



- ◆ **2,093,030** IDPs (370,389 households) were identified in Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Nasarawa, Plateau, Kaduna, Kano, Zamfara states and Abuja FCT.
- ◆ In total, **1,878,205** IDPs captured through the DTM assessments have been displaced by the insurgency (89.74% of the total IDP population).
- ◆ Majority of the IDPs are identified in Borno (1,446,829) followed by Adamawa (163,559) and Yobe (135,442).



OVERVIEW

In response to the need for accurate information on internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Nigeria, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) began implementing the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) project in July 2014. The project is supporting the Government of Nigeria and other humanitarian response partners to conduct IDPs assessments in a systematic way as well as to establish a profile of the IDP population.

Working in close collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs), the DTM programme is worked to expand its reach to addressing the needs in accessible areas and gathering accurate information on the caseload of IDPs.

More and more LGAs are now accessible out of the 27 LGAs in insurgency-hit north-eastern State of Borno, bringing to light heightened need for immediate humanitarian response. IOM also assessed all LGAs in Yobe for the first time during this duration of this Round 11 Report. This is in addition to the assessments ongoing in 12 other states (Abuja FCT, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara) that cover a total of 224 LGAs and 1,495 wards where IDPs had been identified.

Since December 2015, IOM has also been conducting Biometric Registration of IPDs in camps, camp-like sites and host communities in the three north-eastern States of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe. Biometric Registration includes capturing fingerprints of all members of household and in case of children below five photographs are taken. A profile of each IDP is created by collecting detailed information at the household level. The data is captured through an individual interview with the head of household and includes information on household members, displacement history, education, livelihood, return intention, assistance received and needs as well as on vulnerability.

The registered family is given an electronic card that is unique to them and the technology helps in removing duplications and accurate targeting of intended beneficiary. While following IOM's international principles of confidentiality and data protection, biometric data is shared with humanitarian agencies to aid targeted assistance in selected communities of their intervention. To date, over 300,000 beneficiaries had been registered in north-east Nigeria by IOM.

The DTM teams are composed of representatives of NEMA, SEMAs, the Nigerian Red Cross and IOM. The assessment includes the collection of baseline information at LGAs and ward level and detailed surveys in camps and camp-like sites. The DTM programme is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department (ECHO). NEMA is also providing financial support to the programme.

1 POPULATION PROFILE


1A: LOCATION OF DISPLACEMENT

The total number of IDPs identified in Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara as of 31 August 2016 is 2,093,030 IDPs (370,389 households).

Table 1: Total IDP population by current location (State)

State	Households	Individuals	Avg HH Size	Percentage
ADAMAWA	36,189	163,559	4.52	7.81%
BAUCHI	10,136	61,717	6.09	2.95%
BENUUE	5,497	30,584	5.56	1.46%
BORNO	253,951	1,446,829	5.7	69.13%
FCT	3,160	20,924	6.62	1.00%
GOMBE	5,111	28,972	5.67	1.38%
KADUNA	3,842	28,927	7.53	1.38%
KANO	1,841	9,910	5.38	0.47%
NASARAWA	3,664	24,795	6.77	1.18%
PLATEAU	8,692	45,746	5.26	2.19%
TARABA	8,230	47,195	5.73	2.25%
YOBE	20,901	135,442	6.48	6.47%
ZAMFARA	9,175	48,430	5.28	2.31%
Grand Total	370,389	2,093,030	5.65	100%

In total, 1,878,205 IDPs have been displaced by the insurgency with the highest numbers recorded in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe states.



Map 1: Severity Map showing the population density of IDPs per state of displacement.





Fig 1: Percentage of IDPs in Host community and in Camps



The increase in the number of IDPs compared to the last round of assessment (2,066,783 IDPs) is mainly due to the fact that more areas became accessible in Borno and all LGAs became accessible in Yobe. Particularly, Monguno town in Borno witnessed influx of IDPs on account of returnees and people from neighbouring areas moving in. In Yobe, access to Gujba and Gulani led to increase in number of IDPs recorded. Some IDPs are also returning to the place of origin for farming purposes due to the ongoing rainy season. In Borno, Maiduguri LGA is hosting the highest number of IDPs (614,724), while most IDPs in Adamawa and Yobe were found respectively in Girei (28,657) and Gujba (26,417) LGAs.

