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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report of the Round 30 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 4 to 22 November 2019 and reflects trends from the six most affected north-eastern states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.

For Round 30, 2,039,092 individuals were recorded as displaced in the affected states, indicating a stabilization in numbers as it is slightly higher (an increase of 3,860 people) than 2,035,232 internally displaced persons (IDPs) that were recorded in Round 29 which was published in November 2019. Similar trend was observed in previous two rounds of assessment since August 2019.

The figure is slowing inching above the number of displaced persons recorded in Round 25 (2,026,602), which was conducted before escalating violence was observed in October 2018. During Round 25, a higher number of Local Government Areas (LGAs or districts) and wards were accessible. Given that the numbers of IDPs is increasing slowly although accessibility remains low, it can be inferred that the actual displacement figures could be much higher.

To gain insights into the profiles of IDPs, interviews were conducted with 4 per cent of the identified IDP population — 86,530 displaced persons — during this round of assessments. The information collated and analysed in this report includes the reasons for displacement, places of origin and shelter types, mobility patterns, and unfulfilled needs of the displaced populations.

Additionally, site assessments were conducted in 2,375 locations (down from 2,388 in the last round of assessment, published in November 2019). The purpose was to better understand the gaps in services provided and the needs of the affected population. These sites included 293 (no change from the last round of assessment) camps and camp-like settings and 2,082 locations (down from 2,095 in last round of assessment) 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 specifically emphasizes the related analysis and data. Lastly, this report includes analyses on the increasing number of returnees, profiles of their initial displacement, shelter conditions of returnees, and 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 Displacement Tracking Matrix programme in September 2014, in collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and relevant State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMA's).

The main objective of initiating the DTM programme is to provide support to the Government and humanitarian partners by establishing a comprehensive system to collect, analyse and disseminate data on IDPs and returnees for ensuring 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 were communities were hosting IDPs at the time of the assessment.
DTM Round 30 assessments were carried out from 4 to 22 November 2019 in 106 LGAs (down from 107 in the last round of assessment) in 790 wards (down from 794 wards that were assessible in the last DTM assessment) in the conflict-affected north-eastern Nigerian states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe. As per the assessments, 2,039,092 individuals were recorded as displaced in the affected states in Round 30, an increase of 3,860 persons as against 2,035,232 IDPs that were recorded in Round 29 that was published in November 2019.

Illustrating a nominal increase of 16,719 individuals recorded in the last round of assessment as against the 2,018,513 IDPs that were recorded in the round before (Round 28). Similarly, Round 28 had shown an increase of 2 per cent, or 44, 632 individuals, from Round 27, published in May 2019.

The total number of IDPs recorded is at par with the 2,026,602 IDPs that were recorded in Round 25, which was carried out before the escalation of violence in October 2018. And during which the number of accessible LGAs was much higher (110 more LGAs accessible). This plateauing cannot be interpreted as a calm in security situation as there is an increase in the number of LGAs and wards that are inaccessible. Accessibility has continued to decrease in Round 30 in-line with the decreasing trend over the last six rounds of assessments.

The marked decrease in accessibility can be gauged from the fact that 110 LGAs with 807 wards were accessible during Round 25 and only two LGAs were inaccessible, namely: Abadam and Marte. But in Round 26, 13 wards were inaccessible and populous LGAs like Guzamala, Kukawa and Kala/Balge in the most-affected State of Borno were no longer accessible.

Likewise, in Round 28 only 107 LGAs were accessible while Guzamala, Kukawa, and Nganzai LGAs and 12 wards were inaccessible. Inaccessibility continued during Round 29 with 794 wards accessible.

In the latest Round 30, inaccessibility increased further. In addition to Guzamala, Kukawa, and Nganzai LGAs and 12 wards were inaccessible. Two wards in Gubio LGA that were accessible in last round of assessment became inaccessible during Round 30.

Three wards in the State of Taraba were also not accessible but this was somewhat offset by increased accessibility in one ward in Gulani LGA in the State of Yobe.

As a result, four wards were not accessible during Round 30 as against Round 29 that was published in November 2019.

Before the recent deterioration in overall security situation, the number of wards that DTM was assessing had been steadily going up over the months. 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 2019.

Also, the number of sites assessed by DTM enumerators in DTM Round 30 assessment marginally decreased from 2,388 to 2,375 locations.

Map1: LGA Coverage of DTM Round 30 Assessments
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1A: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA

The estimated number of IDPs in conflict affected north-eastern states Nigerian states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe was 2,039,092 individuals or 420,994 households.

The number represents an increase of 3,860 individuals compared with 2,035,232 IDPs that were recorded in Round 29 published in November 2019. The number of IDPs seem to be plateauing. Round 28 had also shown an increase of 2 per cent or 44,632 individuals compared with 1,980,036 IDPs that were recorded in Round 27 published in May 2019.

