

# NIGERIA

## Figure Analysis – Displacement Related to Conflict and Violence

### CONTEXT

The humanitarian situation in Nigeria deteriorated significantly in 2018. Clashes between government forces and Boko Haram became more frequent in the country’s north-east, displacing people as the announcement of elections to be held in 2019 heightened tensions in the region. Violence between herders and farmers also escalated in the Middle Belt region. This increase in violence is linked to the environmental degradation of pasture in the Middle Belt and fighting in the north-east of the country spilling into neighbouring regions, forcing herders to move south.<sup>1</sup> There was an upsurge in Boko Haram attacks on Adamawa, Borno and Yobe states in August, which resulted in more than 200 security incidents.<sup>2</sup> The country also suffered a cholera outbreak, with the highest number of people affected in Borno and Yobe states.<sup>3</sup> Conflict has also led to the withdrawal of 260 aid workers since November 2018.<sup>4</sup> As the 2019 presidential elections approached, fears were rising of attacks by non-state armed groups.

New displacements	Total number of IDPs	Partial or unverified solutions	
		Number of IDPs who have made partial progress towards a durable solution	Number of IDPs whose progress towards durable solutions cannot be verified
541,000	2,216,000 (Year figure was last updated: 2018)	311,000 (1 January – 31 December 2018)	No data available

*This corresponds to new instances of internal displacement having occurred in 2018.*

*This corresponds to the total number of individuals living in internal displacement as of 31 December 2018.*

*This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2018 and for whom the evidence obtained by IDMC suggests that progress toward durable solutions is only partial given their living conditions. In a few instances this number may refer to movements rather than people.*

*This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2018 but for whom there is no available evidence to corroborate progress toward durable solutions. In a few instances this number may refer to movements rather than people.*

## NEW DISPLACEMENTS

*This corresponds to new instances of internal displacement having occurred in 2018.*

### **Sources and methodologies**

IDMC's estimate of the number of new displacements represents a combination of IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM DTM) and Emergency Tracking Tool (ETT) reports, news monitoring and the International Crisis Group's research on displacement in the Middle Belt regions. From the IOM DTM reports, IDMC interpreted net increases in the number of people displaced by conflict to estimate the number of movements. For the periods not covered by DTM reports in 2018, IDMC used ETT reports, from which it extracted information relative to conflict and violence, military operations and fear of attacks. IDMC used ICG's estimate that 300,000 new displacements had been recorded in the Middle Belt between the end of 2017 and June 2018, of which two thirds occurred between January and June 2018. This figure corresponds with observations made through media reports monitoring and IDMC regards it as the most reliable estimate for this region.

### **Main caveats and monitoring challenges**

Data from IOM DTM and ETT reports may not capture small-scale, short-term or spontaneous movements. The two primary caveats concerning the data on new displacements in the Middle Belt are that it was collected for only the first half of the year and that it was not intended to serve as a basis for systematic monitoring. IDMC considers its figure for both the Middle Belt and the entire country to be an underestimate.

### **IDMC figure and rationale**

IDMC's new displacements figure derives from observed increases in the reported number of IDPs between each IOM DTM round as well as movements captured in ETT reports and the ICG report on the Middle Belt states.

### **Significant changes since last year**

Compared to 2017, the higher number of new displacements reported in 2018 was due to increased violence, particularly intercommunal clashes and conflict between farmers and pastoralists in the Middle Belt States and violence in the north-east. Military operations which forced insurgents out of the region drove down violence in the first half of 2018, but attacks have increased in the run-up to the elections, particularly targeted at military bases and personnel.

## TOTAL NUMBER OF IDPS

*This corresponds to the total number of individuals living in internal displacement as of 31 December 2018.*

### **Sources and methodologies**

IDMC's estimate of the total number of IDPs in 2018 is a compilation from various sources, mainly the abovementioned IOM DTM and ETT reports covering the North East zone as well as media reports and ICG research for displacement in the Middle Belt region. The data obtained from IOM provides information on departures and arrivals between reporting rounds as well as more spontaneous movements recorded during emergencies. ICG's reports on the Middle Belt include information on movements in the region since late 2017, two-thirds of which took place in 2018.

### **Main caveats and monitoring challenges**

As in previous years, the main caveat about internal displacement data in Nigeria is the limited geographical coverage: IOM DTM operations are limited to the north-eastern states, including Adamawa, Borno and Yobe, which are most affected by the Boko Haram crisis and therefore where a significant portion of the overall internal displacement in Nigeria occurs. Violence worsened, but

military operations against the terror group delivered greater access to previously unreachable areas in 2018. This renewed access also led to an increase in the number of IDPs recorded, meaning that while IDMC's figure is accurate, it appears to show a large increase in the number of IDPs in the state in 2018, even though some people were likely displaced earlier than this. Additionally, the year-end figure is based on IOM DTM's latest reporting round in 2018, which was based on data collected in October. No systematic monitoring or tracking is carried out in the Middle Belt, so data had to be obtained using event-based monitoring and ICG's report, which only covers the first half of 2018.

