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**KEY FINDINGS**

**ROUND 24**

**IDPs**

- **172,541**
  - Total number of IDPs in Libya
- **93%**
  - Were displaced due to the deterioration of the security situation
- **68%**
  - Of IDPs live in self-paid rented accommodation

**RETURNEEs**

- **445,476**
  - Total number of returnees in Libya
- **83%**
  - Of returnees live in their previous homes

**LOCATIONS**

- **TOP 3 BALADIYAS OF DISPLACEMENT**
  - Benghazi: 16%
  - Sebha: 12%
  - Misrata: 8%

- **TOP 3 BALADIYAS OF RETURN**
  - Benghazi: 42%
  - Sirt: 17%
  - Tripoli: 9%

**COVERAGE**

- **2,116**
  - Key informants interviewed in 100 of 100 municipalities
This report presents the findings of round 24 of the mobility tracking component of the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in Libya, covering the reporting period January to February 2019.

In Round 24, the number of identified returnees in Libya remained stable at 445,476 individuals. At the same time, the number of identified IDPs in Libya was 172,541. The top three municipalities (Baladiya) of displacement were identified as Benghazi, Sebha, and Misrata, whereas the highest number of previously displaced households had returned to Benghazi, Sirt, and Tripoli.

During the last week of February, a rapid assessment was conducted in Murzuq following the deterioration of the security situation in the South. Between 22 and 24 February, 200 families were reported to have been displaced from Murzuq to Al Qatrun. Subsequently, as the security situation improved 120 of the previously displaced families reportedly returned by the beginning of March. The report which includes the findings of rapid needs assessment in Murzuq can be found here: [http://www.globaldtm.info/libya-murzuq-alert-snapshot-2-3-march-2019/](http://www.globaldtm.info/libya-murzuq-alert-snapshot-2-3-march-2019/)

In terms of reported needs, the top three priority needs of IDPs reported during round 24 were shelter, food assistance, and health services, whereas key priority needs for returnees were reported to be food, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), and Non-Food Items (NFIs). As in previous rounds, several challenges related to access to services were reported, most notably the limited availability of medicine and health services were an issue in many locations. For more details please refer to the sector specific sections of this report starting on page 13.
IDP AND RETURNEE PROFILES

KEY CHANGES IN DTM ROUND 24

260 NEW RETURNEE HOUSEHOLDS REPORTED IN SIDI ASSAYEH IN R24

NUMBER OF IDPS REPORTED IN GARABOLLI INCREASED BY 182 HOUSEHOLDS

NUMBER OF IDPS REPORTED IN TARHUNA INCREASED BY 110 HOUSEHOLDS

NUMBER OF IDPS REPORTED IN ALBAYDA REDUCED TO 310 HOUSEHOLDS (-33% FROM R23)

Fig. 2 Key changes observed during round 24 shown on map
DISPLACEMENT FROM MURZUQ

In February 2019, 200 families were reported to have been displaced from Murzuq to Al Qatrun between 22 and 24 February. As the security situation gradually stabilized in Murzuq and surrounding areas during the following week, around 120 previously displaced families were reported to have returned back to their homes in Murzuq.

A needs and area assessment was conducted in Murzuq at the end of Round 24, and the snapshot report is available on DTM’s website at [http://www.globaldtm.info/libya-murzuq-alert-snapshot-2-3-march-2019/](http://www.globaldtm.info/libya-murzuq-alert-snapshot-2-3-march-2019/)

PRIORITY NEEDS

Reported priority needs of the returnee families include food items (such as cooking fuel, baby milk), non-food items (such as diapers and hygiene kits) and medical supplies. Furthermore, at least 60 families within Murzuq’s host population were reported to be affected due to damage to their houses.

Fig. 3 Displacement and Return movements to Murzuq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Incident</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Non-Food Items</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPLACEMENT FROM MURZUQ

MARKETS

As part of the area and needs assessment a market assessment was also conducted. Most local markets were reported to be open in Murzuq as of 01 March, however several constraints related to availability and affordability of commodities were identified. Similarly, most bakeries in Murzuq were reported to be closed during the last week of February; however, following the stabilization of the security situation the bakeries had subsequently re-opened. The reported price per loaf of bread was 0.3 LYD. A similar pattern was observed for other key food commodities, such as rice, pasta, beans, couscous, tuna, milk, tomatoes and vegetable oil which were largely unavailable in the last week of February. The summary of the rest of the findings is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Utensils</td>
<td>Full availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses</td>
<td>Some availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Some availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>Some availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity Kits</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene Kits</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diapers</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Fuel</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Lamp</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASH**: Water was partially reported available, with some neighborhoods reporting water shortages. No sanitation services were reported to be available, and limited cleaning services were reported.

