

DTM NIGERIA DISPLACEMENT TRACKING MATRIX



DTM ROUND 26
JANUARY 2019



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Background	3
Overview: DTM Round 26 Assessments	4
KEY HIGHLIGHTS	5
1. BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF DISPLACEMENT	6
A: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA	6
1B: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	8
1C: REASON FOR DISPLACEMENT	8
1D: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT	8
1E: MOBILITY	8
1G: SETTLEMENT TYPE OF THE DISPLACED POPULATIONS	10
2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS	11
2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPs	11
2C: SECTOR ANALYSIS	12
WASH: WATER RESOURCES	13
Personal Hygiene Facilities	15
3. RETURNEES	22
3A: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT FOR RETURNEES	23
3B: SHELTER CONDITIONS FOR RETURNEES	23
3C: HEALTH FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES	23
3D: EDUCATION FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES	23
3E: MARKET FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES	24
3F: PROFILE OF ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES	24
3G: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES	24
3H: LIVELIHOOD FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES	24
4. METHODOLOGY	25
TOOLS FOR IDPs	25
TOOLS FOR RETURNEES	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report of the Round 26 Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) assessment by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) aims to improve the understanding about 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 20 October 2018 to 20 January 2019 and reflects trends from the six states most affected by displacement: Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.

Round 26 assessments could not be carried out in 13 wards due to escalation in hostilities and insecurity. As a result, 1,948,349 individuals were recorded as being displaced in the affected states, a nominal decrease of four per cent (or 78,253 individuals) in the number of IDPs recorded since the last round of assessment published in November 2018. The 25th Round of assessments had identified 2,026,602 IDPs, which was in-keeping with a steady trend of increase in number of IDPs observed over the last few months. In August 2018 (Round 24), the number of IDPs identified was 1,926,748 and prior to this, a two per cent increase was recorded in the 23rd Round of assessment as against the number identified in Round 22 (published in April 2018).

To gain insights into the profiles of IDPs, interviews were conducted with four per cent of the identified IDP population — that is, 86,914 displaced persons — 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 patterns, and unfulfilled needs of the displaced populations.

Additionally, site assessments were carried out in 2,415 sites, with the aim of better understanding the needs of the affected population. These sites included 298 camps and camp-like settings and 2,117 locations where IDPs were residing with host communities. Site assessments included 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, profile of their initial displacement, shelter conditions of returnees, health, education, livelihood, market, assistance and WASH facilities available to the returnees.

BACKGROUND

The escalation of violence between all parties in north-eastern Nigeria in 2014 resulted in mass displacement and deprivation. 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 the provision of support to the Government and humanitarian partners by establishing a comprehensive system to collect, analyse and disseminate data on IDPs and returnees in order to provide effective 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, as well as 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) and the Government of Germany. NEMA also makes financial contributions.


OVERVIEW: DTM ROUND 26 ASSESSMENTS

DTM assessments for Round 26 were conducted from 20 November 2018 to 20 January 2019 in 109 Local Government Areas (LGAs) or districts, in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe states. As many as 13 wards could not be assessed due to exponential increase in attacks and kidnappings allegedly by Non-State Armed Groups (NSAG), counter offensives by the Nigerian Military and overall deterioration in the security situation.

Nine wards in the most-affected State of Borno could not be assessed due to lack of accessibility. The increase in number of inaccessible wards is key reason for the decrease in the number of IDPs recorded in this round of assessment, even as displacements actually went up due to the increase in insecurity.







Prior to the latest clashes, the number of wards that DTM was assessing had been steadily going up. From 797 wards assessed in June 2018, a high of 807 wards were assessed in the last round of assessment that was published in November 2018.

In the Local Government Area (LGA) of Kukawa in Borno, which witnessed most intense fighting during this period, five wards could not be assessed. Two wards in Guzamala LGA were inaccessible to humanitarians. Other states which saw a decrease in number of wards assessed included Yobe where four wards could not be accessed due of insecurity and Taraba where one ward was not assessed as IDPs left for their place of origin. Two wards in Adamawa and one in Bauchi were not assessed in this round of assessment as IDPs had moved back to their place of origin.




Map1: ACCESS MAP

KEY HIGHLIGHTS



↓ **4%** decrease in displaced population from DTM R25



↓ **5%** decrease in return population from DTM R25

IDP and Returnee population trend

1. BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF DISPLACEMENT

A: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA

As of 20 January 2019, the estimated number of IDPs in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe States was 1,948,349 or 382,296 households. The total number recorded represents a decrease of 78,253 (4%) as against the previous round of assessment that was published in November 2018. Prior to the dip in this round, the numbers of IDPs has been steadily raising since beginning of 2018 as can be noted from Figure 1.




Figure 1: IDP population by round of DTM assessment

Round 25 of assessment had identified 2,026,602 IDPs which was in-keeping with a steady trend of increase in the number of IDPs over the last few months. In August 2018, the number of IDPs identified was 1,926,748 and prior to this, a two per cent increase was recorded in the 23rd Round of assessment as against the number identified in Round 22 (published in April 2018). The number of returns is also on the increase as can be noted from Section 3 on Returnees.

Though Borno continues to host the highest number of IDPs at 1,435,817, it did witness a decrease of 39,788 individuals as compared to the number recorded in the last round of assessment published in November 2018. This is also the highest decrease among all other assessed states and can be attributed to the decreased accessibility in the state.

State	Round 25 (October 2018)	Round 26 (January 2019)	Population Change
ADAMAWA	197,713	194,603	-3110
BAUCHI	67,168	66,716	-452
BORNO	1,475,605	1,435,817	-39,788
GOMBE	37,284	36,882	-402
TARABA	112,197	86,474	-25,723
YOBE	136,635	127,857	-8,778
Total	2,026,602	1,948,349	-78,253

Table 1: Change in internally displaced population by State

Within Borno, Kala Balge, Kukawa and Guzamala LGAs could not be assessed by DTM due to insecurity. In the last round, Kala Balge had recorded 76,389 IDPs while 13,521 displaced persons were recorded in Kukawa and 1,845 in Guzamala in the last round of assessment.