Indeed, prior to the dip recorded in January 2019, the numbers of IDPs had been rising since the beginning of 2018 as can be noted from Figure 1. Round 25 of assessment had identified 2,026,602 IDPs which was in-keeping with a steady trend of increase in number of IDPs over the last few months.

The most-affected State of Borno continues to hosting the highest number of IDPs at 1,496,871 which represents no change from the last round of assessment that was published in November 2019. This is again an indication that the number of IDPs is plateauing back to the levels that were prevalent before the escalation in violence in October 2018.

While Borno’s populous LGAs of Guzamala, Kukawa and Nganzai remained inaccessible to DTM enumerators due to continued insecurity in Round 30. The entire LGA of Gubio also became inaccessible - a clear sign of increasing insecurity and deepening humanitarian crisis.

Two wards of Gubio that were assessed and found to have a population of 3,563 in Round 29 were completely inaccessible in the latest round.

Borno’s capital city of Maiduguri Metropolitan Council (MMC), which hosts the highest number of IDPs among all LGAs in the North East, recorded an increase of 4,763 displaced persons taking its tally to 279,550 on account of influx of new arrivals from Gubio, Magumeri, Nganzai and other security compromised LGAs.

In fact, among all LGAs, MMC recorded the highest increase in absolute number of IDPs, followed by Demsa in Adamawa with an increase of 4,620 persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Count of LGAs</th>
<th>R29 Total (October 2019)</th>
<th>R30 Total (November 2019)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMAWA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>196,888</td>
<td>204,699</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>7,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAUCHI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64,859</td>
<td>64,791</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORNO</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,496,871</td>
<td>1,496,871</td>
<td>Within Range</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOMBE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,969</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARABA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>97,975</td>
<td>101,181</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOBE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>141,670</td>
<td>134,511</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>-7,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2,035,232</td>
<td>2,039,092</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Change in internally displaced population by State

Decrease in IDP numbers recorded in Monguno LGA of Borno where the recorded displaced persons decreased by 3 per cent from 159,542 to 154,462. In percentage terms, Gubio showed the highest reduction as it could not be assessed due to security situation.

Among all the other states that were assessed, Adamawa recorded the highest increase in numbers of IDPs (4%) and Yobe witnessed the highest decrease of 5 per cent.

Figure 1: IDP population by round of DTM assessment
1B: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

A detailed and representative overview of age and sex breakdown was obtained by interviewing a sample of 86,530 persons, representing 4 per cent of the recorded IDP population in the six most affected states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe. The results are depicted in Figures 2 and 3 below.

1C: REASONS FOR DISPLACEMENT

Reasons for displacement remained unchanged since the last round of assessment published in November 2019. The ongoing conflict in north-eastern Nigeria continued to be the main reason for displacement (91% - down from 92%), followed by communal clashes for 8 per cent and natural disaster in 1 per cent of cases.

Map 3 provides an overview of the reasons for displacement by state. Once again, the State of Taraba showed the highest number of displacements due to communal clashes during the Round 30 assessments.

1D: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT

Nine per cent of displacements took place in 2019 so far on account of increased insecurity, communal clashes and natural disasters. The year with the highest percentage of displacements remains 2015 (27% - up by 1% since last round of assessment) followed by 2016 (20%). 17 per cent of IDPs were displaced in 2017 (down by 1%) and 12 per cent in 2018 (Figure 4).

1E: MOBILITY

Most IDPs have been displaced two times and often three times. Fifty-seven per cent of IDPs have been displaced before in the six most affected north-eastern states. In Borno, 68 per cent (up from 66%) of displaced persons said they have been displaced before.

Also, this most-affected state has the lowest percentage (7%) of IDPs who say they have been displaced only once. Adamawa, which has historically been affected by communal clashes, has the highest percentage of people (11%) who say they have been displaced more than three times.
After Borno, Adamawa is the place of origin for the second largest number of IDPs (7% - no change since last three rounds of assessments).

1G: SETTLEMENT TYPE OF DISPLACED POPULATIONS

In keeping with the trend observed in the last few rounds in last few rounds, 58 per cent (up from 57%) of all IDPs were living with host communities (Figure 7) during Round 30 assessments with the remainder (42%) residing in camps and camp-like settings.

Out of all the six states, Borno continues to be the only state where the number of people residing in camps and camp-like settings is 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.

1H: UNMET NEEDS IN IDP SETTLEMENTS

The percentage of people in need for food has continued to remain at a high and unchanged figure of 73 per cent over the last assessments. In Round 30 as well, 73 per cent of surveyed IDPs cited it as their main unmet need.

Non-food items (NFIs) were cited as the other second most unfulfilled need by 14 per cent (down from 15% from the percentage cited in the last round of assessment) and 6 per cent cited (down by 1%) shelter as their main unmet need. These results are consistent with the trend observed in previous assessments.

