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Abstract

The number of internally displaced people is on the increase as a result of Boko Haram insurgency, particularly, in the North-eastern Nigeria. Assessment indicates that 13.33 per cent were displaced due to communal clashes, 0.99 per cent by natural disasters and 85.68 per cent as a result of insurgency attacks by Islamists, and there are 2,241, 484 internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Nigeria (International Organisation for Migration, 2016). Management of IDPs has remained a tough issue to various administrations in Nigeria. The rehabilitation and resettlement of IDPs in Nigeria as well as provision of adequate security for IDPs have posed a bid challenge despite claimed efforts of national authorities to achieve this aim. This paper therefore, aimed at investigating inter alia, how Nigerian government has effectively managed IDPs. The study adopted ex-post facto descriptive method, hence relied heavily on secondary sources for data collection and ‘human security approach’ is employed as a theoretical framework. The paper observed that there are still lacunas in resettlement and protection of IDPs in the country. There is an urgent need to embark on a holistic and well coordinated approach with the help of foreign nations to effectively engage in technical and military actions in order to completely displace Boko Haram insurgents from their deadly enclaves in Nigeria and beyond. Also, Nigerian government should be more proactive in the reconstruction of destroyed houses of IDPs in their various communities so that they would have confidence to return home, and also develop strong mechanisms to guarantee the protection and safety of IDPs, especially those in IDPs camps.
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Introduction

In Nigeria, the number of internally displaced people is on the increase as a result of Boko Haram insurgency in the North-eastern Nigeria. Of the total figure of IDPs, the assessment indicates that 13.33 per cent were displaced due to communal clashes, 0.99 per cent by natural disasters and 85.68 per cent as a result of insurgency attacks by Islamists (IOM, 2016).
According to IOM (2016) there are 2,241, 484 internally displaced people (IDPs) in Nigeria as of February, 2016. According to the report, this figure is particularly based on an assessment conducted from November to December 2015 by the International Organization for Migration’s (IOM) Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) team in 207 Local Government Areas (LGA) covering 13 States of Northern Nigeria which are shown figures in the table below. In fact, as IDPs are returning to their habitual residences, other are still being displaced, thereby making it difficult to accurately have reliable statistics of IDPs in Nigeria. Since 2011, the population of the north-east of Nigeria States has been affected by the insurgency between Boko Haram and governmental forces (UNICEF, 2014). Thus, the government declared a State of Emergency (SoE) on 14 May 2013 in the three north-eastern states of Borno, Yobe, and Adamawa and imposed curfews. UNICEF (2014) reported that the large majority of the IDPs are women and children and over 90 percent are accommodated in host families within communities who are themselves poor and consequently putting pressure on already scarce resources. In 2014, the escalating violence caused by the Boko Haram insurgency in the northeastern region led to an increase.

Nigeria has over experienced incessant cases of internal displacement of people. The cause of this alarming situation is not far-fetched in the Nigerian context. Historically, the country has often experienced incidences or crises leading to the displacement of people from their original inhabitations. For instance, the civil war that took place in Nigeria between 1967 and 1970 resulted to the displacement of people especially those from the Eastern region of the country. Intra-ethnic conflicts, flooding, erosion, desert encroachment among others has remained a great challenge facing the country. Sometimes the causes of displacement are complex and often overlapping. According to Ladan (2011), in Nigeria, most of the incidences of internal displacement occur because of violent conflicts with ethnic religious and/or political undertones. Thousands are annually internally displaced as a result of natural disasters including flooding in the North and West, erosion in the East, oil spillage and development projects in the Niger Delta (South-South) (Laden, 2011).

