JOINT MISSION TO HARD –TO-REACH AREA IN BORNO STATE (BAMA CASE STUDY)

BRIEF PRESENTATION TO THE FOOD SECURITY SECTOR IN ABUJA
21ST FEBRUARY, 2019
Mission Rationale

• Population estimation challenges during the Cadre Harmonise;

• Over 820,000 reported to trapped in hard-to-reach areas (OCHA, 2018);

• Severity of food security & nutrition situation in such areas unknown;

• Alarming number of children reported in UNICEF’s rapid SMART survey of new arrivals; and

• Some newly arrived people left their previous place of abode due to poor living conditions (IOM, 2018).
Mission Objectives

- To gain insights into the food security, nutrition, WASH and livelihoods situation of inaccessible areas around Bama LGA

- To make evidence-based recommendations on ways to improve the analysis and estimation of the population currently trapped in inaccessible areas during the next rounds of CH analysis.

Team Composition

NPFS, WFP, FAO, FEWSNET, NIMET
Strategy/Approach

- Met with representatives of the **FSS, SEMA, IOM** and **REACH International** in Maiduguri on 16\textsuperscript{th} January 2019; and

- Outcomes of meeting informed a more detailed workplan for the assessment and areas of support to leverage from these key partners (**field staff, approval letters, tool revision etc.**)

- Assessment date in Bama IDP camp – 18\textsuperscript{th} January 2019;

- **KII**s conducted with staff of IOM to obtain more information on new arrivals from inaccessible areas;

- **5 FGDs held** with **male & female new arrived groups** from inaccessible areas (**0 – 3 months**);

- FGDs co-moderated by experienced IOM enumerators (**fluent in Hausa & Kanuri**)
Major Findings

- Total Population of Bama IDP camp: **30,618 IDPs** (9,125 households) as at assessment date

- Total Population of **216 new arrivals** (71 households) received between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 7\textsuperscript{th} January 2019

### Inaccessible Villages/Communities of interviewed new arrivals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jiwa, Chongolo, Bulakuri, Sabilwuda (<a href="#">Sambisa axis</a>)</td>
<td>Daraja, Kaları Balgeri</td>
<td>Jiwa, Kulbawi Tufa</td>
<td>Abaram</td>
<td>Bulakare Suraja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Major Findings Cont’d – Demographics'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of escape</strong></td>
<td>Forced escape, sneaked out of captivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance of inaccessible village/community to Bama IDP camp</strong></td>
<td>15km to 120km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of transport between community &amp; Bama</strong></td>
<td>Trekked, bicycle, military trucks on major roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of travel</strong></td>
<td>1 to 8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items arrived with</strong></td>
<td>Few clothing's &amp; drinking water, cooking utensils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whereas some arrived with nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of years trapped</strong></td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of individuals still trapped as @ time of escape &amp; tribe</strong></td>
<td>12 to 300 people, over 5,000+ people in Sabilwuda &amp; most are locals with few non-indigenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender distribution of individuals trapped</strong></td>
<td>Mostly women &amp; children, as most men had escaped and some are dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Findings Cont’d – Food Security & Livelihoods

- **Food Source**: Own production, wild fruits, leaves and vegetables
- **Consumption pattern**: Average of 1 meal per day except for Sabilwuda (near Sambisa) where people sometimes go for 1 – 5 days without food.
- **Access to farmland**: Uninhibited access to farmland. However, insurgents often steal farm produce, hence, farmers do not have full access to their produce.
- **Crops Cultivated**: *Limited* to Sorghum, cowpea, millet, okra and groundnut
- **Coping Strategies**: Consumption of less preferred meals, picking of fruits/vegetables and begging
- **Major livelihoods and income sources**: Farming (*some areas*), unconventional trading of produce (including *trade by barter/casual farm labour for food*)
- **Livelihood evolution**: Complaints of depleted assets, limited own production from farming, limited or no trade due to non-functional markets, no jobs/employment.
- **Inter-community movement**: Restricted inter-community movement reported in some areas
### Basic Services

- **Markets:** Non-functional, although respondents did mention existence of a few middle men in some communities that come to collect produce for sale (*black market system*)
- **Health Facilities:** Non-functional, use of traditional herbs to mitigate in the phase of illnesses.
- **Schools:** No schools.

### WASH

- **Drinking Water:** Locally dug wells without cover and rivers/streams
- **Latrine:** Pit latrines inside the households/within the community and open defecation (bush) few meters from community for security/safety.
Major Findings Cont’d – Current Situation in Bama IDP Camp

- **Security**: New arrivals felt secured in the IDP camp.
- **General living condition**: Reported to be better when compared to period in captivity.
- **Enrollment/Integration in Camp**: Most interviewees were newly arrived (1-3 days in the camp), hence were yet to be registered biometrically by IOM/SEMA. *Some however got temporary food items from relatives in camp.*
- **Conflict with existing camp members/Protection**: No conflicts/tension reported but with the caveat of being new at the time of assessment.
- **Intention to return to place of origin/communities**: Not willing to return unless peace and normalcy is restored.
- **Immediate needs**: Food, clothing, shelter, NFIs, energy (firewood).
Conclusions – What is the food and nutrition security situation in hard-to-reach/inaccessible areas?

• Findings from the assessment confirm that pockets of people are indeed trapped in some hard-to-reach/inaccessible communities with higher concentration around the swathes of Sambisa axis, however, the scale of habitation could not be ascertained.

• Though quite limited and extremely restricted, some level of livelihood activities, particularly farming are ongoing in some of these areas.

• Food security situation may not be critical, albeit dietary diversity would be quite limited, due to heavy reliance the few varieties of own produced food commodities, trade restrictions and non-functionality of markets.

• Nutrition situation of people in hard-to-reach/inaccessible areas could be severely critical given the complete breakdown of basic services (particularly health) and WASH challenges (open dug wells, open defecation), all of which has implication for nutrition (sicknesses/illness).

• Findings has more implication for nutrition due to challenges regarding food utilization, which would be likely exacerbated during the lean period/rainy season due upsurge of water borne/related diseases (malaria, diarrhea etc.).
Recommendations – What are the implications for the Cadre Harmonise Analysis?

- Phase classification and estimation of affected population experiencing food and nutrition insecurity should take into account proportion of population trapped in these hard-to-reach/inaccessible areas vis-à-vis the total population in the LGA.

- Analysis should adequately take into consideration, the food security and nutritional condition, with more emphasis on nutrition, in these hard-to-reach/inaccessible areas (current & projected periods), using proxy measures such as the findings from this assessment and similar studies.

- Scale up similar initiatives and consult with partners (e.g. IOM, REACH International etc.) further to explore possibilities to mainstream analytical approach into existing systems as seen in the case of UNICEF/IOM’s ETT.

Special appreciation to the FSS Coordination team, SEMA, IOM and REACH International for their support towards the success of this assessment.
Thank you!