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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report of the Round 28 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 1 July to 16 July 2019 and reflects trends from the six most affected north-eastern states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.

Over the Round 28 reporting period, a nominal increase in numbers of internally displaced people (IDPs) was observed but hostilities and increased insecurities continued to restrict coverage of DTM assessments – in line with the previous round of assessment that were published in May 2019. In all, 2,018,513 individuals were recorded as being displaced in the affected states in Round 28, an increase of 2 per cent or 38,477 as against 1,980,036 IDPs that were recorded in Round 27. In addition to the ongoing conflict, communal clashes also played a part in increased population mobility.

The figure is almost at par with the number of displaced persons recorded in Round 25, which was carried out before the onset of the current escalation of violence in October 2018, when a significantly higher number of Local Government Areas (LGAs) and wards were accessible. In DTM Round 25 assessment, 2,026,602 people were recorded as IDPs.

To gain insights into the profiles of IDPs, interviews were conducted with 4 per cent of the identified IDP population — that is, 87,875 displaced persons — during this round of assessments. The information collated and analysed in this report includes the reasons for displacement, places of origin and dwelling types, mobility patterns, and unfulfilled needs of the displaced populations.

Additionally, site assessments were carried out in 2,385 sites – nominally more than the 2,383 sites that were accessed in the last round of assessment that was published in May for gaining a better understanding the needs of the affected population. These sites included 294 (281 in last round) camps and camp-like settings and 2,091 (down from 2,102 in last assessment) locations where IDPs were residing with host communities. Site assessments included an analysis of sector-wide needs, including shelter and non-food items, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), food and nutrition, health, education, livelihood, security, communication and protection.

Given that the State of Borno is the most affected by conflict-related displacements, this report places a specific focus on data and analyses pertaining to it. Lastly, this report includes analyses on the increasing number of returnees, profile of their initial displacement, shelter conditions of returnees, health, education, livelihood, market, assistance and WASH facilities available to the returnees.

BACKGROUND

The escalation of violence between all parties in north-eastern Nigeria in 2014 resulted in mass displacement and deprivation. To better understand the scope of displacement and assess the needs of affected populations, IOM began implementing its DTM programme in September 2014, in collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs).

The main objective of initiating the DTM programme was and remains the provision of support to the Government and humanitarian partners by establishing a comprehensive system to collect, analyse and disseminate data on IDPs and returnees in order to provide effective assistance to the affected population. In each round of assessment, staff from IOM, NEMA, SEMAs and the Nigerian Red Cross Society collate data in the field, including baseline information at Local Government Area and ward-levels, by carrying out detailed assessments in displacement sites, such as camps and collective centers, as well as in sites where communities were hosting IDPs at the time of the assessment.

IOM’s DTM programme is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Office (ECHO), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Government of Germany. NEMA also makes financial contributions.
DTM Round 28 assessments were carried out from 1 July to 16 July 2019 in 107 LGAs including 794 wards (a decrease of one ward as against the number of wards that were accessible in DTM Round 27 assessment) in the conflict-affected north-eastern Nigerian states Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe states. As per the assessment, 2,018,513 individuals were recorded as being displaced in the affected states, a nominal increase of 2 per cent or 38,477 individuals as against 1,980,036 IDPs that were recorded in Round 27 published in May 2019.

The number, however, is lower than the 2,026,602 IDPs recorded in Round 25, which was carried out before the onset of the current escalation of violence in October 2018. The decrease in number is on account of reduced accessibility following overall deterioration in the security situation. The number of areas accessible has been showing a downward trend and the reduction in numbers of IDPs and locations accessed in the last 3 rounds of assessment is a marked deviation from the trends since December 2017.

To illustrate, 1.7 million IDPs were recorded in February 2018. This number increased to 2 million by October 2018. Similarly, 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 27, only 107 LGAs were accessible, Guzamala, Kukawa and Kala/Balge LGAs and 12 wards were remained inaccessible. Access was gained in one ward between the period of publishing of Round 26 DTM assessment and the conduct of Round 27 assessment. Inaccessibility continued during Round 28 with 794 wards accessible.

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 2018.