Chart 1: Number of IDPs (December 2014/June 2016)

Table 2: Total IDP population per round and states covered

Round	Release Date	Number of IDPs	States covered
I	Dec-2014	389,281	Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe
II	Feb-2015	1,188,018	Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe
III	Apr-2015	1,491,706	Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe
IV	Jun-2015	1,385,298	Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe
V	Aug-2015	2,150,451	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Nasarawa, Taraba and Yobe
VI	Oct-2015	2,239,749	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba and Yobe
VII	Dec-2015	2,151,979	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara.
VIII	Feb-2016	2,241,484	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara.
IX	Apr-2016	2,155,618	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara
X	Jun-2016	2,066,783	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara
XI	Aug-2016	2,093,030	Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara




Chart 2: LGAs with the highest concentration of IDPs in the North-East

1B: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The demographic profile of the IDP population is the result of a sample survey conducted on 20 households in each of the wards assessed by the DTM team. In total, 29,900 households were interviewed to obtain a detailed age and sex breakdown. This sample represents 7% of the identified IDP population.

After extrapolation, the results show that 52.95% of the IDP population are female and 47.05% are male. Children under 18 constitute 54% of the IDP population and more than half of them are under five years old.




Chart 3a: Age Breakdown




Fig 4: IDP Population by major age groups and sex breakdown




Chart 3b: Age Breakdown

1C: REASONS OF DISPLACEMENT

Most IDPs identified through the DTM assessments were displaced because of the insurgency. This is especially the case in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe and Yobe where 89.74% (1,878,205) IDPs were displaced due to the conflict.

Communal clashes were the second highest reason for displacement (8.85%) in the areas assessed with natural disaster comprising 1.41%.





Chart 4: IDP Population by reason for displacement



Map 2: IDP Population by Reasons of Displacement.




Chart 5: Total IDP Population by current location (State) and reason for displacement

1D: YEARS OF DISPLACEMENT

The majority of IDPs identified during this assessment were displaced in 2014 (42.4%), 2015 (35.80%) and 19% have been displaced so far in 2016.





Chart 6: IDP population by year of displacement

1E: ORIGIN OF THE DISPLACED POPULATION

The majority of IDPs are displaced within their state of origin. 99% of the IDPs displaced in Borno originated from Borno itself followed by Adamawa with 74% displaced.

Table 3: IDP Population by state of origin and current location (State)

STATE OF ORIGIN	CURRENT LOCATION													
	ADAMAWA	BAUCHI	BENUE	BORNO	FCT	GOMBE	KADUNA	KANO	NASARAWA	PLATEAU	TARABA	YOBE	ZAMFARA	
ADAMAWA	73.89%	3.29%	0.00%	0.10%	1.00%	5.08%	0.61%	0.18%	0.00%	0.92%	6.19%	0.00%	0.00%	
BAUCHI	0.00%	15.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
BENUE	0.00%	0.00%	83.84%	0.00%	8.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
BORNO	25.93%	35.67%	0.00%	99.44%	87.99%	52.06%	11.54%	84.31%	17.92%	5.51%	21.49%	37.27%	27.35%	
KADUNA	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	74.91%	0.00%	3.96%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
KANO	0.00%	1.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
NASARAWA	0.00%	3.76%	7.06%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	73.11%	13.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
PLATEAU	0.00%	22.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.72%	0.00%	0.39%	66.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
TARABA	0.00%	6.94%	9.11%	0.00%	2.17%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	4.57%	13.02%	72.05%	0.00%	0.00%	
YOBE	0.18%	10.91%	0.00%	0.46%	0.00%	42.50%	1.23%	15.51%	0.00%	0.82%	0.28%	62.73%	8.18%	
ZAMFARA	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	64.47%	




In Abuja, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, and Kano, the majority of IDPs identified are from Borno State. In Kaduna, Nasarawa, Plateau, Yobe and Zamfara, most IDPs are from the same state.

Fig 7: Percentage of IDPs by State of Origin

1F: TYPE OF LOCATION - RESIDENCE OF IDPs

The vast majority of IDPs identified during the assessments are living in host communities, with friends and relatives or in rented/donated houses. The data collected in the field indicates that 81% of IDPs live in host communities while 19% live in camps or camp-like sites.



1G: RETURNEES

Return assessment was conducted in 19 LGAs in northern Adamawa (Gombi, Hong, Madagali, Maiha, Michika, Mubi North and Mubi South), Borno (Askira Uba, Bayo, Biu, Gubio, Hawul, Kaga, Konduga, Magumeri, Monguno and Ngazai) and Yobe (Gujba and Gulani). During this round of assessment, 910,955 returnees were identified. Most returnees were originally displaced in Adamawa (29%), Borno (21%), Gombe (8.26%), Yobe (8.17%), Kano (7.58%), Nasarawa (6.38%) and Taraba (6%).





Chart 8: Percentage of Returnees by State of Displacement



DTM NIGERIA | Return Assessment

SOURCE: DTM Round XI
DATE: August, 2016



Map 3: Returnees-Places of origin

3 SITES ASSESSMENT

3.1. A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPs IN 155 SITES

In comparison with the last round, a total of 155 camp and camp-like sites have been visited during this round of assessment. 126 sites have been identified in the northeast, 24 in Adamawa, 86 in Borno, 11 in Taraba and 5 in Yobe.