Particularly, insurgency and armed conflicts in Nigeria have caused many casualties and deaths; though there may not be reliable available statistics showing exactly the number of people who lost their lives as a result of armed conflicts in Nigeria. Today, the most worrying issue is the insurgency by the Boko Haram terrorist group whose religious ideology is to establish Islamic caliphate that is based on Sharia Law in the Northern region. The insurgency has not only caused many to suddenly flee their homes and take up shelter in IDP camps, but have also resulted in a massive influx of people into neighbouring states, thereby refugee crisis. As highlighted in the first IOM report, the vast majority of IDPs identified in Adamawa, Baura, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe have been displaced because of the insurgency (85.68%). A smaller number was forced to leave their place of origin because of community clashes (3.33%)
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or natural disaster (0.99%) (IOM, 2016). Most of the IDPs are living with families in host communities who are themselves poor, thus severely straining already scarce resources as well as aggravating poverty levels (including food and nutrition insecurity) of the affected/host communities (OCHA, 2015).

Despite successive efforts by the Nigerian military forces in the region, it is a commonplace fact that Boko Haram violence in the northeastern Nigeria and neighboring countries continues. International media report almost daily Boko Haram attacks since May 29, 2015 resulting in more than 200 deaths in northeastern Nigeria between June 27, 2015 and July 3, 2015 alone, according to the UN and international media (USAID, 2015). According to the agency, as of June, 2015, Boko Haram attacks had internally displaced nearly 1.4 million people—more than 1 million of whom are displaced in Borno State—in northeastern Nigeria, according to IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). This represents a slight decrease from nearly 1.5 million IDPs in late April to approximately 1.4 million by late June, following the return of 120,000 people to areas of origin in Adamawa (USAID, 2015). Based on USAID report, by May 2015, an estimated 168,000 people, including returning migrants, had also fled to neighboring Cameroon, Chad, and Niger. Although the Nigerian military has claimed to have defeated Boko Haram, access to the northeast is highly constrained given the frequency of insurgent attacks.

Despite the efforts made by the Nigerian government, it has been observed that IDPs have continued to face harsh condition especially in the IDP camps. Today, it has been reported that armed groups unleash violent attacks on the IDPs, resulting loss of innocent lives. According to FRN (2012), IDPs in Nigeria face insecurity and all forms of exploitation and abuse, including rape, camping in congested shelters, isolated as well as insecure or inhospitable areas. According to the assessment, Borno, Yobe, Adamawa and Taraba states, face food insecurity mainly due to loss of incomes and livelihood caused by the insurgency and displacement (OCHA, 2014). Within the web of contesting vulnerability today, internally displaced person’s plight is more worrying and precarious (Ekpa & Dahlan, 2015). While some efforts are made by humanitarian and faith-based organisations and government agencies to address some of the basic needs of IDPs, their vulnerability tend to be increased by barriers to accessing healthcare services, education, employment, economic activities and information for participation in decision making affecting their lives (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2012). Furthermore, IDPs in Nigeria also face lack of access to justice, whether in relation to cases of human rights violations such as discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities, sexual violence, and deprivation of means of livelihood (FRN, 2012). Rehabilitation, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs in Nigeria have continued to pose a colossal challenge to the government due to unabated terrorist attacks in the country, particularly in the north-east. This scenario is a pointer to the conclusion that as long as Boko Haram insurgency continues to exist, there is likelihood that the number of IDPs would
continue to increase. To investigate if effective military action against insurgency facilitated the rehabilitation and resettlement of IDPs in Nigeria. Also, to examine whether provision of adequate security by the national authorities facilitated the protection and safety of IDPs from armed attacks in Nigeria.

Conceptual Framework

According to the African Union Convention for Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention, 2009), the term “Internally Displaced Persons” is defined as “persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border.” Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are citizens of a country who are displaced within the territory of a country as a result of natural disasters such as erosion, desertification, flooding etc. People can also be displaced as a result of human-caused disaster such as civil war, internal armed conflict, terrorism and so forth. In this situation, people are left with the option of fleeing their homes for safety.