Maiduguri Metropolitan Council (MMC) which already hosts the highest number of IDPs recorded the highest increase in number of IDPs to take the total number of displaced persons in the LGA up by 29,010 (from 234,045 to 263,055). Most of the new arrivals were from Guzamala and Kukawa. Some of the new arrivals were from Jere and Konduga as well. Nganzai,

Monguno and Jere LGAs also received IDPs from LGAs that were most affected by the recent spate of increased insecurity with 7,212, 4,172 and 4,119 displaced persons arriving in their already overcrowded camps.

Furthermore, within the period of 05 November 2018 and 20 January 2019, DTM's Emergency Tracking Tool (ETT) tracked 86,814 movements (up from 50,961 movements tracked in the previous ETT report which was for the period of August to October 2018) in the northeastern states of Adamawa and Borno.


The movement tracked included 79,361 arrivals and 7,453 departures. In Borno, the Local Government Areas (LGAs) that recorded arrivals included Askira/Uba, Bama, Gubio, Gwoza, Hawul, Jere, Konduga, Maiduguri Metropolitan Council, Magumeri and Ngala and in Adamawa the LGAs that recorded arrivals were Demsa, Girei, Gombi, Guyuk, Lamurde, Madagali, Maiha, Michika, Mubi-North, Mubi-South, Numan, Song, Yola-North and Yola-South. ETT also tracked 10,135 arrivals from neighboring countries like Cameroon, Chad and Niger.

Assessments identified the following main triggers of movements: ongoing conflict (63% - up from 37% in the last ETT report), poor living conditions (11%), voluntary relocation (12%), improved security (7%), fear of attack (5%) and military operations (1%).

During this period, nutrition screening using mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) and signs of Oedema was conducted by Sector partners for 3,567 children: The MUAC reading for 106 children (36 from inaccessible areas and 70 from accessible

areas) was in the Red category (signifying severe malnutrition), 278 were in the Yellow category (signifying moderate acute malnutrition) and 3,183 were measured in the Green category. 735 of the children screened were from neighboring countries of which 26 were measured in the Red category, 48 in the Yellow category and 661 were measured in the Green category. All children found with severe acute malnutrition were admitted into treatment programs.

Please note, the nutrition screening data presented are not surveillance results and should be interpreted with caution.



Map 2: IDP distribution by LGA

1B: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

A detailed and representative overview of age and sex breakdown was obtained by interviewing a sample of 86,914 persons, representing four 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 Figure 2 below. The average number of people per household was five.





Figure 2: IDPs by age group and sex

1C: REASON FOR DISPLACEMENT

Reasons for displacement remained unchanged since the last round of assessment published in June 2018. The ongoing conflict in northeast Nigeria continues to be the main reason for displacement (92% up from 91%), followed by communal clashes which led to the displacement of seven per cent (down from 8%) of the interviewed individuals. Map 3 provides an overview of the reasons for displacement by state. The state of Taraba showed the highest number of displacements due to communal clashes during the assessments of Round 26.



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

1D: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT

In the first month of 2019 itself, 1.5 per cent of displaced persons were displaced. Thirteen per cent of IDPs were displaced in 2018. Overall, however, the largest proportion of interviewed individuals (24%) reported 2015 as their year of displacement (Figure 3).




Figure 3: Displacement trend by State

1E: MOBILITY

CAMPS AND CAMP-LIKE SETTINGS:

As per the assessments conducted in displacement sites (camps and camp-like settings), 50 per cent of residents (up from 40% in the last round of assessment) have been displaced before. In Yobe states, this was the case for 62 per cent of the assessed individuals. In Borno, 41 per cent (up from 38%) of IDPs said they have been displaced more than once.




Figure 4: Frequency of displacement of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

In Adamawa, four per cent of displaced persons said they have been displaced four times before. Forty per cent of IDPs have been displaced two times, with Yobe showing the highest percentage of people displaced two times at 54 per cent.

In line with the previous round of assessments, the majority of IDPs in displacement sites said they intended to return to their places of origin given favorable circumstances. This figure was highest in Borno (93% but down from 96% in the last round of assessment) and lowest in Bauchi (73%).

Forty-six per cent (up from 44%) of IDPs residing in displacement sites stated that improved security was the main pull factor for their intention to return, followed by access to better services (15% - down from 19%) and access to land (22% - up from 19%).

HOST COMMUNITIES:

In comparison to displaced persons living in camps and camp-like settings, a smaller number of IDPs living in host communities said they have been displaced multiple times. In-line with the previous round of assessment published in November 2018, seventy-five per cent said they have not suffered multiple displacements, with highest numbers in Bauchi (93%), Gombe (94%) and Adamawa (78%).




Figure 5: Frequency of displacement of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

Twenty-two per cent (no change from last round of assessment) reported to have been displaced two times – with this figure being 37 per cent for Borno (up from 32% in last round of assessment) and 31 per cent for Taraba. As in last round of assessment, three per cent of the assessed population in all the evaluated states has been displaced three times.

In comparison to people living in displacement sites, a lower percentage (77% - down from 79%) of displaced people residing with host communities intended to go back to their places of origin. Thirty-one per cent of IDPs (down from 33%) cited improved security situation as the main reason for wanting to return, followed by access to better services (16%) and access to land (7%).

For those who reported no intention to return, damages to their houses (11% - own from 12%) was cited as the main reason for not returning, followed by better living conditions in the current place of displacement than in their place of origin (2%) and lack of access to their place of habitual residence (2%).

1F: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATIONS

The most-affected state of Borno continues to be the place of origin of the largest number of IDPs (82% - no change from last round of assessment published in November 2018) in northeast Nigeria. After Borno, Adamawa is the place of origin for the second largest number of IDPs (10% - up from 7%). Majority of the displaced persons are residing within their own state of origin. (Figure 6)





Figure 6: Illustration showing State of origin and State of Displacement



Map 4: Origin of IDPs and location of displacement

1G: SETTLEMENT TYPE OF THE DISPLACED POPULATIONS

As in the previous round, sixty per cent of all IDPs were living in host communities (Figure 7) during Round 26. Out of all the six states, Borno is the only state where the number of people residing in camps and camp-like settings is marginally higher than that of individuals living with host communities. In all other states, people living with host communities far outnumbered those in camps and camp-like settings.