Map 4: Origin of IDPs and location of displacement
2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS

2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPS

DTM Round 30 site assessments were conducted in 2,375 locations (down from 2,388 in the last round of assessment, published in November 2019). The purpose was to better understand the gaps in services provided and the needs of the affected population.

These sites included 293 (no change from the last round of assessment) camps and camp-like settings and 2,082 locations (down from 2,095 in last round of assessment) where IDPs were residing with host communities.

Map 5: IDPs distribution by state and major site type

Table 2: Main needs of IDPs by round of assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DTM Round</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Sanitation and Hygiene</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Water for washing and cooking</th>
<th>Drinking water</th>
<th>Medical services</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Aug 2019</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oct 2019</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collective settlements continued to be the most common type of sites with 59 per cent (no change from last round of assessment), followed by camps at 40 per cent. Ninety-five per cent of camps were described as spontaneous. The land ownership in camps and camp-like settings was classified as private (54%), followed by 45 per cent categorized as government or public buildings and 1 per cent as ancestral property.

On the other hand, the land ownership in sites where IDPs were residing with host communities was classified as private buildings followed by 9 per cent categorized as government or public buildings and 3 per cent as ancestral buildings.

Out of the 293 displacement sites (camps and camp-like settings) that were assessed, 79 per cent were located in Borno.

The state wise break up of IDP population is presented in the table below.

### Table 3: Change in IDP figures by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Sites %</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Sites %</th>
<th>Total IDPs</th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMAWA</td>
<td>14,982</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>189,717</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>204,699</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAUCHI</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63,120</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64,791</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORNO</td>
<td>799,512</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>697,359</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,496,871</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOMBE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>101,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARABA</td>
<td>28,085</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>73,096</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>134,511</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOBE</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>122,281</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>134,511</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>856,480</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,182,612</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,039,092</td>
<td>2,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2B: SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION**

IDP Population by Settlement Type

- **Camp/Camp-like settings:** 42%
- **Host Community:** 58%

Land ownership

- Ancestral: 4%
- Public/Government: 8%
- Private Building: 88%

Figure 9: IDP settlement type by state
2C: SECTOR ANALYSIS
CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT
In the Round 30 DTM assessment, out of the 293 camp and camp-like sites assessed, 86 per cent were informal (up from 84% in the last round of assessment) and remaining 14 per cent were formal.

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 38 per cent (up from 35% in last round of assessments) of sites, and self-made/makeshift shelters (31% - down from 35%). Other types were host family houses (11%), government buildings (8%), individual houses (8% and schools (3% down from 4%).

Host Communities
This round of assessments recorded 1,160,537 or 57 per cent of all IDPs living with host communities. Eighty-five per cent were living in a host family’s house (down from 89%), This is followed by individual houses in 11 per cent (up from 7%) and self-made/makeshift shelters in 3 per cent of sites.

NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIS)
Camps and camp-like settings
Blankets/mats continued to remain the most needed kind of non-food items (NFI) in camps and camp-like settings (50%).

Host Communities
In sites where IDPs were residing with host community, 87 per cent living in the house of the host and 11 per cent in individual houses. Only 1per cent were living in self-made or makeshift shelter.
WASH: WATER RESOURCES

Camp and camp-like settings:

Piped water was the main source of water in 68 per cent (an increase from 63%) of sites where IDPs are residing in camps and camp-like settings. In 20 per cent of sites (down from 22%), hand pumps were the main source of drinking water, followed by unprotected wells (8%) which is a worrying sign given that cholera is endemic in the region.

For more analysis, click here.

Host Communities

In contrast to camps and camp-like settings, hand pumps were the main source of water in 54 per cent (up from 53%) of sites where IDPs are residing with host communities. In 25 per cent of sites (up from 24%), piped water was the main source of drinking water, followed by protected wells (9% - no change from the last round of assessment) and unprotected wells (6% - down from 9%). Other common water sources include water trucks (5%) and surface water (1%).

For more analysis, click here.

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Camps and camp-like settings

In Round 30 assessments, access to food was on site in 39 per cent, down from 38 per cent in the last round of assessment published in November. Food was off-site in 43 per cent of sites (no change from last round of assessment). However, there were no food provisions in 17 per cent (down from 19%) of sites assessed.

For more analysis, click here.
Host Communities

Access to food was on-site in 57 per cent (down from 58%) of sites where IDPs were residing with host community. Twenty-two per cent (up from 21%) of sites had access to food off-site and 21 per cent had no access to food. Similarly, in Borno access to food was on-site in 50 per cent of sites.

For more analysis, click here.