According to OHCHR (2007), IDPs are persons or group of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border. According to Durosaro and Ajiboye (2011) there are two major components of the IDPs; the coercive or otherwise involuntary character of movement and the fact that such movement takes place within national borders. Some of the most common causes of involuntary movements are armed conflict, violence, human rights violation and disaster (NRC, 2009). Thus, it is important to note that these causes have in common that they give no choice to people but to leave their homes and deprive them of the most essential protection mechanisms, such as community networks, access to services and livelihoods. The second component of the IDPs is the movement within national borders. Since IDPs remain legally under the protection of national authorities of their habitual residence, unlike refugees who have been deprived of the protection of their state (country) of origin, they are expected to enjoy the same rights as the rest (undiplaced) of the population (Durosaro & Ajiboye, 2011).
When families are displaced they only run for the survival of their children and themselves. It is a situation where the victims face untold economic hardship, psychological trauma and social dislocation. In this regard, they need the assistance of the government and other humanitarian groups that could intervene to cushion the effect of hardship in order to bring succor to the IDPs.

**Theoretical Analysis**

Human security analysis is adopted. **Mahbub ul Haq** first drew global attention to the concept of human security. Human security perspective is a combination of threats associated with war, genocide, and the displacement of populations (Human Security Research Group, 2010). At a minimum, human security means freedom from violence and from the fear of violence. It is people centered, focusing on the safety and protection of individuals, communities, and their global environment (3P Human Security Policy Briefing, 2011). **United Nations Development Programmes** (UNDP) report conceptualized human security as providing safety for the people from hunger, diseases, oppression and other chronic threats as well as protecting them from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life (Shiro, 2007). The emergence of the human security approach as an area of developmental and intellectual discourse was the product of a convergence of various complex factors. This therefore challenged the traditional dominance of state-centric paradigm of security. Human security is an emerging paradigm for understanding global vulnerabilities whose proponents challenge the traditional notion of national security by arguing that the proper referent for security should be the individual rather than the state. The spread and consolidation of democratization and human rights norms opened a floodgate to reconsider the concept of security. The principal possible indicators of movement toward an individualized conception of security lie in the first place in the evolution of international society’s consideration of rights of individuals in the face of potential threats from states. The most obvious foci of analysis here are the UN Charter, the **UN Declaration of Human Rights** of 1948.

The UNDP's 1994 **Human Development Report**’s definition of human security argues that the scope of global security should be expanded to include threats in seven areas such as economic security which requires an assured basic income for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work; Food security that relies on both physical and economic access to basic food; Health security aims to guarantee a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles; and environmental security supports the protection of people from the short- and long-term ravages of nature, man-made threats in nature, and deterioration of the natural environment. Further, human security covers personal security which aimed at protecting people from physical violence, whether from the state or external states, from violent individuals and sub-state actors, from domestic abuse, or from predatory adults; community security protect people from the loss of traditional relationships and values and from sectarian and ethnic
violence; and Political security is concerned with whether people live in a society that honors their basic human rights. Each of the UNDP's seven categories of threats deserves adequate attention and resources.

There are two major ‘schools of thought’ that attempted to explicate the best practice that could guarantee human security. They are: "Freedom from Fear Approach" and "Freedom from Want Approach." These approaches clearly centre on what threats individuals should be protected from and over the appropriate mechanisms for responding to these threats. ‘Freedom from fear’ seeks to limit the practice of Human Security to protecting individuals from violent conflicts while recognizing that these violent threats are strongly associated with poverty, lack of state capacity and other forms of inequities. This approach however argues that limiting the focus to violence is a realistic and manageable approach towards human security. According to this approach, emergency assistance, conflict prevention and resolution, peace-building are prerequisite to human security. ‘Freedom from want’ on its own point of argument advocates a holistic approach in achieving human security and argues that the threat agenda should be broadened to include hunger, disease and natural disasters because they are inseparable concepts in addressing the root of human insecurity (UNDP, 1994) and they kill far more people than war, genocide and terrorism combined (Tadjbakhsh, 2007). Different from "Freedom from Fear", it expands the focus beyond violence with emphasis on development and security goals. Though these approaches to human security may appear to be opposites, they are complementary to each other rather than contradictory. After all, each of them emphasizes the security of individuals in society.