Figure 7: IDP settlement type by state



1H: UNMET NEEDS IN IDP SETTLEMENTS

In a survey conducted among 16,457 displaced persons, food was found to be the main unmet need cited by 73 per cent (marginally down from 74% in the last round of assessment) of those surveyed. As seen in Table 4, the need for food has been consistently high over the last few rounds. In an increase of two per cent over the last round of assessment, 15 per cent cited non-food items (NFIs) and six per cent shelter as their main needs. These results are consistent with the observed trend during previous assessments.

DTM Round	Security	Water for washing and cooking	Sanitation and Hygiene	Drinking water	Medical services	Shelter	NFI	Food
Round 22	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	6%	13%	73%
Round 23	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	6%	15%	71%
Round 24	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	6%	12%	73%
Round 25	1%	0%	1%	2%	3%	6%	13%	74%
Round 26	1%	0%	1%	2%	2%	6%	15%	73%

Table A: Change in internally displaced population by State

2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS

2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPS

DTM Round 26 site assessments were conducted in 2,415 sites, with the aim of better understanding the needs of the affected population. These sites included 298 (same as in Round 25 assessment) camps and camp-like settings and 2,117 locations where IDPs were residing with host communities.


Most IDPs residing in camps and camp-like settings lived in private buildings (55% - up from 53%) followed by 43 per cent living in government or public buildings and two per cent in ancestral property. Most displaced people lived in emergency shelters (37% overall – down from 38%) and 35 per cent (up from 34%) in self-made/makeshift shelters.

On the other hand, most displaced persons residing with host communities lived in private buildings (88% - down from 93%

in last round of assessment) followed by nine per cent (up from 5%) residing in government/public buildings and three per cent in ancestral buildings.

Out of the 298 displacement sites (camps and camp-like settings) that were assessed, majority were located in Borno and nearly all were spontaneous (95% - up from 94%). As in the last round of assessment, 58 per cent of sites were classified as collective settlements or centers. Forty-one per cent were categorized as camps and one per cent were classified as transitional centers.

Twelve per cent of sites (down from 13%) reported fire as the single biggest natural hazard risk, while six per cent (down from 9%) said flood and another six per cent said storm was a natural hazard risk. Insurgency was the main reason for displacement (96% of sites).



Map 5: IDPs distribution by state and major site type

State	Camp/Camp-like settings				Host Community				Total			
	# IDPs	% IDP	# Sites	% Sites	# IDPs	% IDP	# Sites	% Sites	# IDPs	% IDP	# Sites	% Sites
ADAMAWA	15,107	1%	28	1%	179,496	9%	456	19%	194,603	9.99%	484	20.04%
BAUCHI	4,826	0%	8	0%	61,890	3%	369	15%	66,716	3.42%	377	15.61%
BORNO	745,397	38%	237	10%	690,420	35%	464	19%	1,435,817	73.69%	701	29.03%
GOMBE		0%		0%	36,882	2%	203	8%	36,882	1.89%	203	8.41%
TARABA	7,476	0%	12	0%	78,998	4%	223	9%	86,474	4.44%	235	9.73%
YOBE	13,122	1%	13	1%	114,735	6%	402	17%	127,857	6.56%	415	17.18%
Total	785,928	40%	298	12%	1,162,421	60%	2117	88%	1,948,349	100.00%	2415	100.00%

Table 2: Change in IDP figures by State

2C: SECTOR ANALYSIS

CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT

This round of assessment identified 131 (44% - significant drop from 79% as per the last round of assessment) presenting a camp-governance structure or committee and management support and 129 having a site management agency on site that provides camp management support (such as site facilitation provided by humanitarian partners).




Figure 8: Presence and type of camp management agency

SHELTER

Camps and camp-like settings

Camps and camp-like settings presented a variety of shelter conditions, with the most common type of shelter being emergency shelters in 110 (37%) sites, followed by self-made/makeshift shelters in 103 (35%) sites.




Figure 9: Types of shelter in camps/camp-like settings

Other types were host family houses (9%), government buildings (7%), schools (5%), individual houses (6%), community shelters (1%) and health facilities (1%).




Figure 10: Number of camp sites with most needed type of shelter material Furthermore, of the total 298 camps and camp-like settings, in twelve sites (hosting 4,614 families) in all six States, some

households lived without shelter.

Out of the total number of IDPs on site, the number of families in need of shelter is lower than 25 percent.

In 212 sites (hosting 132,987 families) a number of households lived in makeshift or self-made shelters, of which 71 sites where more than 75 percent of the total IDPs on site live in makeshift shelters. In 86 sites no household lived in makeshift shelters.

In 178 sites (hosting 140,549 families), there were households living in emergency shelters structures primarily provided by humanitarian actors. Of these, 59 sites host more than 75 percent of IDPs on site living in these emergency shelters.




Figure 11: Number of camp sites with most needed type of NFI

Various shelter needs were observed in 268 sites hosting 165,410 families, with the most needed shelter material being tarpaulin, followed by timber/ wood and roofing sheets.

The most needed NFI items were blankets/mats, followed by mosquito nets and kitchen sets.

Host Communities

This round of assessment identified 2,117 host communities hosting 210,882 IDP households, most commonly residing in the host family's house (which was the most common shelter type in 1,861 sites hosting 197,028 households). This is followed by individual houses (most common shelter type in 160 sites hosting 15,487 households), self-made/makeshift shelters (most common shelter type in 77 sites hosting 6,666 households), emergency shelters (in 8 sites hosting 968 households), government buildings (in 5 sites hosting 343 households), and health facilities (in 2 sites hosting 177 households).




Figure 12: Types of shelter in host community sites

No shelter: On analyzing the shelter needs in host communities, it was noted that in 74 sites where 11,098 households are hosted, some IDPs live without shelter. In all cases, the proportion of IDPs in need of shelter was less than 25 percent

of the total IDPs in these sites.

Makeshift shelters: 736 sites, hosting 135,161 households, host IDPs living in makeshift shelters. Of these, in 512 sites the IDPs living in makeshift shelters comprise less than 25 percent of the total number of IDPs in these sites.

Emergency shelters: 177 sites, hosting 30,921 households, host IDPs living in emergency shelters. For 142 of these sites, the proportion of IDPs living in emergency shelters was less than 25 percent of the IDPs on site.




