribution: It was reported that food distribution was irregular in all camp/camp-like settings in Benue, Nasarawa, Kaduna and Plateau. In 90 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, food distribution was reported as irregular; in two per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, food was distributed once in a month. Kano was the only state where food had never been distributed in the camps/camp-like settings.




Figure 31: Frequency of food distribution in camps/camp-like settings

Means of obtaining food: The most common way of obtaining food for IDPs who were living in camp/camp-like settings was with their personal savings, as reported in 56 per cent of the locations assessed. Personal savings were followed by crop cultivation (reported in 17% of the locations, down by 7% compared to that of Round 11), assistance via food aid (reported in 11% of the locations) and assistance from the host community (reported in 8% of the locations).

In the state of Zamfara, personal savings were reported as the only source for obtaining food in all locations where IDPs were living in camp/camp-like settings. In Kaduna, host community donations accounted for the provision of food in all locations assessed.




Figure 32: Means of obtaining food in camps/camp-like settings

Nutrition: Screening for malnutrition was reported in 16 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings. Malnutrition screenings were only reported in the camps/camp-like settings of the states of Benue and Zamfara. Twelve per cent of the camp/camp-like settings reported screening for malnutrition in Benue State while in Zamfara 79 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings report the presence of screenings.




Figure 33: Presence of nutrition screening in camps/camp-like settings

2. Host Communities

Access to food: Displaced households in host communities have access to food support in 21 per cent of the locations assessed. This food was available on-site in 12 per cent of the locations and off-site in nine per cent.

The outcome of the Round 12 is similar to the previous rounds of assessments as the majority, or 80 per cent of IDPs living among host communities, do not have access to any form of food support. In Kano, no location have been supported with food. Ninety per cent and 89 per cent of host community locations in Zamfara and Katsina respectively are yet to receive food support.




Figure 34: Access to food in host communities

Frequency of distribution: Food was never distributed in one per cent of locations where IDPs lived among host communities. The situation continues to be particularly acute in Kano as no food distribution has been recorded. Furthermore, food distributions were reported as irregular in 94 per cent of the locations assessed. Meanwhile, two per cent of host community locations recorded daily food distribution.




Figure 35: Frequency of food distribution in host communities

Means of obtaining food: The most common manner of obtaining food for IDPs living among host communities was with their savings, as reported in 52 per cent of the locations assessed. Personal savings were followed by crop cultivation (reported in 40% of the locations). Other means were donations by host community (4%), food aid (1%), contribution by family and friends (1%) and exchange by barter (1%).

In the state of Benue, cultivation of crop were reported as the most common source for obtaining food in 50 per cent of the locations where IDPs lived among host communities. In Zamfara and Sokoto, personal savings accounted for the provision of food in 78 per cent and 77 per cent of the locations, respectively.




Figure 36: Means of obtaining food in host communities

Nutrition: Similarly to the situation in camps/camp-like settings, only a few locations where the local community hosted IDPs had programmes for screening malnutrition. In only seven per cent of locations, a malnutrition programme was reported. In Sokoto State, 99 per cent of locations hosting displaced persons did not have a malnutrition screening activity recorded.




Figure 37: Presence of nutrition screening in host communities

I. Camps/camp-like settings

Most common health problem: In 69 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, malaria was reported as the most common health problem for IDPs. Malaria was followed by diarrhoea and fever, reported in 10 per cent of the locations assessed. Cough was reported as the most common health problem for IDPs in seven per cent of the camps/camp-like settings assessed.

In the states of Kaduna, Kano, Plateau and Nasarawa, all the camps/camp-like settings assessed reported malaria as the most common health problem for IDPs. In contrast, fever was reported as the most common health problem for IDPs in 43 per cent of camps/camp-like settings in the state of Zamfara.