#### **IDMC figure and rationale**

IDMC's year-end estimate is primarily based on the IOM DTM data collected in October 2018 concerning people displaced by conflict and intercommunal violence. IDMC also included data from IOM's ETT from October to December. IDMC extracted the number of movements as a result of conflict, fear of attacks and military operations for the ETT reports. Since we obtained no evidence indicating that people displaced in the Middle Belt between January and June had returned to their homes or habitual place of residence in a sustainable manner, we included these people in our year-end estimate.

#### **Significant changes since last year**

The increase in the total number of IDPs figure is the result of a combination of methodological and contextual factors. The increase in geographical coverage in the North East zone, with some previously unreachable areas accessed and assessments performed, led to a larger stock figure, which does not necessarily mean increased violence. In the run-up to the presidential and senatorial elections, however, even though security operations were increased, so were acts of violence, mainly aimed at military bases and personnel. This has also contributed to an increase in IDP numbers. Additionally, the figures provided by IOM decreased between 2016 and 2017, because they did not report on movement in the Middle Belt states. The latter had previously experienced an overspill of people fleeing violence in the north-east and some intercommunal clashes. Those clashes have significantly increased in number and intensity in 2018, triggering a large number of new displacements accounted for by ICG data.

## NUMBER OF IDPS WHO HAVE MADE PARTIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS A DURABLE SOLUTION

*This corresponds to the number of IDPs whom our data providers have identified as having returned, resettled or locally integrated in 2018 and for whom the evidence obtained by IDMC suggests that progress toward durable solutions is only partial given their living conditions. In a few instances this number may refer to movements rather than people.*

#### **Sources and methodologies**

IDMC's only source for this estimate is IOM DTM data, which indicates the number of individuals and households who were able to return to their habitual place of residence. Given that IOM DTM reports include information about the shelter conditions of people upon their return, IDMC used this data to assess how many returnees had made progress toward durable solutions and how many had made no progress despite having returned.

#### **Main caveats and monitoring challenges**

Other than the limited geographical coverage, returns are usually harder to assess, particularly in more volatile areas such as the north-east of Nigeria. This is mainly because there are repeated waves of population movements in areas affected by the conflict. As a result, the partial solutions figure is reported as a number of movements rather than a number of people who have been able to return. The IOM DTM reports include information about the number of individuals who were able to return

home between two DTM rounds and a total number of those movements since record-keeping began. IDMC does not use the latter figure, as it is highly likely to double-count people who fled and returned multiple times.

#### **IDMC figure and rationale**

IDMC based its estimate of partial solutions on reports on shelter conditions upon return, as reported by IOM DTM. We used this information to determine how many return movements represented progress toward a durable solution and how many resulted in IDPs continued displacement despite having returned.

#### **Significant changes since last year**

The variation since last year is likely due to military operations leading to a greater access to previously unsafe areas, allowing a greater number of individuals to go back home.

## CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

The Confidence Assessment provides an at-a-glance overview of the comprehensiveness of the data available regarding displacement associated with conflict for each country. It describes the methodologies used, frequency of reporting, data disaggregation and geographical coverage. Here two key metrics are analysed: the new displacements and the total number of IDPs.

Displacement metric	New displacements	Total number of IDPs
Reporting units	People, households	People, households
Methodology	Media monitoring, registration, key informants	Key informants, registration, media monitoring
Geographical disaggregation	Admin 2 or more	Admin 2 or more
Geographical coverage	Partial coverage	Partial coverage
Frequency of reporting	Every 3 months	Every 3 months
Disaggregation on sex	Yes	Yes
Disaggregation on age	Yes	Yes
Data triangulation	Some local triangulation	Some local triangulation
Data on settlement elsewhere	No	No
Data on returns	Yes	Yes
Data on local integration	No	No
Data on cross border movements	Partial	Partial
Data on deaths	Partial	Partial
Data on births	Partial	Partial

For any additional questions please email: [data@idmc.ch](mailto:data@idmc.ch)

For the full country profile on Nigeria please visit:  
<http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/nigeria>

<sup>1</sup> IDMC, [Mid-Year figures internal displacement in 2018](#), 12 September 2018.

<sup>2</sup> UNHCR, [Regional Update Nigeria situation](#) 31 August 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Médecins Sans Frontières [Crisis update Borno and Yobe States January 2019](#), 14 January 2019.

<sup>4</sup> OCHA, [North-East Nigeria humanitarian dashboard](#), 31 December 2018.