In fact, the analytical strength of this approach is based on its ability to situate the people at the heart of security. This therefore means that the welfare of the people should be paramount. In other words, the physical security of people as well as the socio-economic wellbeing of the people should be prioritized by the state. That is why human security approaches ask, “Stabilization for whom and for what purpose?” The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine details each state’s responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing - mass atrocities (3P Human Security Policy Briefing, 2011). Accordingly, if the State is unable to protect its population, the international community has a responsibility to help build state capacity for early-warning, mediating conflicts, security sector reform, and many other actions. In the face of violent attacks against the people, and the state does not have the capacity to handle the situation alone, and refuses to seek foreign assistance due to perhaps national pride and myth of indivisibility of sovereignty, the human rights of the people would continue to be violated. In this situation, human security, social cohesion, and national integration may be elusive.
Dwelling this security paradigm within the context of the present study is appropriate as it has analytical strength to explain the importance of the security of Nigerians. This, therefore, presupposes that the root cause of displacement as well as the plight of the IDPs should be made national and international agenda. Arguably, the security of the people is in question if issues such as natural and human disasters, terrorism, violent conflicts, insurgency etc that lead to displacement are beyond the capacity of the state to effectively tackle. The human rights and the security of the IDPs are jeopardized when the state fails to facilitate their protection and safety in a manner they (displaced persons) are ‘free from fear’ and ‘free from want’ as well as their dignity restored through rehabilitation, reintegration and resettlement.

Inadequate Military Action Prolonged Large Scale Terrorist Attacks in Nigeria

In the case of Nigeria, there was no such direct foreign military intervention, as Boko Haram continued to terrorize Nigeria and Nigerians to a point that serious-minded commentators, public analysts and security scholars began to lament on the extent to which Nigerian state had lost part of its territory to the Boko Haram insurgents. The absence of foreign assistance and lack of ‘political will’ by the President Goodluck Jonathan-led Federal government of Nigeria to decisively confront the terrorists is arguably believed to have combined independently. The ineffective military action by the Nigerian military was strongly considered to have made the insurgents to seize parts of North-Eastern Nigeria for a long time, especially in 2014 which was the peak of their nefarious violent activities. Up until February, Boko Haram had pushed government forces out of vast swathes of territory in Borno, Yobe, and Adamawa states after a rapid advance beginning around July 2014. Borno was worst affected, with as much as 70 per cent of the state’s territory outside of government control and Maiduguri almost surrounded (NSN Special Report, 2015). This ugly situation persisted unabated until the President Muhammadu Buhari administration that came to power in 2015, demonstrated conspicuous ‘political will’ to confront the sect squarely.

In the midst of the crisis, the former President, Goodluck Jonathan while speaking at an audience with the Special Representatives of the UN Secretary-General for West Africa and Central Africa, urged the United Nations to focus more on helping Nigeria with the rehabilitation and reconstruction of persons and communities affected by terrorism in Northern Nigeria rather than deploying an international force to the country (Premium Times, 2015). Egbulefu (2015) observed that the US was among the countries, whose officials have openly and severely flayed the Jonathan government over its perception of a lack of will to deal decisively with the Boko Haram insurgency. According to Egbulefu, when US government deployed it military to help Nigeria in the search of the Chibok girls abducted by the Boko Haram, the US government spelt it out that its military assistance was to be strictly on intelligence gathering and not for logistics or combat. However, in less than two weeks, US withdrew its men in very hazy circumstances
claiming lack of confidence on the Nigerian military. In a similar vein, French President François Hollande, ruled out any direct French military engagement as well as any over flights of Nigerian territory (Barlue, 2015). According to Lagneau (2015), France has taken more and more of an indirect role in the conflict in Nigeria, deploying troops to Diffa in Niger to support Nigerien forces, as well as a second detachment to Cameroon. It should be mentioned that the willingness of Chad fight Boko Haram as a result of security threat it posed, Chadian government led regional coalition to fight against group.