On the other hand, the number of sites assessed by DTM enumerators marginally increased from 2,383 in the previous Round 27 to 2,385 locations in the Round 28 assessment.
**KEY HIGHLIGHTS**

**2,018,513** Displaced Individuals

- 54% Female
- 46% Male
- 26% Children under 6
- 79% Women and Children

**1,642,539** Returned Individuals

- 53% Female
- 47% Male
- 30% Children under 6
- 79% Women and Children

**IDP and Returnee population trend**

- 2% increase in displaced population from DTM R27
- 1% increase in return population from DTM R27

**IDPs**

- Adamawa: 1,483,394
- Bauchi: 64,303
- Borno: 1,490,163
- Gombe: 36,871
- Taraba: 102,165
- Yobe: 131,597

**Returnees**

- Adamawa: 808,584
- Bauchi: 30,622
- Borno: 668,800
- Gombe: 128,140
- Taraba: 74,574
- Yobe: 165,155

**Returnees Total by State**

- Less than 102,000
- 102,001 to 152,000
- Above 201,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Returnees Total by State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>808,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>30,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>668,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>128,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>74,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>165,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Displaced Individuals Returned Individuals**

- 89% Displaced within the States
- 11% Displaced from different States
- 72% Returned within the States
- 20% Returned from other States
- 8% Fled to neighbouring countries before return

**Maps showing migration patterns from various states.**

**Graph showing the trend of IDPs and Returnees over time.**

**Figure showing the distribution of displaced individuals and returnees by state.**

**Table showing the distribution of displaced individuals and returnees by state.**
1. BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF DISPLACEMENT

1A: PROFILE OF DISPLACEMENT IN NORTHEAST NIGERIA

As of 16 July 2019, the estimated number of IDPs in conflict affected north-eastern states (Nigerian states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe) States was 2,018,513 individuals or 398,993 households. Though the figure represents a nominal increase of 2 per cent or 38,477 as against 1,980,036 IDPs that were recorded in Round 27. The total number is still less than the number of individuals counted prior to the sharp escalation in clashes between NSAG and security forces that have rendered entire wards inaccessible.

Prior to the dip recorded since beginning of 2019, the number of IDPs has been steadily rising since 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. In August 2018, the number of IDPs identified was 1,926,748 and prior to this, a two per cent increase was recorded in the Round 23 of assessment as against the number identified in Round 22 (published in April 2018). The number of returns is also on the increase as can be noted from Section 3 on Returnees.

Table 1: Change in internally displaced population by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Count of LGAs</th>
<th>R27 Total (May 2019)</th>
<th>R28 Total (July 2019)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>192,534</td>
<td>200,011</td>
<td>7,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64,387</td>
<td>64,303</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,467,908</td>
<td>1,483,566</td>
<td>15,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,872</td>
<td>36,871</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85,332</td>
<td>102,165</td>
<td>16,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131,003</td>
<td>131,597</td>
<td>(5,594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,900,036</td>
<td>2,018,513</td>
<td>38,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Change in internally displaced population by State.

The most-affected State of Borno continues to host the highest number of IDPs at 1,483,566 recording an increase of over one per cent or 15,658 as against the number assessed during the last Round 27 DTM assessment. The number is a two per cent or 32,091 IDP increase over the 1,453,817 IDPs that were recorded in Borno during Round 26 assessment. With this increase the total number of IDPs in Borno is now nearly the same as the number recorded in DTM Round 25 assessment published in November 2018, i.e., before the recent decrease in accessibility due to spurt in violence. Yet again, Borno’s populous LGAs of Kala Balge, Kukawa and Guzamala could not be assessed by DTM enumerators for carrying out assessments due to insecurity and consequent inaccessibility. As per Round 25 assessment, which was published before the recent decrease in accessibility, Kala Balge had recorded 76,389 IDPs while 13,521 displaced persons were recorded in Kukawa and 1,845 in Guzamala.

Within Borno, populous LGAs like Kala/Balge, Kukawa and Guzamala could once again not be assessed by DTM due to insecurity. In Round 25 assessment, which was published...
in Jalingo LGA where the number of IDPs increased by 12,078 (from 21,337 to 33,415) on account of clashes between Kona community and herders. The next highest increase (3,269) was in Takum LGA that took the population of IDPs from 3,657 to 6,926, nearly double. The influx was because of ongoing communal crises in the southern zone (more details in ETT reports).