**Infrastructure**: Electricity and telecommunication services were reported to be available intermittently.

**Education**: Most schools were reported to be open and operational.

**Health**: Limited health services were reported to be available.

**Access**: Roads to Murzuq were reported to be accessible and open.

Fig. 4 Availability of NFI Items in the Local Market in Murzuq (1 March 2019 snapshot)
In round 24, a large proportion (42%) of IDPs were identified in the west of Libya, followed by 31% in the East and 27% identified in the South Libya. The highest figure reported for the presence of IDPs was in Benghazi (26,865 individuals) followed by Sebha (21,005 individuals).

In terms of IDPs returning to their places of origin, the majority (51%) of returning IDPs (returnees) were identified in the East Libya, followed by 42% in the west while the remaining 7% were identified to have returned to their places of origin in the South. Benghazi had the highest number of returnees (189,175 individuals), followed by Sirt with 77,210 individuals identified as returnees. The ten municipalities with the highest number of returnees are shown in figure 6.
LOCATIONS OF DISPLACEMENT AND RETURN (MAP I)

Fig. 7 Map of IDP and Returnee Locations
The comparison of municipality of origin and municipality of displacement indicates that in many cases a substantial share of IDPs did not move far away from their areas of origin. For instance, in the case of Benghazi, at least 22,635 IDPs were reported to originate from Benghazi and surrounding areas. Similarly, in Sirt 1,200 IDPs (14% of Sirt’s IDP population) were displaced within the same municipality.
The overwhelming majority of key informants (93%) reported that IDPs present in their localities had left their respective places of origin due to security related issues.

To a significantly lesser extent various other reasons were cited, such as deterioration of the economic situation at the places of origin and inavailability of basic services.

Similarly, when asked about the reasons for IDPs’ presence at their respective current locations, most key informants (75%) reported that better security conditions in their localities was the major reason for the IDPs’ decision to move there. This was followed by a large proportion of key informants (54%) reporting that IDPs chose these localities due to the presence of IDP relatives, signifying social and cultural bonds and the possibility of social safety nets. This was followed by availability of basic services as reason for choosing those communities (35%), and access to humanitarian assistance (30%).

Overall, the major driver of displacement was identified to be related to the security situation, playing a role in both the decision to leave the place of origin and for choosing the site of displacement.
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Round 24 data indicated that children (0-17) accounted for 49% of the IDP population, while 41% were adults (18-59 years), and 9% were older adults (aged 60 years and above). Across all age categories males made up 47% of the sampled population and females accounted for 53%.

**Fig. 11 Gender disaggregation of sampled IDPs**

**Fig. 12 Age disaggregation of sampled IDPs**
NEEDS OF IDPS AND RETURNEES

IDPs’ Priority Needs Identified

- Shelter (29%)
- Food (23%)
- Health services (17%)
- NFIs (13%)
- Access to income (7%)
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (7%)
- Education (3%)
- Security (1%)

Returnees’ Priority Needs Identified

- Food (20%)
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (19%)
- NFIs (18%)
- Health services (17%)
- Education (11%)
- Security (10%)
- Shelter (4%)
- Access to income (0.1%)

Fig. 13 IDP’s priority need comparison

Fig. 14 Returnees’ priority needs comparison

The top three priority needs identified for IDPs’ were:
- Shelter (23,400 households’ priority need);
- Food (120,000 individuals’ priority);
- Health Services (99,000 individuals’ priority need).

The top three priority needs identified for returnees’ were:
- Food (about 242,000 individuals’ priority need);
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (about 240,00) and;
- Non-Food Items (about 289,000 individuals’ priority need).