Figure 13: Number of host community sites with most needed type of shelter material

1,743 (82%) sites hosting 162,250 families, have indicated the need for various shelter items. Among them, 902 sites hosting 99,550 households mentioned either tarpaulins or roofing sheets as the main need, followed by timber/wood in 360 sites hosting 24,861 households. The third most needed shelter item is timber/wood in 358 sites hosting 29,637 households. 374 sites hosting 48,632 households had no shelter items needed at the time of the assessment.

Of all the 2,117 sites assessed, the highest need for NFI items was blankets/mats in 1,065 sites hosting 122,225 households, followed by mosquito nets in 376 sites hosting 33,607 households and mattresses in 316 sites hosting 18,173 households.




Figure 14: Number of host community sites with most needed type of NFI

WASH: WATER RESOURCES

Camp and camp-like settings:

Piped water continues to be the main source of drinking water in most sites (68% of sites – up from 59% in August assessment), followed by hand pumps in 18 per cent (down from 24%) of sites, water trucks in six (down from 8%) per cent of sites, protected wells in four per cent of sites, unprotected wells in two per cent of sites, while two percent got drinking water from other sources such as ponds, lakes, canals and surface water. The nominal decrease in use of unprotected

wells is a welcomed sign.

Yobe saw a significant increase in use of piped water as the main source of drinking water with the percentage increasing from 71 per cent to 92 per cent of sites. In Borno, where cholera is a recurring threat, the main source of drinking water was piped water in 73 (up from 65%) per cent of sites, followed by hand pumps in 16 (down from 21%) per cent of sites and water trucks in six (down from 9%) per cent of sites. (Figure 15)




Figure 15: Main water sources in camps/camp-like settings

Overall, in 82 per cent of sites (up from 80% in November round of assessment), the main water source was located on-site and at a walking distance of less than 10 minutes. In Borno, there was no change from last round of assessment and the main source of water continued to be on-site and required less than a 10 minutes' walk in 82 per cent of sites.




Figure 16: Average amount of water available per person per day in camps/camp-like settings

Water sources had been improved in 67 per cent (up from 58%) of all assessed sites (Table 3). In Borno, this figure was 69 per cent (up from 63%) of sites.

State	No	Yes
ADAMAWA	50%	50%
BAUCHI	25%	75%
BORNO	31%	69%
TARABA	42%	58%
YOBE	31%	69%
Total	33%	67%

Table 3: Percentage of sites reporting improvement to water points in camps and camp-like settings

As illustrated in Figure 16, residents still are not differentiating

between drinking and non-drinking water but there is some improvement from 92 per cent to 87 per cent not differentiating. In Borno as well the percentage of residents not differentiating




Figure 17: Percentage of sites where IDPs differentiate between drinking and non-drinking water in camps/camp-like settings

went down slightly from 97 to 94 per cent.

In a notable drop, the average amount of water available per person per day was 10 to 15 liters in 49 per cent of sites. This figure was 60 per cent over the last two rounds of assessments published in November and August, respectively. In 15 per cent (down from 21%) of sites, it was more than 15 liters per person and in 13 per cent (down from 16%) of sites IDPs had an average of 5 to 10 liters per person. The scenario in Borno more or less reflected the overall scenario. Drinking water was potable in 91 per cent (up from 90%) of sites with Borno still faring relatively better at 95 per cent (up from 94%).




Figure 18: Average amount of water available per person per day in camps/camp-like settings

Host Communities

Unlike the scenario in camps and camp-like settings, hand pumps are the main source of water in 51 per cent (down from 52% in November round of assessment) of sites where IDPs are residing with host communities. In 25 per cent of sites




Figure 19: Main water sources in host communities

(slight improvement from 23%), piped water was the main source of drinking water, followed by protected wells (8%) and unprotected wells (7%). Other common water sources include water trucks (6% of sites), spring (1%), surface water (1%) and ponds/canal (1%). (Figure 19)

The scenario differed in Borno, where piped water was the main source in 49 per cent (down from 50%) of assessed sites, followed by hand pumps in 28 per cent of sites and unprotected wells in 12 per cent (down from 14%) of sites.




Figure 20: Distance to main water source in host communities

The main source of water was on-site and less than a 10-minute walk in 74 per cent (down from 76%) of sites. In 11 per cent of sites (5% in Borno), water was off-site but at less than a 10-minute walk distance. In eight per cent of sites, water was available on-site but at more than 10-minutes' walk and in seven per cent of sites, water was available off-site as illustrated in Figure 20 (same as last round of assessment).

State	No (%)	Yes (%)
ADAMAWA	39%	61%
BAUCHI	36%	64%
BORNO	43%	57%
GOMBE	73%	27%
TARABA	57%	43%
YOBE	18%	82%
Total	41%	59%

Table 4: Percentage of sites reporting improvement to water points in camps and camp-like settings

Water points had been improved in 59 per cent (up from 58% in the last round of assessment). This improvement of water points differed between states: In Yobe, where Cholera Disease is recurring, 82 per cent (up from 75%) of sites had improved water points and in Borno this figure was 57 per cent (up from 52%).




Figure 21: Percentage of sites where IDPs differentiate between drinking and non-drinking water in host communities

Forty-six per cent of displaced persons living with host communities differentiated between drinking and non-drinking water (slight improvement from 45% in last round of November assessment). The corresponding figures for Borno were 21 per cent (up from 15%) differentiating between drinking and non-drinking water.




Figure 22: Average amount of water available per person per day in host communities

In 51 per cent (up from 48%) of sites, 10 to 15 liters of water was available per person per day; 31 per cent of sites (same as in last round of assessment) reported access to more than 15 liters of water per person per day; and in 17 per cent of sites (down from 18%), five to 10 liters of water per person per day was available. In Borno, in 65 per cent of sites, the amount of water available for IDPs living with host communities was between 10 and 15 liters per day.

PERSONAL HYGIENE FACILITIES

Camps and camp-like settings

In 93 per cent of displacement sites (same as in the November round of assessment), toilets were described as ‘not hygienic’, while toilets were reported to be in hygienic conditions in five per cent of sites (down from 6%) and non-usable in two per cent of sites (up from 1%). In Yobe, where Cholera Disease is recurring, 100 per cent of toilets were described as not good/hygienic. In Borno, 95 per cent (up from 94%) were reported as not hygienic. (Figure 23).




