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NIGERIA - Contextual update

There was a marked escalation in Boko Haram attacks in 2017, including a significant number of suicide attacks and others specifically targeting displacement camps. Counter-insurgency operations by the Nigerian military and the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) also increased, generating further displacement. Tougher security measures restricted people's freedom of movement in north-eastern regions. The military presence in some towns and ban on access to Lake Chad prevented farmers, pastoralists and fishermen from pursuing their livelihoods, driving displacement to camps.

The military operations also re-established government control over many previously inaccessible areas. The authorities claims to have regained control of all local government areas, but three are reportedly under the control of insurgents.

Intercommunal violence continued to affect farming and pastoralist communities, and there was also violence in the Niger Delta and Biafra regions. Violence between herdsmen also flared in Benue state toward the end of the year, causing tens of thousands of people to flee to neighbouring regions, including Plateau state and other parts of the Middle Belt.

The governments of Nigeria and Cameroon and UNHCR, signed a tripartite agreement for the voluntary repatriation of Nigerian refugees living in Cameroon in March. This agreement was driven in part by an increasing number of forced returns at the hands of the Cameroonian police, but is has led many Nigerians not to register as refugees or pushed them go into hiding for fear of being forcibly repatriated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock:</th>
<th>1,707,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New displacements:</td>
<td>279,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns:</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional solutions:</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NIGERIA - Major displacement events in 2017

More than 280,000 new displacements were recorded in the northeastern states during 2017, as a result of the Boko Haram insurgency. Location: Northeastern Nigeria. Source: IOM, DTM.
Sources and methodologies
Our estimate is a combination of DTM data and displacement reported as having occurred between the last DTM data collection period in 2017 and the end of the year through the emergency tracking tool (ETT). We extracted caseloads from the latter that could be identified as having been caused by acts, threats or fear of violence.

Main caveats and monitoring challenges
DTM is limited geographically to the north-eastern states, which are worst affected by the Boko Haram insurgency and account for vast majority of forced displacement in the country. Its data does not include displacement information for the Middle Belt states or areas of the north-east still inaccessible.

IDMC figure, methodology and rationale
We used the total number of IDPs and added the number of displacements recorded via ETT as having occurred between the date of the last DTM data collection exercise and the end of the year.

Significant methodological and contextual changes from last year
Our figure is significantly lower than last year’s, despite the increase in Boko Haram attacks reported. The main reason is methodological, as last year’s figure included significant caseloads in the Middle Belt states, for which no data has been provided for 2017.
NIGERIA - New displacements: 279,000

This corresponds to the estimated number of internal displacement movements to have taken place during the year.

Sources and methodologies
IOM’s DTM and ETT reports.

Main caveats and monitoring challenges
As for our stock figure, geographical coverage is limited to the north-eastern states. As such, it excludes new displacements elsewhere in the country, and any missed by ETT. Nor is displacement in hard-to-reach or inaccessible areas captured. Definitions of displacement triggers are often vague and inconsistent in some reports, so we excluded movements attributed to motives not clearly linked to violence or threat of violence.

IDMC figure, methodology and rationale
We used the sum of movements identified in DTM and ETT reports that match our conceptual framework displacement associated with conflict and violence. Given the risk of overlap, double counting and definitional inconsistencies, we only included ETT data for the period between the last DTM data collection round and the end of the year.

Significant methodological and contextual changes from last year
Our figure is significantly lower than last year's, mainly due to methodological differences, namely the use last year of positive variations as opposed to the identification of displacement caseloads having occurred in 2017. Data gaps also play a role. The lack of data for the Middle Belt states has caused an apparent decrease in the figure, but this does not necessarily reflect an improvement in the security situation. That said, our analysis of the violent attacks and events that took place in 2017 showed that they were less likely to have generated new or further displacements because they did not affect people in their place of residence.
There are concerns that return figures include individuals or households who only return to their general area of habitual residence rather than their actual homes. As such, our figure only reflects people reported in DTM data as having returned to their habitual place of residence and able to live there. We excluded those reported as having returned to damaged or destroyed housing.
Challenges in accounting for returns
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