Priority needs were identified by calculating weighted averages based on affected population in the assessed locality and rank scores assigned to each priority need by KIs. The graphs in Figure 13 and 14 show relative percentages of the calculated weighted averages for comparison.
68% of all IDPs identified in Libya were reported to be residing in private rented accommodation, while 8% were taking shelter at informal camp-like settings and 7% were residing with host families. A smaller proportion of IDPs identified was also taking shelter in public buildings such as schools (5%), abandoned buildings (3%), staying on other people’s property (1%), other undetermined shelter settings (5%) and some were even reported to have no accommodation or shelter (1%).

With regards to returnees, the overwhelming majority (83%) was reported to be back in their own houses at their places of origin. The rest were renting accommodation in their places of origin (8%), living with host families (7%), or in various other kinds of shelter settings (2%).

Please refer to page 16 for the geographical distribution of IDPs in public and private shelter settings by region and to page 17 for the returnees’ shelter settings in different parts of Libya.
Fig. 18  Map showing public shelter settings used by IDPs

Shelter Type

- Abandoned Buildings
- Squatting on other people’s properties (farms, flats, houses)
- Schools or Other public buildings
- Informal settings (e.g. tents, caravans, makeshift shelters)
- No Accommodation

SHELTER SETTINGS MAP: IDP

LIBYA IDP REPORT
JAN - FEB 2019
Fig. 19 Map showing shelter settings used by Returnees
EDUCATION

Out of the 100 municipalities covered in Round 24, key informants in 91 municipalities reported that between 80% and 100% of public schools in their municipalities were operational. Similarly, 80% to 100% of private schools were reportedly operational in 74 municipalities.

In six municipalities between 61% and 80% of private schools were reported to be operational, while key informants in three municipalities reported that only 41% to 60% of private schools were operational. Please refer to the chart at the bottom of this page for more detailed breakdowns.

With regards to the schools’ operational conditions, 198 schools were reported to be partially damaged, whereas 46 schools were reported to be fully destroyed.

In addition, 25 schools were reported to be used as shelters for the internally displaced persons.
FOOD

In terms of data collected on access to food, key informants in 99 municipalities reported that IDPs, returnees and other residents of the host communities in these municipalities purchased food from the local market. In 25 municipalities food distributions conducted by charity and aid organizations were also identified as major source of food supply.

![Fig. 22 Primary source of food for residents by number of municipalities](image1)

The primary modalities of payment used for purchasing food items were identified to be cash based payments and the use of ATM / debit cards while in nearly half of the municipalities (46%) people relied on purchasing food on credit.

![Fig. 23 Main problems related to food supply](image2)

The most significant problem in terms of access to food supplies was identified as food being too expensive, as reported in 93% of the surveyed municipalities.

![Fig. 24 Main modalities of payment used for purchasing food by number of municipalities](image3)
**HEALTH**

Across Libya, 55% of all hospitals were reported to be operational, while 37% were reported to be only partially operational and 7% were reported not to be operational at all.

Notably, in 11 municipalities there were no operational hospitals available whereas several municipalities did not have operational public health centers / clinics.

Regular access to medicine was reported in only 3% of assessed municipalities, while in 94% of the municipalities access to medical supplies was reported to be irregular.

![Fig. 25 Regular Access to Medicines (% Municipalities)](image)

![Fig. 26 Availability and status of health facilities across 100 municipalities of Libya](image)
**NFIS AND ACCESS TO MARKETS**

Data was also collected on humanitarian priority needs related to non-food items (NFIs). Notably, mattresses emerged as the most commonly cited NFI need and were reported to be needed in 68 municipalities, followed by clothes in 56 municipalities, hygiene items in 41 municipalities and portable lights was chosen as priority need in 29 municipalities.

![Bar chart: Items prioritized as part of NFI needs per locality](image)

In terms of challenges faced in access to non-food items, the most commonly cited obstacle was that the non-food items were too expensive for those in need. In addition, key informants in 23 municipalities also highlighted that inadequate quality of NFIs was an issue. In five municipalities, key informants reported that distance to the local market was the main challenge, whereas in three municipalities no problems or challenges in accessing NFIs were reported.

![Bar chart: Main challenges faced in obtaining NFI items](image)
SECURITY

As part of the baseline assessment, security related indicators were collected in all municipalities. The aim was to understand the challenges faced by residents in being able to move safely within their municipalities, the reasons hindering such safe movement (where applicable), and awareness of the presence of unexploded ordnances (UXOs).