Figure 23: Condition of toilets in camps/camp-like settings by state

Separate toilets for male and female IDPs were available in 42 per cent (up from 37%) of sites; this figure was 43 per cent (up from 41%) in Borno state. In Yobe, 46 per cent of sites (up from 21%) had separate toilets for men and women. Thirty-seven (down from 42%) per cent of toilets did not lock from inside.

Handwashing stations were found in 16 per cent (up from

11%) of sites, out of which four per cent did not have soap. Handwashing practice was observed in 24 per cent (down from 26%) of sites, although hygiene promotion campaigns had taken place in 64 per cent (down from 67%) of displacement sites




Figure 24: Availability of targeted hygiene promotion (L); Main garbage disposal mechanism (R) in camps/camp-like settings

Waste was burned in 76 per cent (no change from November round of assessment) of sites and garbage pits were used in 13 per cent of the identified sites, while there were no waste disposal mechanisms in 11 per cent (down from 12%) of sites. (Figure 24).

Open defecation was observed in 33 per cent of sites (down from 35%) and fully functioning drainage systems were evident in only one per cent of the sites.

Host communities

In 98 per cent of host community sites, toilets were described as ‘not hygienic’ (up from 96% in November round of assessment) and good in 2 per cent of sites. In Borno, 97 per cent (up from 96%) of toilets were reported as not good/hygienic.




Figure 25: Condition of toilets in host communities by state

Separate toilets for male and female IDPs were available in only six per cent (up from 5%) of sites; this figure went up from three to seven per cent in Borno state. In Yobe, four per cent of sites had separate toilets for men and women (down 1%). Toilets lock from inside in 34 (up from 13%) per cent of sites.




Figure 26: Availability of targeted hygiene promotion (L); Main garbage disposal mechanism (R) in host communities

Handwashing stations were found in five per cent of sites

(same as in November round of assessment) but nearly all of them did not have soap. In Borno, eight per cent of toilets had handwashing facilities. The practice of handwashing was, however, observed in 15 per cent (up 1%) of sites, although hygiene promotion campaigns had taken place in 27 per cent of sites.

Waste was burned in 65 per cent (up from 63%) of sites, put in garbage pits in 13 per cent of the identified sites and there was no waste disposal mechanism in 21 per cent (down from 24%) of sites.

Open defecation was observed in 47 per cent (up from 45%) of sites and functioning drainage systems were evident in 20 per cent (up from 10%) of the sites.

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Camps and camp-like settings

Access to food remained unchanged since the last round of assessment published in November 2018. As per Round 26, 85 per cent of sites (same as in the last two rounds of assessment) had access to food on-site.

The percentage of sites with no access to food went up by one per cent to nine and six per cent of sites solely had access to food off-site. The situation across the state is shown in Figure 27.




Figure 27: Access to food in camps/camp-like settings

Ninety-seven per cent of displacement sites had access to markets (up from 96%). The frequency of cash or voucher distribution was once a month in 41 per cent of sites (up from 31%), irregular in 36 per cent (down from 50%) and never in nine per cent of sites (up from 7%). In Borno nine per cent of sites (up from 5% in last round of assessment) never received food or cash assistance.




Figure 28: Frequency of food or cash distribution in camps/camp-like settings

For the first time, food distribution was not the most common means of obtaining food. Personal money was the most common means of obtaining food cited by 47 per cent (up from 45% in November round of assessment) of sites. Food distribution came in second at 47 per cent (down from 50%).

In 68 per cent of sites (down from 70%), screening for malnutrition was reported. No blanket supplementary feeding

of children was reported in 42 per cent (same as in last round of assessment) of sites, and no distribution of micronutrient powders was observed in 60 per cent of sites (up from 57%).

No supplementary feeding for the elderly was reported in 96 per cent of sites (up from 94%). Supplementary feeding for pregnant and lactating women was found in 47 per cent. In 37 per cent of sites, counselling on infant and young child feeding practices was available.

Host Communities

Compared to the population in displacement sites, the number of individuals with access to food on-site continues to be lower for IDPs residing in host communities (Figure 28). 54 per cent of sites (same as in the last two rounds of assessments published in November and August, respectively) had access to food on-site. This was the case for 51 per cent (down from 57%) of assessed individuals in Borno.




Figure 29: Access to food in host communities

As in the previous round, 24 per cent of IDPs had access to food off-site and 22 per cent had no access to food.

96 per cent of sites (no change) had access to markets, although the frequency of obtaining food or cash vouchers was irregular in 63 per cent of sites (improvement of 1% over November round of assessment). Food or cash voucher distribution never took place in 22 per cent of sites and once a month in 13 per cent of sites (up from 11%).




Figure 30: Frequency of food or cash distribution in host communities

Two per cent of sites received food or cash on a on daily basis. In Borno, frequency of distribution improved with 59 per cent of sites getting irregular food distribution (improvement from 63% in November round of assessment).

Cultivation was more common among IDPs living with host communities and was observed in 55 per cent (up from 50%) of sites assessed. The situation in Borno closely mirrored the overall figures.

Malnutrition screening was reported in 30 per cent of assessed sites in host communities (down from 35%). Blanket supplementary feeding was not present in 80 per cent of sites (no change from last round), while there was no supplementary

feeding for lactating and pregnant women in 79 per cent of sites (down from 82%). Counselling on infant and young child feeding practices was not observed in 78 per cent (up from 76%) of sites. There was no micronutrient powder distribution observed in 79 per cent (up by 1%) of sites. Supplementary feeding for the elderly was evidenced in one per cent of sites.

HEALTH

Camps and camp-like settings

Malaria was the most common health problem in 58 per cent (down from 73%) of assessed displacement sites, followed by cough in 24 per cent of sites (significant increase from 7% in the November round of assessment) and fever in 15 per cent (up from 11%). Diarrhea incidents went down from eight to two per cent.




Figure 31: Common health problems in camps/camp-like settings

Regular access to medicine was observed in 81 per cent of sites (no change from last assessment), with better percentages reported in Borno at 85 (down 1%) per cent. Virtually all sites (99%) had access to health facilities; 70 per cent of sites (up from 68%) had health facilities available on-site and within three kilometers; 26 per cent (down from 27%) had access to health facilities off-site but within three kilometers; mobile clinics were found in one per cent of sites and one per cent of sites had no access to health facilities. The situation in Borno state was reflective of the overall scenario (Figure 32).