The third highest increment in number of IDPs was recorded in Adamawa with 7,477 new arrivals taking the population of displaced persons to 200,011. The highest increase was noted in Mubi North where 1,152 IDPs arrived from Madagali. The movement was triggered by insecurity.
A detailed and representative overview of age and sex breakdown was obtained by interviewing a sample of 87,875 persons, representing four per cent of the recorded IDP population in the 6 most affected states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe. The results are depicted in Figures 2 and 3 below. The average number of people per household was five.

**1C: REASONS FOR DISPLACEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Insurgency</th>
<th>Community Clashes</th>
<th>Natural Disasters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 y</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 y</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17 y</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59 y</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ y</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: IDPs by age group and sex**

- Children: 56%
- Adults: 38%
- Elderly: 6%

**Figure 3: Proportion of IDP population by age groups**

Reasons for displacement remained unchanged since the last round of assessment published in May 2019. The ongoing conflict in north-eastern Nigeria continued to be the main reason for displacement (92% - down from 93%), followed by communal clashes. 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 28 assessment.

**1D: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT**

An increase of 2 per cent was noted in the proportion of displacements that have taken place in 2019 so far as against the percentage in last round of assessment in May 2019. This increase could be attributed to the increased insecurity and communal clashes. The highest percentage of displacements took place in 2015 (25%) and 2016 (23%). Seventeen per cent of IDPs were displaced in 2017 and 11 per cent in 2018 (Figure 5).

**1E: MOBILITY**

Sixty-seven per cent of IDPs have been displaced at a separate previous time as per the Round 28 assessment carried out in the six most affected northeastern states. In Borno, 41 per cent of displaced persons said they have been displaced prior as well. In fact, the number of people displaced two times was higher than the number of persons displaced once in the most-affected State of Borno.

**1F: ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATIONS**

The most-affected state of Borno continues to be the place of origin of the largest number of IDPs (83%) in conflict affected states of north-eastern Nigeria. After Borno, Adamawa is the
place of origin for the second largest number of IDPs (7% - no change since last round of assessment). Majority of the displaced persons are residing within their own state of origin. In 18 per cent of wards assessed, there are IDPs originating from the same LGA and 29 per cent of the IDPs are currently living in the LGA where their habitual place of residence was before displacement.

![Figure 7: Illustration showing State of origin and State of Displacement](image)

In-keeping with the trend set in last few rounds, 59 per cent of all IDPs were living with host communities (Figure 7) during Round 28 assessments while remaining were 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 marginally higher than that of individuals living with host communities. In all other states, people living with host communities far outnumbered those in camps and camp-like settings.

![Figure 8: IDP settlement type by state](image)

**1H: UNMET NEEDS IN IDP SETTLEMENTS**

In a survey conducted among 19,033 displaced persons, food continues to be the main unmet need cited by 73 per cent (no change from the last two rounds of assessments) of those surveyed. As seen in Table 2, the need for food has been consistently high over the years. Non-food items (NFIs) were cited as the other most unfulfilled need by 13 per cent (no change from the last two rounds of assessments) of those surveyed. As seen in Table 2, the need for food has been consistently high over the years.

![Map 4: Origin of IDPs and location of displacement](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DTM ROUND</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Water for washing and cooking</th>
<th>Sanitation and Hygiene</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Drinking water</th>
<th>Medical services</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>May-19</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-19</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Main needs of IDPs by round of assessments
DTM REPORT ROUND 28 - AUGUST 2019

2. SITE ASSESSMENTS AND SECTORAL NEEDS

2A: LOCATION AND NUMBER OF IDPS

DTM Round 28 site assessments were conducted in 2,385 sites (up from 2,383 in last round of assessment). The purpose was to better understand the gaps in services provided and the needs of the affected population. These sites included 294 (up from 281 in last round of assessment) camps and camp-like settings and 2,091 (down from 2,102) locations where IDPs were residing with host communities. The state-wise break up of IDP population is presented in table below.