HEALTH
Camps and camp-like settings Host communities

A high of 68 per cent of sites (up from 65%) cited malaria as the most common health problem in DTM Round 30 assessment. Fever was cited in 16 per cent of sites (down from 20%) and coughing in 12 per cent (no change from last round of assessment).

For more analysis, click here.

Host Communities

Mirroring the situation in displacement sites, malaria was most prevalent health ailment among IDPs residing with host community in 59 per cent of sites (significant decrease from 64% in the last round of assessment). The situation in Borno was worse with malaria cited as the most prevalent health issue in 60 per cent of sites.

For more analysis, click here.

EDUCATION
Camps and camp-like settings

Access to schools went back up to 100 per cent after it had dropped to 96 per cent in the last round of assessment that was published in November 2019. In corresponding percentage in Borno was also 100 per cent.

For more details, click here.

Host Communities:

In sites where IDPs were residing with host communities, access to education services was 100 per cent (up from 98% that was recorded in the last round of assessment).

For more details, click here.
COMMUNICATION
Camps and camp-like settings
Friends and neighbours were cited as the most-trusted source of information in 60 per cent of sites (down from 62% in the last round of assessment published in November). Local and community leaders were cited as the second most trusted source of information in 30 per cent of sites (up from 24%).

Host communities
In contrast to IDPs living in displacement camps, the majority of IDPs living with host communities engaged in farming. In a high of 63 per cent (down from 65%) of sites, IDPs engaged in farming.

LIVELIHOODS
Camps and camp-like settings
Petty trade was the main livelihood activity for displaced persons in 36 per cent (up by 1%), followed by farming (27%) and daily wage labourers (25%).

Host communities
Amongst the sites where IDPs lived with host communities, 89 per cent (no change since last round of assessment published in November 2019) had some form of security.
3. RETURNES

A total of 1,611,676 returnees were recorded in the DTM Round 30 assessment, a nominal increase of 7,334 persons from the 1,619,010 assessed during the last round of assessment that was published in November. This is the second consecutive reduction in number of returnees since round 28 assessment published in August 2019 after their numbers were constantly increasing.

Thirty-nine LGAs were assessed for returnees in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe during this round of assessment which is same as last year.

Within the total number returnees, 127,823 (or 8% of all returnees) were classified as return refugees as they travelled back from neighboring countries which is a negligible decrease since the last round of assessment when 130,672 return refugees were recorded from Cameroon (60,770 individuals), Chad (26,778 individuals) and Niger Republic (40,275 individuals).

Table: Change in returnee population by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>R29 Accessed LGA's</th>
<th>R30 Accessed LGA's</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>-1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>-11,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>5,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the total number returnees, 127,823 (or 8% of all returnees) were classified as return refugees as they travelled back from neighboring countries which is a negligible decrease since the last round of assessment when 130,672 return refugees were recorded from Cameroon (60,770 individuals), Chad (26,778 individuals) and Niger Republic (40,275 individuals).

3A: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT FOR RETURNES

Thirty-seven per cent of returnees (down from 44%) stated 2016 as their year of displacement. Thirty-two per cent of returnees said they were displaced in year 2016.
3B: REASONS FOR INITIAL DISPLACEMENT OF RETURNEES

Ninety-three per cent (up from 92%) attributed their displacement to the ongoing conflict in north-eastern Nigeria. 6 per cent (down by 1%) returnees said they were displaced due to communal clashes and 1 per cent due to natural disasters. Furthermore, 12% of returnees assessed in Adamawa were displaced due to communal clashes in the state.

3C: SHELTER CONDITIONS FOR RETURNEES

The number of returnees living in households with walls in Borno went up from 63 per cent in the last round of assessment to 81 per cent amongst all. Borno also had the highest damaged (31%) homes.

Ten per cent of returnees in Borno are living in emergency/makeshift shelters and 9 per cent living in traditional shelters.

3D: HEALTH FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Sixty-three per cent of areas of returns assessed do not have access to health services (a slight improvement on the 64% recorded in last round of assessment published in November). This figure is the highest for Adamawa at 57 per cent, followed by Borno at 30 per cent and Yobe at 13 per cent. In areas that do have access to health services, the most common type were government hospitals (19% - down from 21%) followed by general hospital (7%).

3E: EDUCATION FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Educational facilities were present in 51 per cent of locations with returnees. This figure was 56 per cent for Borno, 55 per cent in Yobe and 47 per cent in Adamawa.