Figure 32: Regular access to medicine in camps/camp-like settings

United Nations agencies and International NGOs were the main providers of health facilities for IDPs in 59 per cent of sites (up from 49%), followed by the Government in 30 per




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

cent (down from 34%) and NGOs in six per cent of sites. The situation was similar in Borno (Figure 33).

Host communities

Mirroring the situation in displacement sites, prevalence of malaria went down in host community sites as well from 71 per cent to 57 per cent of sites during Round 26. The situation in Borno is illustrated in Figure 34. Fever was the next most prominent health issue in 16 per cent of sites, followed by cough (14% - up from 6%) and diarrhea in six per cent of sites.




Figure 34: Regular access to medicine in host communities

Regular access to medicine was observed in 72 per cent of sites (up from 68%), with 81 per cent of sites in Borno reporting regular access. In 99 per cent of sites where IDPs were living with host communities, access to health facilities was observed.

In 54 per cent of sites (down from 57%), health facilities were on-site and located within three kilometers (Figure 35). For 29 per cent of sites (up from 27%), health facilities were off-site but located within three kilometers and in 8 per cent of sites the health facilities were off-site more than 6 per cent of sites.




Figure 35: Common health problems in host communities

The Government was the main provider of health care for IDP sites in 67 per cent of sites (same as in last round of assessment), followed by local clinics in 22 per cent of sites (up 1%) and international NGOs in 7 per cent of sites. The situation in Borno differed from the overall trend due to higher presence of INGOs in the state.




Figure 36: Main health providers in host communities

EDUCATION

Camps and camp-like settings

98 per cent of sites reported access to (formal or informal) education services, indicating a steady increase since the 95 per cent observed in the assessment conducted in February though it was one per cent drop since November round assessment. The scenario in Borno was similar (Figure 37).




Figure 37: Access to formal/informal education services in camps/camp-like settings

In 71 per cent of sites (down from 72%), formal or informal education facilities existed on-site, while they were located off-site in 26 per cent of sites (down 1%). The distance to education facilities was less than one kilometer in 74 per cent of sites (up from 71%), less than two kilometers in 23 per cent of sites and less than five kilometers in one per cent of sites (down from 3%).

In 35 per cent of sites (up from 33%), less than 50 per cent of children were attending school. In 34 per cent of sites (same as in last round of assessment), less than 75 per cent of children were attending school. The corresponding figure was 36 per cent in Borno (down 1%). In 20 per cent of sites less than a quarter of children were attending school. In seven per cent




Figure 38: Percentage of children attending school in camps/camp-like setting

of sites (down from 9%), more than 75 per cent of children attended school. The scenario in Borno mirrored the overall picture.

The high costs associated with school constituted the main deterrent for school attendance in 69 per cent (up from 63%) of sites. The other key reasons preventing school attendance were the lack of teachers in 17 per cent (down from 21%) of sites and lack of school in one per cent (down from 7%) of sites.

Host Communities:

In sites where IDPs are residing with host communities, access to education services was recorded in 99 per cent of sites (same as in November round of assessment). In 71 per cent of sites (no change), formal or informal education facilities existed on-site, while they were located off-site in 28 per cent (down by 1%) of sites. The distance to education facilities was less than one kilometer in 64 per cent of sites (up 1%), between one and two kilometers in 29 per cent (no change), and between two and five kilometers in five per cent (down from 7%) of sites.




Figure 39: Access to formal/informal education services in host communities

In 38 per cent of sites (down 1%) less than half of children attended school. In Borno, this figure was 47 per cent (down from 51%), while in 35 per cent of sites (up from 29%) less than 75 per cent of children attended school. In all states, less than 25 per cent of children were enrolled in schools in 17 per cent of sites (down from 21% - showing steady improvement). Similar to the assessment in Round 25, no children attended school in two per cent of sites. The scenario in Borno was different from the overall picture, mostly because of the relatively higher number of humanitarian actors in the state.




Figure 40: Percentage of children attending school in host communities

In 78 per cent of sites (up 1%), the main reason preventing school attendance were the high costs and fees.

COMMUNICATION

Camps and camp-like settings

Friends and neighbors were cited as the most-trusted source of information in 65 per cent of sites (up from 60% from the last round of assessment published in November 2018). Local and community leaders were cited as the second most trusted source of information in 25 per cent of sites (down 1%) -- a decreasing trend over the last few rounds of assessment. Only five per cent of sites cited religious leaders as source of information.




Figure 41: Most trusted source of information for IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

Radio was cited as the most preferred medium for receiving information in 26 per cent of sites, followed by word of mouth in 30 per cent, telephone voice calls in 4 per cent and community meetings in 3 per cent.

In 84 per cent of sites, few people had access to functioning radio. In fact, almost all had functioning radio in only two sites. The main subject matters that the IDPs wished to receive




Figure 42: Access to functioning radio in camps/camp-like settings

information on included: distributions (46% - down from 49%), other relief assistance (18% - up 1%), access to services (13% - down from 17%), safety and security of sites (12% - up from 9%) and situation in areas of origin (8%) as depicted in Figure 43.




Figure 43: Most important topic for IDPs camps/camp-like settings

Host communities

For IDPs residing with host communities, friends and family were the most trusted sources of information at 41 per cent (up from 39%) of sites. Local community leaders were close behind in 40 per cent of sites (same as in last round of assessment).

Friends and neighbors were the second most popular source of information at 39 per cent. Religious leaders followed in 11 per cent of sites (down from 12%).




Figure 44: Most trusted source of information for IDPs in host communities

In sites where IDPs are residing in camps and camp-like settings, radio was the most preferred source of information for displaced persons living with host communities (in 56% of sites). Word of mouth came in next at 30 per cent and 6 per cent got their information from community meetings.




Figure 45: Access to functioning radio in host communities

In 71 per cent of sites few residents had access to functioning radio. Only in four per cent of sites almost all residents possessed functioning radio.

The main topics IDPs in host communities wished to receive information on included: distributions in 45 per cent (up 1%) of sites, followed by the situation in the area of origin in 17 per cent of sites (no change from the November round of assessment), information on other relief assistance in 14 per cent (down 1%) of sites, and safety and security in 12 per cent of sites (no change from last round of assessment).