<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>14,467</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>185,544</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>200,011</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAUCHI</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62,605</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64,303</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORNO</td>
<td>809,160</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>674,406</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,483,566</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOMBE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36,871</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36,871</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARABA</td>
<td>25,961</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>76,204</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>102,165</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOBE</td>
<td>12,893</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>118,704</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>131,597</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>864,179</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,154,334</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,018,513</td>
<td>2,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Change in IDP figures by State
DTM REPORT ROUND 28 - AUGUST 2019

2B: SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION

Collective settlements are the most common type of sites with 59 per cent of the camp/camp like settings, 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 were classified as private buildings (54% - same as in last round of assessment) followed by 44 per cent (same as in last round of assessment) categorized as government or public buildings and 1 per cent as ancestral property. On the other hand, the land ownership in sites were

IDPs residing with host communities were classified as living in private buildings (88% - down from 89% in the last round of assessment) followed by 9 per cent (up from 8%) categorized as government or public buildings and 3 three per cent as ancestral buildings.

Out of the 294 displacement sites (camps and camp-like settings) that were assessed, 79 per cent (up from 60% in the last round of assessment) were located in Borno.

IDP Population by Settlement Type

![IDP settlement type by state](image-url)

Figure 9: IDP settlement type by state
2C: SECTOR ANALYSIS

CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT

In the Round 28 DTM assessment, out of the 294 camp and camp-like sites assessed, 88 per cent were informal (up from 85% in the last round of assessment) and remaining were formal. Twenty nine per cent of camps and camp-like settings had a presence of a Camp Management Agency.

SHELTER

Camps and camp-like settings

Camps and camp-like settings presented a variety of shelter conditions, common shelter being emergency shelters and self-made/makeshift shelters, each of which are 37%. Other types were host family houses (11%), government buildings (7%), schools (3% - the same as last round of assessment), individual houses (4%) and community shelters (0.3%).

Host Communities

This round of assessment identified 2,091 (up from 2,117 in the last round of assessment) host communities hosting 210,300 IDP households, most commonly residing in the host family’s house (which was the most common shelter type in 89 per cent of sites. This is followed by individual houses in 8 per cent of sites, 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 item (NFI) in camps and camp-like settings. The corresponding number for the most affected State of Borno was 62 per cent.

Host Communities

In sites where IDPs were residing with host communities, blankets/mats were the most needed NFI in 39 per cent of sites. Mosquito nets were the next most needed in 21 per cent of sites.
WASH: WATER RESOURCES

Camp and camp-like settings:

Piped water continues to be the main source of drinking water in most sites (65% of sites – down from 70% in May assessment), followed by hand pumps in 19 per cent (up from 17%) of sites, water trucks in 9 per cent (up from 7%) of sites, protected wells in 3 per cent of sites (remain the same), unprotected wells in 2 per cent of sites, while 1 per cent got drinking water from other sources such as ponds, lakes, canals and surface water.

Borno had the highest reliance on piped water supply, with 70 per cent of sites in that state using piped water as a water source, followed by Yobe (69%). In fact, in Borno the main source of drinking water was piped water in 70 (down from 75%) per cent of sites, followed by hand pumps in 17 (up from 15%) per cent of sites and water trucks in 8 (up from 6%) per cent of sites.

For more analysis, click here.

Host Communities

Unlike the scenario in camps and camp-like settings, hand pumps are the main source of water in 54 per cent (up from 52%) of sites where IDPs are residing with host communities. In 22 per cent of sites (down from 23%), piped water was the main source of drinking water, followed by protected wells (9% - down from 10%) and unprotected wells (8%). Other common water sources include water trucks (5% - down from 6%) and springs (1%).

The scenario differed in Borno, where piped water was the main source in 49 per cent of assessed sites (remain the same), followed by hand pumps in 25 per cent (down from 29%) of sites and unprotected wells in 13 per cent (up from 10%) of sites.

For more analysis, click here.

PERSONAL HYGIENE FACILITIES

Camps and camp-like settings

In 96 per cent of displacement sites (up from 95% in the last round of assessment in May), toilets were described as ‘not hygienic’, while toilets were reported to be in hygienic conditions in only 3 per cent of sites (down from 5%) and none were reportedly non-usable. In Yobe, where cholera is recurring, 100 per cent of toilets were described as not good/hygienic in this round of assessment as well. In Borno, 97 per cent (up from 96%) were reported as not hygienic.

For more analysis, click here.