3F: MARKET FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Twenty-six per cent of sites where returnees have settled had markets nearby (an increase from 25% in last round of assessment published in November 2019). Twenty-six per cent of markets were functional.
3G: PROFILE OF ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES
Out of 667 sites assessed, food support was the most common type of assistance provided, with 25 per cent (down from 33%) of sites reporting this kind of assistance. This was followed by NFIs in 21 per cent and WASH in 8 per cent of locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIs</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 39: Percentage of sites received by type of assistance

3H: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES
Communal boreholes were the most common Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) facilities available in areas of returns, at 29 per cent. The next most found WASH facility were hand pumps in 25 per cent (down by 1% since last round of assessment) of sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Dump</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Wells</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-WASH Facilities</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Pumps</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Boreholes</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 40: Percentage of sites by WASH facilities provided

3I: LIVELIHOOD FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES
The most common livelihood activity was farming and access to farmland was universal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMA WUA</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOBE</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR NO</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42: State-wise breakdown of farmers with access to farmland

Figure 43: Means of Livelihood

Figure 44: State-wise breakdown of farmers with access to farmland
**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 informants. 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
DTM Nigeria | Sectoral Analysis - Round 29 (November 2019)

SHELTER / NFI

Camp/Camp-like Settings

Community center: 1%
School: 3%
Individual house: 8%
Government building: 8%
Host family house: 11%
Self-made/makeshift shelter: 31%
Emergency shelter: 38%

Figure 11: Types of shelter

Tarpaulin: 8.2%
Timber/wood: 64.5%
Roofing sheets: 9.6%
Block/bricks: 3.1%
Nails: 3.8%
Rope: 0.3%
Thatches: 0.1%
Tools: 0.7%

Figure 11a: Most needed shelter materials

Yes: 91.8%
No: 8.2%

Figure 11b: Need for Shelter Materials

Yes: 99.66%
No: 0.34%

Figure 11c: Sites assemble by trucks for NFI Distribution

Host Communities

Community center: 0.0%
School: 0.1%
Government building: 0.2%
Health facility: 0.3%
Emergency shelter: 0.4%
Self-made/makeshift shelter: 1.1%
Individual house: 11.3%
Host family house: 86.5%

Figure 12: Types of shelter

Tarpaulin: 5.2%
Roofing sheets: 14.7%
Block/bricks: 17.1%
Rope: 1.1%
Nails: 0.3%
Thatches: 0.1%
Tools: 0.3%

Figure 12a: Most needed shelter materials

Yes: 85.25%
No: 14.75%

Figure 12b: Need for Shelter Materials

Yes: 98.75%
No: 1.25%

Figure 12c: Sites assemble by trucks for NFI Distribution

Emergency shelter: 86.5%
Self-made/makeshift shelter: 11.3%
Government building: 0.4%
Health facility: 0.3%
Individual house: 0.4%
Host family house: 0.3%
Religious Organization: 3.8%
Government: 4.6%
INGO: 23.8%
UN: 38.2%

Figure 11d: Most supporting Organization in Camps/Camp-like settings

No: 16.38%
Yes: 83.62%

Figure 11e: Most supporting Organization in Camp/Camp-like settings

No: 32.76%
Yes: 67.24%

Figure 11f: Most supporting Organization in Camp/Camp-like settings

No: 41.64%
Yes: 58.36%

Figure 11g: Most supporting Organization in Camp/Camp-like settings

Go back.
### Water Facilities

#### Camps/camp-like settings

- Lake: 0.34%
- Borehole/water well: 0.34%
- Surface water: 0.34%
- Protected well: 2.73%
- Water truck: 3.41%
- Hand pumps: 4.78%
- Piped water supply: 20.14%

#### Host Communities

- Borehole/water well: 0.1%
- Piped water supply: 0.3%
- Lake: 0.5%
- Surface water: 0.6%
- Spring: 0.6%
- Water truck: 5.0%
- Protected well: 5.9%
- Piped water supply: 24.8%
- Hand pumps: 53.6%

#### Figure 15: Main drinking water sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>ADAMAWA</th>
<th>BAUCHI</th>
<th>BORNO</th>
<th>TARABA</th>
<th>YOBE</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>92.49%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>67.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand Pumps</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 15a: Distance to main water sources

- On-site (<10 min): 66.6%
- Off-site (<10 min): 27.2%
- Off-site (>10 min): 6.2%

#### Figure 15b: Average amount of water available per person per day

- None: 92.49%
- Taste: 5.12%
- Suspended solids: 1.71%
- Odor/smell: 0.68%

#### Figure 15c: Main problem with water
- Taste: 92.49%
- Suspended solids: 3.36%
- Odor/smell: 1.30%

### WASH

Go back.
**Personal Hygiene Facilities**

**Camps/camp-like settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Good (Hygienic)</th>
<th>Non usable</th>
<th>Not so good (Not hygienic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>90.20%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>93.64%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>95.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>83.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Host Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Good (Hygienic)</th>
<th>Non usable</th>
<th>Not so good (Not hygienic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>59.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>40.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>64.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>35.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>54.59%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condition of toilets in Camps/Camp-like settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condition of toilets in Host Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>51.88%</td>
<td>48.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>69.50%</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>53.37%</td>
<td>46.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>48.51%</td>
<td>51.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>82.81%</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>74.59%</td>
<td>25.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targeted hygiene promotion/main garbage disposal mechanism in camps/camp-like settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Burning</th>
<th>No waste disposal system</th>
<th>Garbage pit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have Water Points been Improved in Camp and Camp-like settings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>95.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>92.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have Water Points been Improved in Host Communities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>64.48%</td>
<td>35.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>54.59%</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>53.77%</td>
<td>46.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targeted hygiene promotion/main garbage disposal mechanism in Host Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Burning</th>
<th>No waste disposal system</th>
<th>Garbage pit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Food / Nutrition