Possible presence of UXOs was reported in 10 municipalities, while the remaining 90 municipalities reported no presence of UXOs. Residents were reported as not being able to move safely within their municipalities in 17 municipalities.

In municipalities where movement was reported to be unsafe the main reason cited was insecurity (11 municipalities) followed by roads closure (2 municipalities), and threat/presence of unexploded ordnances (1 municipality).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Reason for Restricted Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ejkherra</td>
<td>Road closed/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marada</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghat</td>
<td>Road closed/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alqatroun</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsharguiya</td>
<td>Reason not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murzuq</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraghin</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebha</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubari</td>
<td>Reason not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azzahra</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasr Akhyar</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janoub Azzawya</td>
<td>Threat/presence of explosive hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zliten</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suq Aljumaa</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aljmail</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziltun</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 29 Is there visible presence of unexploded ordinance? (% of municipalities)

Fig. 30 Are people able to safely move around? (% of municipalities)

Fig. 31 Table of the municipalities and the reported reasons that restrict the movement of residents there.
WASH AND PUBLIC SERVICES

In terms of the availability of public services, garbage disposal and electricity were the two most cited public services available across Libya, although electricity often only intermittently. Out of the hundred assessed municipalities, in 58 municipalities garbage disposal was reported to be available, whereas regular availability of electricity was reported in 49 municipalities.

In 49 municipalities water supply networks were reported to be present and operational. In only 7 municipalities fully functional sewage treatment services were reported while in just 7 municipalities regular public infrastructure maintenance services were reported to be happening.

---

**Fig. 32 Public services available at the municipalities**

- Garbage Disposal: 58 municipalities
- Water Network: 49 municipalities
- Electricity: 49 municipalities
- Sewage Treatment: 7 municipalities
- Infrastructure Repair: 7 municipalities

**Fig. 33 Main sources of water supplying to the municipalities**

- Water Trucking: 56
- Water Network: 46
- Open well: 38
- Water Bottles: 37
- Springs or river: 6
- Other water source: 4

**Fig. 34 Main problems associated with access to potable water**

- Too expensive: 64
- Not safe for drinking or cooking: 32
- No problem: 18
- Other problem: 8
- Security reasons: 1

---
The data in this report is collected through DTM’s Mobility Tracking module. Mobility Tracking gathers data through key informants at both the municipality and community level on a bi-monthly data collection cycle. The full description of the Mobility Tracking methodology is available on the DTM Libya website.

In Round 24 DTM assessed all 100 municipalities. 2,116 Key Informant interviews were conducted during this round. 368 Key Informants were interviewed at the municipality level, and 1,748 at the community level. 32% of those interviewed were representatives from divisions within the municipality offices (social affairs, muhalla affairs, etc.), 11% were representatives from civil society organizations and 10% were education facility representatives. Of the 2,116 KIs interviewed 6% were female and 94% were male.

**ENUMERATORS**

- **55 enumerators**
- **3 team leaders**
- **5 Implementing partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No Of KIs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other representation from baladiya office (Soci)</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of education facilities</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of Health facilities</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / tribal representative</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Crisis Committee Representative</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of displaced groups</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian NFI distribution team</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant community leaders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian HEALTH team</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant networks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DATA CREDIBILITY**

47% of data collected was rated as “very credible” during the round 24, whereas 37% was rated “mostly credible” while 15% as “somewhat credible”. This rating is based on the consistency of data provided by the Key Informants, on their sources of data, and on whether data provided is in line with general perceptions.

![Data Credibility Graph]

Disclaimer: The content of this report is based on the evidence collected during the survey. Thus, the reported findings and conclusions represent the views and opinions of the surveyed key informants, for which DTM cannot be held responsible.
Funded by the European Union the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in Libya tracks and monitors population movements in order to collate, analyze and share information packages on Libya’s populations on the move. DTM is designed to support the humanitarian community with demographic baselines needed to coordinate evidence-based interventions. DTM’s Flow Monitoring and Mobility Tracking package includes analytical reports, datasets, maps, interactive dashboards and websites on the numbers, demographics, locations of origin, displacement and movement patterns, and primary needs of mobile populations. For all DTM reports, datasets, static and interactive maps and interactive dashboard please visit www.globaldtm.info.libya/