Host communities

In 97 per cent of host community sites (down from 98%), toilets were described as not hygienic and good in 3 per cent of sites (up from 2%). The situation in Borno mirrored the overall scenario.

For more analysis, click here.

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Camps and camp-like settings

In camps and camp-like settings, a notable change was observed in terms of access to food as against the last round of assessment published in May.

In Round 28 assessment, access to food was on site in 40 per cent (down from 75% and 85% in last two rounds of assessments in May and February) of sites and off-site in 44 per cent of sites (up from 12%). But there were no food provisions in 16 per cent (up from 13%) of sites assessed.
For more analysis, click here.

**Host Communities**

Access to food on-site continued to be on-site in 56 per cent (same as in last round of assessment) of sites. But in Borno, access to food was on-site in 48 per cent of sites, which is a dip from the 57 per cent recorded in the last round of assessment.

Twenty-two per cent of IDPs had access to food off-site (down from 25%) and 22 per cent (up from 19%) had no access to food.

For more analysis, click here.

**HEALTH**

**Camps and camp-like settings Host communities**

Malaria was the most common health problem in 54 per cent (up from 52%) of assessed displacement sites, followed by fever in 27 per cent of sites (no change from last round of assessment) and cough in 12 per cent (down from 14%).

For more analysis, click here.

**EDUCATION**

**Camps and camp-like settings**

Access to schools continued to increase from an already high of 98 per cent recorded in the last round of assessment published in May to 100 per cent in this round of assessment.

The scenario in Borno was similar.

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 55 per cent of sites (up from 53%). The situation in Borno was worse with malaria cited as the most prevalent health issue in 60 per cent of sites.

For more details, click here.
**COMMUNICATION**

**Camps and camp-like settings**

Friends and neighbors were cited as the most-trusted source of information in 75 per cent of sites (steep increase from 60% in last round of assessment published in May as well as from 65% figure published in previous DTM Round 26 assessment). Local and community leaders were cited as the second most trusted source of information in 18 per cent of sites (down from 24%) continuing the decreasing trend observed over the last few rounds of assessment.

For more details, click here.

**Host communities**

In a marked difference from the findings of the assessment published in May, friends and neighbors were the most trusted source of information for IDPs residing with host communities as per this round of assessment. Forty-three per cent cited friends and neighbors as most trusted source of information (up from 41%).

For more details, click here.

**LIVELIHOODS**

**Camps and camp-like settings**

In a marked deviation from the findings of DTM Round 27, petty trade and farming tied as the main livelihood activities for displaced persons in 35 per cent of assessed sites. The percentages were in-line with previous assessments.

For more details, click here.

**Host communities**

Amongst the sites where IDPs lived with host communities, 86 per cent (down from 90%) had some form of security.

For more details, click here.

**PROTECTION**

**Camps/camp-like settings**

Security was provided in 87 per cent (down from 90%) of evaluated sites. In the most-affected State of Borno, security was provided in 89 per cent of sites (down from 92%).

For more details, click here.

**Host communities**

Amongst the sites where IDPs living in displacement camps, the majority of IDPs living with host communities engaged in farming. In the current round of assessment, in 60 per cent (same as in the last Round 27 assessment) of sites IDPs engaged in farming.

For more details, click here.
3. RETURNEES

A nominal increase of 1 per cent (down from 4% in the last round of assessment) was recorded in the number of returnees assessed during DTM Round 28 assessment in the most-affected north-eastern Nigerian states.

The number of returnees went up by 19,631 to take the total number to 1,642,539 (269,280 households) from 1,622,908 returnees that were assessed in the last round of assessment published in May 2019. This increase, though relatively small, is in-line with the increasing trend observed since DTM began assessing returnees in August 2015.

The number of LGAs assessed for returnees saw an increase from 40 per cent to 41 per cent during this round of assessment which is at par with the number of LGAs that were assessed by DTM prior to the recent escalation of hostilities between Nigerian security forces and NSAGs.

### Table 8: Change in returnee population by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>802,225</td>
<td>808,584</td>
<td>6,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>658,869</td>
<td>668,800</td>
<td>9,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>161,814</td>
<td>165,155</td>
<td>3,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,622,908</td>
<td>1,642,539</td>
<td>19,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the total number returnees, 132,957 were classified as return refugee as they travelled back from neighboring countries. A 6 per cent increase in number of return refugees was recorded in this round of assessment as against the previous round that was published in May.