The number of individuals residing in these sites is 318,646 individuals (60,544 households).


The sites assessed during this exercise have been classified in three categories:

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

Table 4: Number of sites - State

Site type	Number Of sites	Households (HH)	Number of Individuals	Percentage of individuals
Camp	33	10,491	53,733	16.86%
Collective Settlement	118	49,574	262,750	82.46%
Transitional Centre	4	479	2,162	1%
Total	155	60,544	318,645	100%

The majority of sites are categorized as collective settlements (118 sites) of which most are self-made tents (36 sites), Government buildings (32 sites) and schools (30 sites).



Map 4: Number of sites - State

3.1. B: SECTOR ANALYSIS



SHELTER

The most common types of shelter identified during the site assessments were classified as informal settlements. Out of the 155 sites assessed in the north-east, 55 are not officially recognized which constitutes 51.8% of the total camps in the north-east.

The most common types of shelter identified are self-made tents (36 sites), Government buildings (32 sites) and schools (20 sites, majorly in informal sites). In majority of sites (53), more than 75% of IDP population live indoors.

In 61 sites, residents reported blankets as the most needed type of NFI.




Chart 9: Percentage of Shelter Types



WASH

In the majority of sites (99) the main water source is located on-site within a 10 minute walk. In 30 sites, the main water source is located off-site within a 10 minute walk. In 25 sites the water sources are located off-site and requires more than a 10 minute walk.

At 66 sites hand pump is the main source of drinking water. At 56 sites piped water supply provide the main source. In 113 sites the drinking water is reported to be potable. In 23 sites, there were complaints of unpleasant water taste.

At 118 sites, the latrines were assessed as in "not so good conditions". In 61 sites, there are separated toilets for males and females. In 91 sites, toilets do not lock from inside. In most sites (58) burning is the main method of garbage disposal. 47 sites have hand washing stations but 104 sites have no soap or water. At the majority of sites (128), there was no evidence of hand washing practices. At 120 sites, there were evidences of open field defecation and 135 sites do not have working drainage system.



FOOD AND NUTRITION

Of the 155 sites accessed, 116 sites had access to food. The provision of food, however, is irregular in 91 sites. The most common source of food is food distribution (47 sites). Screening for malnutrition among children was conducted at 110 sites.



HEALTH

In the majority of sites (113), residents reported malaria as the most prevalent health problem. Residents in 105 sites reported to have irregular access to medicines. In 53 sites the health facilities are located on site – less than 3 kilometers away – and in 17 sites the health facilities are located off site – more than 3 kilometers away.




Chart 10: Most Prevalent Health Problem



EDUCATION

In 106 sites accessed, 67 had facilities for formal or informal education. In the majority of sites where education is available (43), the nearest education facilities are located on site. In 55 sites, education facility is located within one kilometer distance. In 35 sites none of the children attend school while in 24 sites less than 25% of children attend school. In 18 sites, the number of students who attend school is less than 50% of the children and this percentage increases to less than 75% in 14 sites.




Chart 11: Number of Sites where Children Attend Schools



PROTECTION

Security was provided in 112 sites and most (54) was self-provided followed by military. Incidents were identified in 34 sites out of all the sites assessed and mostly classified as due to theft (19 sites) and friction among site residents (9 sites). Among the sites assessed, 9 GBV incidents were related to domestic violence and 16 were unknown. In majority of sites (129), IDPs relationship with host community was described as good.



COMMUNICATION




Chart 12: Means of Communication

In 45 sites, resident get information from radio/news. Family and friends were the second best source of information at 30. Residents in 54 sites required more information about the situation in their areas of origin whereas residents in 53 sites required more information about safety and security.



LIVELIHOOD

In 70 sites farming is the main occupation of the IDPs while daily labour was second main occupation in 30 sites. Residents, however, do not have access to land for cultivation in 59 sites. At 99 sites, residents have access to income generating activities but mostly on an irregular basis. Livestock was present in camps in 70 sites.

4 METHODOLOGY

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

Local Government area (LGA) level location assessment:

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

Ward/village level location assessments:

Assessments are conducted with key informants at the ward/village level. The information collected includes: estimates on the number of displaced households and individuals living in the ward, details on the location and type of residence of displaced households (host community – free or renting, camp-like settings – formal and informal), reason for displacement, areas of origin, and length of displacement. The assessment also includes information on displacement originating from the ward, as well as a demographic calculator based on a sample of IDPs in host communities and camp-like settings. Interviews are conducted with key informants, such as Ward leaders, representatives of the LGA administration, IDP community leaders, religious leaders, and NGO or humanitarian aid workers. The results of the ward/village assessments are used to verify the information collected at LGA level. The ward/village level location assessments are carried out in all those wards identified as having IDP populations during the LGA assessment.

Site assessments

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

Registration:

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

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>