### Camps/camp-like settings

#### Figure 19: Access to food in Camps/Camp-like settings

- **ADAMAWA**: 38% Yes, on site, 33% Yes, off site, 29% No
- **BAUCHI**: 38% Yes, on site, 33% Yes, off site, 29% No
- **BORNO**: 38% Yes, on site, 33% Yes, off site, 29% No
- **TARABA**: 38% Yes, on site, 33% Yes, off site, 29% No
- **YOBE**: 38% Yes, on site, 33% Yes, off site, 29% No

#### Figure 19a: Frequency of food or cash distribution in Camps/Camp-like settings

- **ADAMAWA**: 54% Every 2 weeks, 33% Once a month, 4% Twice a week, 0% Never
- **BAUCHI**: 48% Every 2 weeks, 33% Once a month, 4% Twice a week, 0% Never
- **BORNO**: 54% Every 2 weeks, 33% Once a month, 4% Twice a week, 0% Never
- **TARABA**: 48% Every 2 weeks, 33% Once a month, 4% Twice a week, 0% Never
- **YOBE**: 54% Every 2 weeks, 33% Once a month, 4% Twice a week, 0% Never

#### Figure 19b: Most common source of obtaining food in Camps/Camp-like settings

- **Cash (personal money)**: 53% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 28% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Cultivated**: 44% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 29% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Distribution**: 43% ADAMAWA, 37% YOBE, 28% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Host community donation**: 44% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 29% TARABA, 0% YOBE

#### Figure 19c: Duration of last received food support in Camps/Camp-like settings

- **10-12 months**: 3.85% ADAMAWA, 2.46% BORNO, 4.95% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE
- **1-3 months**: 15.38% ADAMAWA, 26.56% BORNO, 78.22% TARABA, 50.00% YOBE
- **1 year and above**: 26.92% ADAMAWA, 9.17% BORNO, 50.00% TARABA, 5.56% YOBE
- **4-6 months**: 3.85% ADAMAWA, 9.17% BORNO, 44.44% TARABA, 44.44% YOBE
- **6-9 months**: 11.54% ADAMAWA, 11.79% BORNO, 0.00% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE
- **Never received Support**: 38.46% ADAMAWA, 15.28% BORNO, 0.00% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE

### Host Communities

#### Figure 20: Access to food in Host Communities

- **ADAMAWA**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No
- **BAUCHI**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No
- **BORNO**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No
- **GOMBE**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No
- **TARABA**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No
- **YOBE**: 48% Yes, on site, 48% Yes, off site, 4% No

#### Figure 20a: Frequency of food or cash distribution in Host Communities

- **ADAMAWA**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never
- **BAUCHI**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never
- **BORNO**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never
- **GOMBE**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never
- **TARABA**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never
- **YOBE**: 57% Every 2 weeks, 17% Once a month, 5% Twice a week, 1% Never

#### Figure 20b: Most common source of obtaining food in Host Communities

- **Cash (personal money)**: 53% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 28% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Cultivated**: 44% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 29% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Distribution**: 43% ADAMAWA, 37% YOBE, 28% TARABA, 0% YOBE
- **Host community donation**: 44% ADAMAWA, 38% YOBE, 29% TARABA, 0% YOBE

#### Figure 20c: Duration of last received food support in Host Communities

- **10-12 months**: 3.85% ADAMAWA, 2.46% BORNO, 4.95% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE
- **1-3 months**: 15.38% ADAMAWA, 26.56% BORNO, 78.22% TARABA, 50.00% YOBE
- **1 year and above**: 26.92% ADAMAWA, 9.17% BORNO, 50.00% TARABA, 5.56% YOBE
- **4-6 months**: 3.85% ADAMAWA, 9.17% BORNO, 44.44% TARABA, 44.44% YOBE
- **6-9 months**: 11.54% ADAMAWA, 11.79% BORNO, 0.00% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE
- **Never received Support**: 38.46% ADAMAWA, 15.28% BORNO, 0.00% TARABA, 0.00% YOBE

---

Go back.
Figure 23: Access to formal/informal education services in Camps/Camp-like settings