#### 3A: YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT FOR RETURNEES

Thirty-nine per cent of returnees stated 2015 as their year of displacement. The figure was same in the last round of assessment that was published in May. Thirty-seven per cent of returnees said they were displaced in 2016. Once again, 94 per cent (no change from the last two rounds of assessments) attributed their displacement to the ongoing conflict in north-eastern Nigeria and six per cent returnees said they were displaced due to communal clashes.

**Figure 32: Year of displacement for returnees**

---

Return Assessments are not conducted in Bauchi, Taraba & Gombe.
3B: SHELTER CONDITIONS FOR RETURNEES

Borno has the highest number of returnees living in makeshift or emergency centers at 64 per cent (down from 67%) amongst all and the most affect state also has highest (60%) semi damaged and fully (56%) damaged homes.

Forty-eight per cent (same in last round of assessment) of returnees in Borno are living in walled buildings and 27 per cent are living in traditional shelters like Bukka, Gidan zana, thatched roofs, and others.

3C: HEALTH FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

A high of 66 per cent of areas of returns assessed do not have access to health services. This figure is highest for Yobe at 69 per cent, followed by Adamawa at 67 per cent and Borno at 59 per cent. In areas that do have access to health services, the most common type were Primary Health Care Centre (PHCC) (21%), followed by clinic and General hospital (11% and 2%, respectively).

3D: EDUCATION FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Education facilities were available in 50 per cent of sites assessed, with the corresponding figure for Borno is 55 per cent (no change since the last round of assessment).

3E: MARKET FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Twenty-five per cent of sites where returnees have settled had markets nearby. In Borno, it was 28 per cent. Twenty-five per cent of markets were functional.

3F: PROFILE OF ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES

Out of the 380 sites assessed, assistance with NFIs was the most common in 34 per cent of locations. Health assistance was next at 26 per cent and food assistance was reaching 17 per cent of areas of returns.

3G: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Communal boreholes (30%) were the most common Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) facilities available in areas of returns. The next most found WASH facility were hand pumps in 26 per cent of sites.
3H: LIVELIHOOD FACILITIES FOR RETURNEES

Ninety-five per cent (up from 94%) of all returnees had access to land. Farming is the means of livelihood for the great majority of returnees.

4. METHODOLOGY

The data collected in this report was obtained through the implementation of different DTM tools used by enumerators at various administrative levels. The type of respondent for each tool was different as each focuses on different population types:

TOOLS FOR IDPS

Local Government Area Profile - IDP: This is an assessment conducted with key informants at the LGA level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on IDPs and includes:

- Displaced population estimates (households and individuals), date of arrival, location of origin, reason(s) for displacement and type of displacement locations (host communities, camps, camp-like settings, etc.).
- The assessment also records the contact information of key informants and organizations assisting IDPs in the LGA.

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.

Site assessment: This is undertaken in identified IDP locations (camps, camp-like settings, and host communities) to capture detailed information on the key services available. Site assessment forms are used to record the exact location and name of a site, accessibility constraints, size and type of the site, availability of registrations, and the likelihood of natural hazards putting the site at risk. The form also captures details about the IDP population, including their place of origin, and demographic information on the number of households disaggregated by age and sex, as well as information on IDPs with specific vulnerabilities. In addition, the form captures details on access to services in different sectors: shelter and NFI, WASH, food, nutrition, health, education, livelihood, communication, and protection. The information is captured through interviews with representatives of the site and other key informants, including IDP representatives.
TOOLS FOR RETURNEES

Local Government Area Profile - Returnees: This is an assessment conducted with key informants at the LGA level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on returnees and includes: returnee population estimates (households and individuals), date of return, location of origin and initial reasons of displacement. The main outcome of this assessment is a list of wards where returnee presence has been identified. This list will be used as a reference to continue the assessment at ward level (see “ward level profile for returnees”).

Ward level Profile - Returnees: The ward level profile is an assessment that is conducted at the ward level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on returnees and includes information on: returnee population estimates (households and individuals), date of return, location of origin and reasons for initial displacement. The results of this type of assessment are used to verify the information collected at LGA level. The ward assessment is carried out in all wards that had been identified as having returnee populations in the LGA list.