It was quite regrettable that the international community never taken the crisis in Nigeria as issue of global importance considering the reluctant attention great powers showcased. It is observed by many that the relationships of Nigeria had with other great powers in the international were frosted as a result of perceived lack of political will to tackle Boko Haram in the country. Nonetheless, Nigerian government has today made some significant giant strides to restore the integrity of Nigeria. With the help of Chad, Niger and Cameroon as well as technical training of Nigerian forces by the US, it has been reported that Nigeria military has significantly succeeded in displacing Boko Haram from their strongholds in north east. This development therefore gives a strong signal that the rehabilitation and resettlement of IDPs in the north east would be possible in the nearest future, as there is hope in the horizon.

**The Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) and Military Action in Nigeria**

The Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) between Nigeria, Chad and Niger was set up in 1998 in order to combat transnational crime in the Lake Chad region, but was mostly dormant until 2012, when it was reactivated in order to deal with Boko Haram (European Parliament, 2015). According to the parliament, in order to cope with the spread of terrorism in the region, the Paris Summit of May 2014, which brought together the heads of state of Benin, Chad, Cameroon, France, Niger and Nigeria, and representatives of the United States, United Kingdom and European Union, decided to enhance regional cooperation in the fight against Boko Haram, by means of coordinated patrols and border surveillance, pooling intelligence and exchanging relevant information. Starting in late January 2015, a coalition of military forces from Nigeria, Chad, Cameroon, and Niger began a counter-insurgency campaign against Boko Haram (Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia, 2015). In March 2015, Boko Haram lost control of the Northern Nigerian towns of Bama (Ewokor, 2015) and Gwoza believed to be their headquarters to the Nigerian army (BBC News Africa, 2015). According to BBC Africa, the Nigerian authorities said that they had taken back 11 of the 14 districts previously controlled by Boko Haram. In April, 2015, four Boko Haram camps in the Sambisa Forest were overrun by the Nigerian military who freed nearly 300 females (BBC, Africa, 2015). Accordingly, Boko Haram forces were believed to have retreated to the Mandara Mountains, along the Nigeria-Cameroon
According to the Office Head, Conflict Prevention and Risk Analysis Division, ISS Dakar, Théroux-Bénoni (2015), Nigeria agreed with Niger, Cameroon, Chad and Benin to send a 8,700-strong regional “Multinational Joint Task Force” (MNJTF) to fight Boko Haram which has killed thousands in northeastern Nigeria and is increasingly threatening neighboring countries.

According to the report, Nigerian authorities have previously opposed any foreign troops to help combat Boko Haram on Nigerian territory. However, Chadian troops entered Nigeria from Cameroon and engaged in intense fighting with the militant group in the town of Gamburu. This was possible, within the framework of a bilateral military agreement between Nigeria and Chad, not based on a multinational force operation (Théroux-Bénoni, 2015). In relation to the above, as for the AU-authorised MNJTF, it will not be deployed in Nigeria, but along Nigeria’s outside borders within neighbouring countries, with the aim of containing the terrorist group’s regional expansion.

According to Nigeria Weekly Security Report (2015), Nigerian military and multi-regional security forces continued their offensives against Boko Haram in the north-east, recording a number of significant successes, including the recovery of villages in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States. The Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF), comprised of troops from neighboring countries, is also enjoying a wave of successes against the insurgents and is increasingly gaining the support of the public and the media (Nigeria Weekly Security Report, 2015). It is identified that the military and civilian task force (CTF) are on top of the situation to ensure that the sect is defeated.

The Rehabilitation and Resettlement of IDPs not Achieved in Nigeria

Figures released by the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), an offshoot of the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), an independent, non-governmental humanitarian organization as of April 2015, ‘‘estimated that about 1,538,982 people that fled their homes in Nigeria were still living in internal displacement camps scattered across Nigeria (Okereke, 2015).

The rehabilitation process in IDP camps members has been very slow. There seems to be a deliberate attempt from the government to ignore these displaced persons; this is evident in several failed, unfulfilled promises made by government and the politicising of the situation of IDPs. Today, the IDP camps are emerging grounds for politicians to score cheap political popularity by visiting to donate scanty items while leaving out long term solutions (Rotimi, 2015).