Figure 38: Common health problems in camps/camp-like settings

Location of health facility: For 84 per cent of the IDPs residing in camps/camp-like settings, health facilities were located within a three kilometer radius. These included both health facilities on-site (35%) and off the site of assessment (39%). In 25 per cent of camps/camp-like settings, health facilities were reported to be located more than three kilometers away.




Figure 39: Location of health facilities in camps/camp-like settings

2. Host communities

Most common health problem: In 73 per cent of the locations where IDPs were residing among host communities, malaria was reported as the most common health problem. Malaria was the primary health concern in the states, with the highest percentage reported in Nasarawa (88% of the locations).

Malaria was followed by fever and diarrhoea as the most common health problem reported in nine per cent and six per cent of the locations. Cough and malnutrition were reported as the most common health problem in five per cent and five per cent of the assessed location, respectively.




Figure 40: Common health problems in host communities

Location of health facility: For 71 per cent of the IDPs living among host communities, health facilities were located within a three kilometer radius. These included both health facilities on-site (51%) and off the site of assessment (20%). In 28 per cent of the locations, health facilities were reported to be located more than three kilometers away. These included both health facilities on-site (18%) and off the site of assessment (10%).




Figure 41: Location of health facilities in host communities

5g: EDUCATION

I. Camps/camp-like settings

Access to education: In 82 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, children in displaced households had access to formal or informal education.




Figure 42: Access to education in camp/camp-like settings.

Location of education facilities: Forty-nine per cent of the camp/camp-like settings reported that education facilities were located within the site. In Plateau State, 100 per cent of schools were found on the site. Camps/camp-like settings in the states of Kaduna and Zamfara had the all education facilities located outside of the camp/camp-like setting, followed by Kano (71%) and Katsina (50%).




Figure 43: Location of formal/informal education services in camp/camp-like settings

School attendance: In 43 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings in north-central and north-west Nigeria, between 25 per cent and 50 per cent of the children were attending school. In 19 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, less than 25 per cent of IDP children attended school and in 21 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, between 51 per cent and 75 per cent of the IDP children attended school. Six per cent of camps/camp-like settings reported that more than 75 per cent of IDP children attended school.




Figure 44: Percentage of children attending school in camps/camp-like settings.

Reasons for not attending school: Fees and costs continued to be the most significant barrier preventing children from accessing education, with 47 per cent of respondents in camps/camp-like settings reporting these factors as the reason why some IDP children were not attending school. In 17 per cent of camps/camp-like settings, the main reason for IDP children not attending school was the lack of support from parents or caregivers, while in 15 per cent of camps/camp-like settings, IDP children did not participate in school because they had to work in the fields to support their parents.




Figure 45: Reasons for not attending schools in camp/camp-like settings



IOM enumerator and a NRCS staff conducting an interview with a resident of Agabge camp in Gwer West LGA, Benue State © IOM 2023/Abel UGADA

2. Host communities

Access to education: In 93 per cent of the locations assessed, displaced children living among host communities had access to education (both formal and informal). However, in seven per cent of the locations, it was reported that displaced children did not have access to education whether formal or informal.

Zamfara State recorded the most significant number of IDP children who did not have access to education (30% of the locations assessed).




Figure 46: Access to education in host communities

Location of education facilities: In 79 per cent of the locations assessed, the schools were on-site or within the community. Most notably, in the State of Sokoto, 61 per cent of the schools were located off-site or outside of the locations of assessment, while in the State of Plateau, 100 per cent of education facilities were located on-site.




Figure 47: Location of formal/informal education services in host communities

School attendance: In seven per cent of the locations where IDPs were living among host communities, more than 75 per cent of the children were attending school, while in 17 per cent of the locations assessed, less than 25 per cent of IDP children were attending school. Two per cent of the locations where IDPs lived among host communities recorded that IDP children were not attending school. The state that scored the highest in school attendance was Plateau, where in 34 per cent of the locations assessed, more than 75 per cent of IDP children were attending school.