- On-site: ADAMAWA = 57.7%, BAUCHI = 50.0%, BORNO = 50.0%, TARABA = 50.0%, YOBE = 50.0%
- Off-site: ADAMAWA = 42.3%, BAUCHI = 50.0%, BORNO = 50.0%, TARABA = 50.0%, YOBE = 50.0%
- None: ADAMAWA = 0.44%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%

Figure 24: Access to formal/informal education services in Host Communities

- On-site: ADAMAWA = 78.85%, BAUCHI = 88.38%, BORNO = 88.84%, GOMBE = 91.58%, TARABA = 40.38%, YOBE = 89.00%
- Off-site: ADAMAWA = 20.70%, BAUCHI = 11.62%, BORNO = 11.16%, GOMBE = 8.43%, TARABA = 100.0%, YOBE = 100.0%
- None: ADAMAWA = 0.4%, BAUCHI = 0.3%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.48%, YOBE = 0.50%

Figure 23a: Location of formal/informal education facilities in Camps/Camp-like settings

- On-site: ADAMAWA = 57.7%, BAUCHI = 50.0%, BORNO = 50.0%, TARABA = 50.0%, YOBE = 50.0%
- Off-site: ADAMAWA = 42.3%, BAUCHI = 50.0%, BORNO = 50.0%, TARABA = 50.0%, YOBE = 50.0%
- None: ADAMAWA = 0.44%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%

Figure 24a: Location of formal/informal education facilities in Host Communities

- On-site: ADAMAWA = 78.85%, BAUCHI = 88.38%, BORNO = 88.84%, GOMBE = 91.58%, TARABA = 91.56%, YOBE = 40.38%
- Off-site: ADAMAWA = 20.70%, BAUCHI = 11.62%, BORNO = 11.16%, GOMBE = 8.42%, TARABA = 100.0%, YOBE = 100.0%
- None: ADAMAWA = 0.44%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.48%, YOBE = 0.50%

Figure 23b: Percentage of children attending school in Camps/Camp-like settings

- <1 km: ADAMAWA = 57.68%, BAUCHI = 50.50%, BORNO = 77.73%, TARABA = 50.00%, YOBE = 50.00%
- >1 km: ADAMAWA = 19.23%, BAUCHI = 33.33%, BORNO = 16.16%, TARABA = 25.00%, YOBE = 35.33%
- >2 km: ADAMAWA = 23.08%, BAUCHI = 16.67%, BORNO = 5.24%, TARABA = 7.14%, YOBE = 16.67%
- >5 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.44%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%
- Unknown: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.44%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%

Figure 24b: Percentage of children attending school in Host Communities

- <1 km: ADAMAWA = 52.23%, BAUCHI = 64.86%, BORNO = 78.02%, GOMBE = 84.65%, TARABA = 38.94%, YOBE = 75.92%
- >1 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%
- >2 km: ADAMAWA = 41.19%, BAUCHI = 33.24%, BORNO = 17.66%, GOMBE = 7.43%, TARABA = 43.75%, YOBE = 17.75%
- >5 km: ADAMAWA = 6.17%, BAUCHI = 1.89%, BORNO = 2.90%, GOMBE = 7.92%, TARABA = 10.10%, YOBE = 6.00%
- >7 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 4.33%, YOBE = 0.00%
- Unknown: ADAMAWA = 0.44%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.48%, YOBE = 0.50%

Figure 23c: Distance to nearest education facilities in Camps/Camp-like settings

- <1 km: ADAMAWA = 57.68%, BAUCHI = 50.50%, BORNO = 77.73%, TARABA = 50.00%, YOBE = 50.00%
- >1 km: ADAMAWA = 19.23%, BAUCHI = 33.33%, BORNO = 16.16%, TARABA = 25.00%, YOBE = 35.33%
- >2 km: ADAMAWA = 23.08%, BAUCHI = 16.67%, BORNO = 5.24%, TARABA = 7.14%, YOBE = 16.67%
- >5 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.44%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%
- Unknown: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.44%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%

Figure 24c: Distance to nearest education facilities in Host Communities

- <1 km: ADAMAWA = 52.23%, BAUCHI = 64.86%, BORNO = 78.02%, GOMBE = 84.65%, TARABA = 38.94%, YOBE = 75.92%
- >1 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.00%, YOBE = 0.00%
- >2 km: ADAMAWA = 41.19%, BAUCHI = 33.24%, BORNO = 17.66%, GOMBE = 7.43%, TARABA = 43.75%, YOBE = 17.75%
- >5 km: ADAMAWA = 6.17%, BAUCHI = 1.89%, BORNO = 2.90%, GOMBE = 7.92%, TARABA = 10.10%, YOBE = 6.00%
- >7 km: ADAMAWA = 0.00%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 4.33%, YOBE = 0.00%
- Unknown: ADAMAWA = 0.44%, BAUCHI = 0.00%, BORNO = 0.00%, GOMBE = 0.00%, TARABA = 0.48%, YOBE = 0.50%
**Figure 25a: Most trusted source of information for IDPs**