Figure 46: Most important topic for IDPs camps/camp-like settings

LIVELIHOODS

Camps and camp-like settings

Petty trade was the main livelihood activity in 36 per cent of sites (up from 32%), while daily labor and farming was the occupation of the majority of IDPs in 30 and 25 per cent of displacement sites, respectively. The percentages were not significantly different from the November round of assessment.




Figure 47: Livelihood activities of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

Access to income generating activities was found in almost all sites, while the presence of livestock was recorded in 87 per cent (up from 82% in the previous round of assessment) of sites, and access to land for cultivation was found in 59 per cent (up from 54%) of sites.

Host communities

In contrast to IDPs living in displacement camps, the majority of IDPs living with host communities engaged in farming. In 65 per cent of sites IDPs engaged in farming during this round of assessment which is same as the last round of assessment published in November 2018.




Figure 48: Livelihood activities of IDPs in host communities

Access to income generating activities was found to be universal. Livestock was found in 93 per cent of sites (same as in last two rounds of assessments) and similarly, access to land for cultivation was evidenced in 90 per cent of sites in which IDP households lived with host communities.

PROTECTION

Camps/camp-like settings

Security was provided in 97 per cent (up 1% since the November round of assessment) of evaluated sites. As a point of comparison, security was provided in almost all the assessed sites in Borno state (Figure 38). Security was self-organized in 57 per cent (up from 55% and 51% in the November and

August rounds of assessments, respectively) of sites across the six northeastern Nigerian states, while the military provided security in 22 per cent of sites (down from 25%). Police provided security in seven per cent of sites (Figure 49).




Figure 49: Security provided in camps/camp-like settings

IDPs in 90 per cent (up 2%) of sites, claimed not have witnessed any security incident. Theft was reported in three per cent of sites and friction among site residents in five per cent of sites.

The proportion of sites reporting no incident of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) went up to 98% from 97 per cent, with sites in Adamawa and Borno states being the only ones reporting instances of domestic violence. No cases of physical violence were reported in 96 per cent (up from 98%) of sites.

Incidents of children involved in forced work were reported in two per cent of sites and in one per cent of sites there were reports of child separation (in-line with previous round of assessment), while no incident was reported in 97 per cent of sites (up 1%).




Figure 50: Livelihood activities of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

31 per cent of sites (up from 18%) reported no problem in receiving support. The major problem relating to support had to do with inadequate coverage of the assistance for all entitled, which was cited in 60 per cent (down from 72%) of sites. In four per cent of sites, assistance did not respond to actual needs (same as in last two rounds of assessments). Fighting between recipients was reported in two per cent of sites (no change from last round).

There were 58 (down from 70) recreational places available to children in the sites assessed. This, however, represents an increase from the 30 recreational areas that were recorded in the February round of DTM assessment (Round 21). Out of the 70 recreational spaces identified, 41 (down from 50 in the November round of assessment) recreational places were located in Borno. There were 23 (down from 30) recreational places for women, 15 (down from 23) of which were in Borno.

The majority of IDPs had identity cards (89% - up from 78%), with the proportion being the highest in Borno, where 89 per

cent (up from 84%) of displaced people possessed identity cards. No referral mechanism for incidents was in place in 48 per cent of sites (down from 63%). Women, men and children felt unsafe in 99 per cent of sites, respectively.

Relationships between IDPs were reported as being good in 97 per cent (no change from the previous round of assessment) of sites, and relationships with surrounding host communities were described as good in 97 per cent (down 1%) of sites.

There was no lighting in 76 per cent (down from 82%) of sites, while it was inadequate in 22 per cent (up from 17%) of sites.

Lastly, work opportunities were offered within Nigeria in four per cent of sites.

Host Communities

Amongst the sites where IDPs lived with host communities, 89 per cent (up from 87%) had some form of security.

Local authorities were the main providers of security in 23 per cent (down 1%) of sites, followed by self-organized security in 20 per cent of sites (up 1%) and security provided by police in 18 per cent (up 1%) of sites.




Figure 51: Security provided in host communities

In host communities, no security incidents were reported in 78 per cent (up from 76%) of sites. Theft was the most commonly reported type of security incident in 13 per cent (down from 17%) of sites, followed by crime in 3 per cent and friction amongst site residents in two per cent of sites, respectively.

In 95 per cent of sites (up from 93%), no incident of GBV was reported. Similar to the situation in camps and camp-like settings, domestic violence was the main type of incident reported amongst the sites in which incidents of GBV were reported. No case of physical violence was reported in 88 per cent of sites (down from 93%).




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

Child labor or forced begging was reported in two per cent (down from 6%) of sites. No child protection incident was reported in 96 per cent of sites (up from 90% in November round of assessment).

In 58 per cent of sites (down from 63%), assistance provided was reportedly not adequate for all those entitled and in four

per cent (down 1%) of sites it was inadequate for the most vulnerable individuals. In 27 per cent (up from 19%) of sites there were no problems in assessing assistance.

There were 177 recreational spaces for children in all assessed sites (up from 172 in the last round of assessment), 71 (up from 52) of which were located in Borno. In total, there were 45 (down from 50) social places for women, 19 (up from 2) of which were in Borno.

12 per cent of IDPs residing with host communities did not have identification documents (down from 45% in the November round of assessment). This figure was 9 per cent in Borno.

Referral mechanisms were in place in 40 per cent (same as in last round of assessment) of sites. In 96 per cent (down from 99%) of sites, women said they felt unsafe, in 97 per cent of sites men felt unsafe and children felt unsafe in 97 per cent (down 1%) of sites.

Relations among IDPs were described as good in 97 per cent (up from 93%) of sites, poor in one per cent and excellent in five per cent (up from 3%) of sites. Similarly, relations with host communities were good in 96 per cent (no change from last round) of sites and excellent in three per cent (no change), but were reported as poor in one per cent of sites.

55 per cent of sites (down from 57% in November round of assessment but up from 41% in August round of assessment) had lighting in the camp though only four per cent (up 15) of sites said the lighting was adequate. Lighting was inadequate in 41 per cent of sites (up 1%).