Figure 48: Percentage of children attending school in host communities

Reasons for not attending school: Similarly to IDP children in camps/camp-like settings, the main obstacle to school attendance in locations where IDPs were living among host communities were the high fees and costs, as reported in 60 per cent of the locations. Other reasons for which IDP children were not going to school were the lack of support by parents or caregivers (mentioned in 10% of the locations), the fact that children had to work in the fields (mentioned in 8% of the locations) and the lack of school supplies (mentioned in 7% of the locations).




Figure 50: Reasons for not attending schools in host communities



Emmanuel undergoing his biometric registration in Mbachohon ward of Gwer West LGA, Benue State © IOM 2023/Abel UGADA

5h: LIVELIHOODS

I. Camps/camp-like settings

Access to livelihood support: In 39 per cent of the camps/camp-like settings, IDPs had access to livelihood support. In 14 per cent of the camp/camp-like settings, IDPs had access to livelihood support on-site, while 25 per cent had access to livelihood support off-site. Sixty-one per cent of the camp/camp-like settings did not have access to livelihood support. In Kaduna and Kano, 100 per cent of the locations reported they had no access to livelihood support.




Figure 51: Access to livelihood support in camps/camp-like settings

Livelihood activities: In 42 per cent of camps/camp-like settings assessed, farming was cited as the main occupation of IDPs, farming was followed by daily labour jobs, cited in 38 per cent of camps/camp-like settings as the main occupation of IDPs. In eight per cent of camps/camp-like settings, petty trading was cited as the main occupation of IDPs.




Figure 52: Livelihood activities of IDPs in camp/camp-like settings

Access to land for cultivation: In 50 per cent of camp/camp-like settings in north-central and north-west Nigeria, it was reported that IDPs had access to farmlands. In 50 per cent of camps/camp-like settings, IDPs had no access to land for crop cultivation. In the state of Kaduna all camps/camp-like setting had no access to land for farming. In the state of Katsina, the majority (83%) of the camps/camp-like settings had no access to land for farming as shown in figure 53 above.




Figure 53: Access to land for cultivation in camps/camp-like settings

2. Host Communities

Access to livelihood support: In most or 84 per cent of locations where IDPs were living in host communities, IDPs did not have access to livelihood support. Sixteen per cent of IDPs did have access to livelihood support (7% on-site, 9% off-site). In the state of Kano, it was reported that 98 per cent of the IDPs residing in host communities had no access to livelihood support. This number was similar to the IDPs in camps and camp-like settings in Kano State.




Figure 54: Access to livelihood in host communities

Livelihood activities: In 55 per cent of the locations where IDPs were residing in host communities, farming was reported to be the main type of livelihood. Farming was followed by jobs as daily labour (21%) and petty trade (17%).




Figure 53: Livelihood activities of IDPs in host communities

Access to land for cultivation: Sixty-nine per cent of the locations where IDPs lived among host communities had access to land for farming. Thirty-one per cent of the locations had no access to land for cultivation. More than 95 per cent of the locations in the State of Nasarawa had access to land for cultivation.




Figure 55: Access to land for cultivation in host communities

5i: PROTECTION

1. Camps/camp-like settings

Security: Security was provided in 64 per cent of camps/camp-like settings in north-central and north-west Nigeria. In Plateau and Nasarawa all camps/camp-like settings had security on site.




Figure 56: Security provided in camps/camp-like settings

2. Host communities

Security: Security was provided in 83 per cent of the locations where IDPs were residing among host communities. Nasarawa and Plateau were the states where the most locations without security were reported (<1% and 3% of the locations respectively).




Figure 57: Security provided in host communities



Sensitization activity during the field visit of IOM's Chief of Mission and the UNHCR's country representative to Ichwa camp, Makurdi LGA, Benue State © IOM 2023/Elijah ELAIGWU



IDPs in Ichwa camp, Makurdi LGA, Benue State © IOM 2023/Elijah ELAIGWU