- Friends, neighbors and family: 90%
- Local leader/Community leader: 3%
- Religious leader: 2%
- Aid worker: 1%
- Government official: 1%
- Military official: 1%
- Traditional Leader: 3%

**Figure 25b: Access to functioning radio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>How to get information</th>
<th>How to contact aid providers</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Situation in areas of origin</th>
<th>Other relief assistance</th>
<th>Access to services</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 25c: Type of Information willing to share with Aid Organizations**

- Feedback (positive or negative) about the services in the site: 62.86%
- Information about your experience: 15.88%
- Information about needs in the community: 19.88%
- Almost all: 3%
- Few: 10%
- Most: 86%
- None: 2%

**Figure 25d: Most Preferred channel of communication in Camps/Camp-like settings**

- Radio: 62.86%
- Word of Mouth: 25.46%
- Telephone voice call: 6.48%
- Community meetings: 4.44%
- Loudspeakers: 0.34%
- Newspaper/magazine: 0.34%

**Figure 26a: Most important topic for IDPs**

- Distribution: 49.5%
- Access to services: 20.1%
- Other relief assistance: 11.3%
- Safety and Security: 9.9%
- Situation in areas of origin: 6.5%
- Registration: 1.4%
- How to get information: 0.7%
- How to contact aid providers: 0.3%
- Shelter: 0.3%

**Figure 26b: Access to functioning radio**

- Radio: 88.71%
- Telephone voice call: 72.77%
- Community meetings: 5.72%
- Loudspeakers: 20.1%
- Word of Mouth: 1.63%
- Feedback (positive or negative) about the services in the site: 0.05%
- Information about needs in the community: 0.34%
- Information about your experience: 0.34%

**Figure 26c: Type of Information willing to share with Aid Organizations**

- Almost all: 2%
- Few: 86%
- Most: 10%
- None: 3%

**Figure 26d: Most Preferred channel of communication in Host Communities**

- Radio: 55.19%
- Word of Mouth: 29.30%
- Telephone voice call: 10.42%
- Community meetings: 4.23%
- Loudspeakers: 0.77%
- TV: 0.14%
- SMS messages: 0.06%
### LIVELIHOOD

#### Camps/camp-like settings

- Fishing: 0.3%
- Pastoralism: 1.0%
- Collecting firewood: 3.1%
- Agro-pastoralism: 7.5%
- Daily labourer: 24.6%
- Farming: 27.8%
- Petty trade: 36.5%

#### Host Communities

- Collecting firewood: 6.7%
- Pastoralism: 1.56%
- Fishing: 1.39%
- Agro-pastoralism: 6.15%
- Petty trade: 12.34%
- Daily labourer: 14.84%
- Farming: 63.26%

---

**Figure 27**: Livelihood activities of IDPs

- Farms: 44%

**Figure 27a**: Access to Land for Cultivation

- Yes: 94%

**Figure 27b**: Livestock on site

- Yes: 95%

**Figure 27c**: Sites with access to income generating activities

- Yes: 98%

---

**Figure 28**: Livelihood activities of IDPs

- Farms: 11%

**Figure 28a**: Access to Land for Cultivation

- Yes: 95%

**Figure 28b**: Livestock on site

- Yes: 98%

**Figure 28c**: Sites with access to income generating activities

- Yes: 98%

---

*Go back.*
**PROTECTION**

### Camps/camp-like settings

**Figure 29:** Security provided on-site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 29a:** Main security providers

- Religious Leaders: 1.4%
- Community Leaders: 1.4%
- Local Authorities: 4.4%
- Police: 8.2%
- None: 13.0%
- Military: 18.8%
- Self organized: 52.9%

**Figure 29b:** Most common type of security incidents

- Armed conflict: 0.34%
- Alcohol/drug-related disturbance: 0.34%
- Friction with host community: 0.68%
- Friction among site residents: 3.75%
- Theft: 4.44%
- None: 90.44%

### Host Communities

**Figure 30:** Security provided on-site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 30a:** Main security providers

- Political Leaders: 0.0%
- Religious Leaders: 0.2%
- Military: 10.9%
- None: 11.5%
- Community Leaders: 14.0%
- Police: 19.4%
- Self organized: 19.5%
- Local Authorities: 24.4%

**Figure 30b:** Most common type of security incidents

- Armed conflict: 0.22%
- Alcohol/drug-related disturbance: 1.39%
- Friction with host community: 2.39%
- Friction among site residents: 3.12%
- Crime: 3.65%
- Theft: 14.41%
- None: 74.11%