Data is collected via interviews with key informants such as representatives of the administration, community leaders, religious leaders and humanitarian aid workers. To ensure data accuracy, assessments are conducted and cross-checked with a number of key informant. The accuracy of the data also relies on the regularity and continuity of the assessments and field visits that are conducted every six weeks.
The depiction and use of boundaries, geographic names, and related data shown on maps and included in this report are not warranted to be error free nor do they imply judgment on the legal status of any territory, or any endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries by IOM.

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

IOM: Henry Kwenin, Project Officer, hkwenin@iom.int, +234 9038852524, http://nigeria.iom.int/dtm, https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
### Camps/camp-like settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual house</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government building</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host family house</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-made/makeshift shelter</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Types of shelter**

### Host Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government building</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facility</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-made/makeshift shelter</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual house</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host family house</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Types of shelter**

### Most needed shelter materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarpaulin</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/bricks</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing sheets</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber/wood</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Most needed shelter materials**

### Most needed NFI types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blankets/Mats</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene kits</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar lamp</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket/Jerry Can</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene kits</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: Most needed NFI types**
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**WaSH**

**Camps/camp-like settings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake/dam</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water truck</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand pumps</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water supply</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Host Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake/dam</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponds/canals</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water truck</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water supply</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand pumps</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: Main drinking water sources**

**Figure 8: Main drinking water sources**

**Figure 9: Distance to main water sources**

**Figure 10: Distance to main water sources**

**Figure 11: Average amount of water available per person per day**

**Figure 12: Average amount of water available per person per day**
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Figure 13: Condition of toilets in camps/camp-like settings

Figure 14: Condition of toilets in host communities

Figure 15: Targeted hygiene promotion/main garbage disposal mechanism in camps/camp-like settings

Figure 16: Targeted hygiene promotion/main garbage disposal mechanism in host communities

Go back.

FOOD/NUTRITION

Camps/camp-like settings

Figure 17: Access to food

Figure 18: Access to food

Host Communities

Figure 19: Frequency of food or cash distribution

Figure 20: Frequency of food or cash distribution
### Camps/camp-like settings

- Cough (19% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 13% BORNO, 14% TARABA, 0% YOBE, 12% GRAND TOTAL)
- Diarrhea (0% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 3% BORNO, 0% TARABA, 0% YOBE, 3% GRAND TOTAL)
- Fever (58% ADAMAWA, 43% BAUCHI, 22% BORNO, 29% TARABA, 0% YOBE, 27% GRAND TOTAL)
- Malaria (23% ADAMAWA, 57% BAUCHI, 58% BORNO, 57% TARABA, 38% YOBE, 54% GRAND TOTAL)
- Malnutrition (0% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 0% BORNO, 0% TARABA, 19% YOBE, 1% GRAND TOTAL)
- Skin disease (0% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 0% BORNO, 0% TARABA, 6% YOBE, 0% GRAND TOTAL)
- None (0% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 3% BORNO, 0% TARABA, 0% YOBE, 3% GRAND TOTAL)

### Host Communities

- Cough (15% ADAMAWA, 8% BAUCHI, 14% BORNO, 9% GOMBE, 10% TARABA, 9% YOBE, 11% GRAND TOTAL)
- Diarrhea (8% ADAMAWA, 5% BAUCHI, 2% BORNO, 10% GOMBE, 5% TARABA, 9% YOBE, 6% GRAND TOTAL)
- Fever (21% ADAMAWA, 18% BAUCHI, 23% BORNO, 26% GOMBE, 22% TARABA, 22% YOBE, 22% GRAND TOTAL)
- Hepatitis (5% ADAMAWA, 0% BAUCHI, 0% BORNO, 0% GOMBE, 0% TARABA, 0% YOBE, 3% GRAND TOTAL)
- Malaria (51% ADAMAWA, 60% BAUCHI, 60% BORNO, 43% GOMBE, 53% TARABA, 53% YOBE, 50% GRAND TOTAL)
- Malnutrition (0% ADAMAWA, 4% BAUCHI, 0% BORNO, 0% GOMBE, 12% TARABA, 9% YOBE, 5% GRAND TOTAL)