3. RETURNEES

The number of returnees assessed in the 26th Round of DTM assessment showed a dip, on account of lack of accessibility to many locations.

A total of 1,558,058 returnees (or 254,829 households) were recorded, a decrease of 82,852 or five per cent since the Round 25 report published in November 2018, when 1,642,696 returnees were identified. Prior to this, every assessment had shown a trend of steady increase in the number of returnees since DTM started recording data on returnees in August 2015 (Figure 53).

be attributed to the lack of access to carryout assessments and overall increase in insecurity. In Round 26, 95,402 returnee refugees were recorded in the states of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe as against 124,162 identified in Round 25 that was published in November 2018.

Overall, nine wards were not assessed during this round of assessment. In Borno, nine wards were not assessed, including five in Kukawa, two in Guzamala and one each in Kala Balge and Nganzai. In Yobe, six wards were not assessed including four in Gujba and one each in Gulani and Yusufari. On the other




Figure 53: Returnee population trend


It is noteworthy that during this round of assessment, 39 LGAs were assessed. Whereas in the previous round of assessment 41 LGAs were assessed by DTM. Borno’s Kukawa LGA, which is among the most affected in the recent escalation of hostilities, saw the highest drop in number of returnees. Due to lack of humanitarian access, none of the 26,369 returnees in Kukawa who were recorded in Round 25 published in November could be assessed in this Round 26.

State	Round 25 (October 2018)	Round 26 (January 2019)	Population Change
ADAMAWA	780,571	783,244	+2,673
BAUCHI	684,798	641,216	-43,582
BORNO	177,327	133,598	-43,729
Total	1,642,696	1,580,093	-84,638

Table 5: Change in returnee population by State

Gujba and Geidam LGAs in the State of Yobe also recorded high reductions in number of returnees – 17,605 and 16,484, respectively. The increasing trend of “returnees from abroad” or return refugees who are persons previously displaced to another country in the Lake Chad basin (notably Cameroon, Chad and Niger) also showed a dip. While over the last many rounds of assessment, numbers of returnee refugees have steadily increased, in this round there was a minor decrease. This can

hand four new wards were assessed in Adamawa and one each in Borno and Yobe.



Map 6: Returned population by State

3A: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT FOR RETURNEES

The year 2015 was cited as the year during which they were displaced by 42 per cent of returnees assessed. Twenty-six per cent of respondents said they were displaced in 2014. Overall, 94 per cent attributed their initial displacement to the ongoing conflict in northeast Nigeria and 60 per cent returnees said they were displaced during the ongoing conflict.




Figure 54: Livelihood activities of IDPs in camps/camp-like settings

3B: SHELTER CONDITIONS FOR RETURNEES

Borno has the highest number of returnees living in makeshift or emergency centers at 63 per cent. 47 per cent of returnees in Borno are living in walled buildings and 34 per cent are living in traditional shelters like Bukka, Gidan zana, thatched roofs, etc.




Figure 55: Most common shelter types of the returned households

57 per cent (down from 72%) of returnee shelters assessed in Borno were not damaged, 55 per cent were partially damaged (up from 23%) and 42 per cent not damaged.




Figure 56: Shelters conditions of the returned households in areas of return

3C: HEALTH FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

In an assessment carried out in 665 sites where returnees are residing, 58 per cent of sites had some form of health facility available in the location, while the remaining 42 per cent did not. Figure 44 gives the State-wide breakdown of available health facilities.




Figure 57: Access to the health services in the area of return

The most common form of health facility available was a Primary Health Care Center (36%), followed by clinic (10%), mobile clinic (8%) and General Hospital (5%).

A high percentage of health facilities, however, were not functioning. As per the assessment, 42 per cent of facilities were not functioning while remaining were.




Figure 58: availability of medical services in areas of return

3D: EDUCATION FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

In 79 per cent of sites assessed, education facilities were available with the most percentage in Borno at (85%). There were no education facilities in 21 per cent of sites with the corresponding figure for Borno being 15 per cent. The other states fared better as can be seen from Figure 59.




Figure 59: Availability of education services in areas of return

3E: MARKET FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

The majority of locations hosting returnees did not have market facilities: as per the assessment, no markets were found in 71 per cent of sites. And while markets were present in 31 per cent of sites, only 20 per cent were functioning.

3F: PROFILE OF ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES

Assistance was found to be provided to returnees in 665 assessed locations via United Nations (UN) agencies. Thirty-four sites were getting UN assistance, followed by local non-government organizations (NGOs) and international NGOs in 28 per cent of sites, respectively, the Government in seven per cent of sites, religious bodies in two per cent and none in two per cent of sites.




Figure 60: Percentage of sites received by type of assistance

3G: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) facilities were found to be available in 86 per cent of sites, while none were found in 14 per cent of sites assessed. The most common form of WASH

assistance provided were communal boreholes (37%), followed by handpumps (24%), communal wells (19%) and public toilets (5%). On the other hand, 29 per cent of WASH facilities were not functioning while 71 per cent were functioning and catering to 568,142 people residing in these sites.




Figure 61: Percentage of sites

Most women and children said they felt safe using these facilities (68%) while 17 per cent did not feel safe and 16 per cent gave no answer. The picture in Borno mirrored the overall percentages.

3H: LIVELIHOOD FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Farming is the means of livelihood for the great majority of returnees with 92 per cent or 234,419 people engaging in it. Petty trade came in as second most common form of livelihood at five per cent. One per cent of returnees were practicing trade.

Access to farmland was high at 92 per cent (86% in Borno), while eight per cent did not have access to farmland. Among those who said they did not access to farmland, four per cent said that the farmland was insufficient, three per cent said they could not access farms due to military restrictions and three per cent said that they found it unsafe to go and farm.

4. METHODOLOGY

The data collected in this report was obtained through the implementation of different DTM tools used by enumerators at various administrative levels. The type of respondent for each tool was 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 the 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 the ward level. The type of information collected at this level includes: displaced population estimates (households and individuals), time of arrival, location of origin, reason(s) for 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. In addition, 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 is 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 - Returnees: The ward level profile is an assessment that is conducted at the 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:

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

IOM: Henry Kwenin, Project Officer,
hkwenin@iom.int
+234 9038852524
<http://nigeria.iom.int/dtm>
<https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria>