### Figure 21: Common health problems

- Mobile clinic
  - ADAMAWA: 0%
  - BAUCHI: 0%
  - BORNO: 3%
  - TARABA: 0%
  - YOBE: 0%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 2%

- Off-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 27%
  - BAUCHI: 43%
  - BORNO: 71%
  - TARABA: 43%
  - YOBE: 63%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 64%

- Off-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 4%
  - BAUCHI: 0%
  - BORNO: 4%
  - TARABA: 0%
  - YOBE: 6%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 4%

- On-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 69%
  - BAUCHI: 43%
  - BORNO: 22%
  - TARABA: 57%
  - YOBE: 31%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 29%

- On-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 1%
  - BAUCHI: 14%
  - BORNO: 0%
  - TARABA: 0%
  - YOBE: 0%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 1%

### Figure 22: Common health problems

- Mobile clinic
  - ADAMAWA: 0%
  - BAUCHI: 0%
  - BORNO: 6%
  - GOMBE: 0%
  - TARABA: 0%
  - YOBE: 0%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 1%

- Off-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 13%
  - BAUCHI: 43%
  - BORNO: 36%
  - GOMBE: 11%
  - TARABA: 72%
  - YOBE: 28%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 28%

- Off-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 2%
  - BAUCHI: 2%
  - BORNO: 3%
  - GOMBE: 3%
  - TARABA: 10%
  - YOBE: 7%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 4%

- On-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 73%
  - BAUCHI: 79%
  - BORNO: 71%
  - GOMBE: 75%
  - TARABA: 53%
  - YOBE: 62%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 60%

- On-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 4%
  - BAUCHI: 4%
  - BORNO: 3%
  - GOMBE: 50%
  - TARABA: 13%
  - YOBE: 5%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 7%

### Figure 23: Location of health facilities

- Mobile clinic
  - ADAMAWA: 34%
  - BAUCHI: 69%
  - BORNO: 19%
  - TARABA: 79%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 3%

- Off-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 58%
  - BAUCHI: 79%
  - BORNO: 72%
  - TARABA: 4%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 13%

- Off-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 19%
  - BAUCHI: 14%
  - BORNO: 13%
  - TARABA: 5%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 4%

- On-site (<3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 73%
  - BAUCHI: 86%
  - BORNO: 23%
  - TARABA: 4%
  - YOBE: 15%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 8%

- On-site (>3 km)
  - ADAMAWA: 34%
  - BAUCHI: 21%
  - BORNO: 72%
  - TARABA: 4%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 21%

### Figure 24: Location of health facilities

- Government
  - ADAMAWA: 72%
  - BAUCHI: 79%
  - BORNO: 50%
  - GOMBE: 75%
  - TARABA: 74%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 78%

- INGO
  - ADAMAWA: 7%
  - BAUCHI: 3%
  - BORNO: 50%
  - GOMBE: 25%
  - TARABA: 79%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 79%

- Local clinic
  - ADAMAWA: 18%
  - BAUCHI: 13%
  - BORNO: 50%
  - GOMBE: 25%
  - TARABA: 3%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 4%

- NGO
  - ADAMAWA: 1%
  - BAUCHI: 4%
  - BORNO: 77%
  - GOMBE: 13%
  - TARABA: 6%
  - GRAND TOTAL: 6%
**EDUCATION**

### Camps/camp-like settings

Figure 27: Access to formal/informal education services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Location of formal/informal education facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
<th>On-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Host Communities

Figure 28: Access to formal/informal education services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30: Location of formal/informal education facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
<th>On-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of children attending school

Figure 31: Percentage of children attending school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>&lt;25%</th>
<th>25-50%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>&gt;75%</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32: Percentage of children attending school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>&lt;25%</th>
<th>25-50%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>&gt;75%</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 35: Most trusted source of information for IDPs
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Figure 36: Most trusted source of information for IDPs

Figure 37: Most preferred channel of information for IDPs

Figure 38: Most preferred channel of information for IDPs

Figure 39: Access to functioning radio

Figure 40: Access to functioning radio

Figure 41: Most important topic for IDPs

Figure 42: Most important topic for IDPs
PROTECTION
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Figure 43: Security provided on-site

Figure 44: Security provided on-site

Figure 45: Main security providers

Figure 46: Main security providers

Go back.