In Nigeria, 2,241,484 IDPs identified in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Nasarawa states and Abuja through the IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) as of February 2016 (UNHCR Report, 2016).

Location of Displacement
The total number of IDPs identified in Abuja, Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Kaduna, Kano, Nasarawa, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara as of 29 February 2016 is 2,241,484 IDPs (334,608 households). In total 1,920,471 IDPs have been displaced by the insurgency mainly in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa states.

### Number of IDP Individuals and Households in Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDP locations</th>
<th>IDP Individuals</th>
<th>IDP Households</th>
<th>Average HHs size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuja</td>
<td>15,154</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>132,626</td>
<td>19,636</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>65,365</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>85,850</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>1,525,404</td>
<td>210,293</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombe</td>
<td>26,233</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>40,688</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>11,853</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa</td>
<td>37,953</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td>68,365</td>
<td>12,226</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraba</td>
<td>45,587</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
<td>139,550</td>
<td>31,908</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamfara</td>
<td>46,856</td>
<td>8,678</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>2,241,484</td>
<td>334,608</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- 2,241,484 individuals (334,608 households) were identified in Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Gombe, Taraba, Yobe, Nasarawa, Plateau, Kaduna, Kano, Zamfara, states and Abuja.
- In total, 1,920,471 IDPs captured through the DTM assessments have been displaced by the insurgency (85.70% of the total IDP population).
- Majority of the IDPs are identified in Borno (1,525,404) followed by Yobe (139,550) and Adamawa (132,626).
- 54.53% of the IDP population are children and 26.01% are five(5) years old or younger.
- 92% of IDPs live in host communities while 8% live in camps.
- 84 Camps and camp-like sites have been identified through the DTM assessments.


- 1,188,018 IDPs (149,357 households) were identified in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe states. (DTM)
- Another 47,276 IDPs (5910 households) were identified in Plateau, Nasarawa, Abuja, Kano and Kaduna states. (NEMA)
- Total 1,235,294 IDPs identified in northern Nigeria.
- The highest number of IDPs are in Borno (672,714 IDPs), followed by Adamawa (220,159 IDPs) and Yobe (135,810 IDPs).
- Number of IDPs by LGA (States of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe).
- The IDP population is composed of 53% women and 47% men.
- 56% of the total IDP population are children of which more than half are up to 5 years old, while 42% are adults.
- 92% of IDPs were displaced by the insurgency.
- The majority of the current IDP population was displaced in 2014 (79%).
- The IDPs come mainly from Borno (62%), Adamawa (18%) and Yobe (13%).
- 87% of IDPs live with host families while 13% live in camps.

Considering the comparison between 2015 and 2016 IOM report, it is evidently convincing that as of 2015 were still displaced as a result of insurgency. The increase recorded in 2016 is a pointer to the fact that rehabilitation and resettlement has not taken place in Nigeria, as number of IDPs has increased significantly.

Though the return of IDPs in Nigeria has not commenced in earnest, it is believed that the federal government of Nigeria has planned to embark on a holistic and well coordinated approach to ensure that IDPs are rehabilitated and resettled back to their liberated communities, though it is assumed by many that Boko Haram has not been totally defeated as the ‘Evil Sambisa Forest’ continues to be the hide out the sect. Also, transnational operation of the group is a source of worry to many people. However, government has appeared resolute in defeating the sect.

In continuation of efforts to provide relief to residents of liberated communities in the North East, officials of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), North-East have delivered sizeable quantities of food and non-food items to GSS Benishek IDP camp in Kaga LGA. Humanitarian organisations have also stepped up their supplies to existing IDP camps in the region ahead of plans to relocate IDPs to liberated communities. Consequently, the Federal Government Inter-Ministerial Committee (FG-IMC) on resettlement of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the North-East has set conditions for return of displaced persons to their liberated communities. The resettlement of IDPs will only be effected after assessments on the level of stability and socio-economic activities in the affected areas have been conducted (NSRP, 2016).

The strain of caring for the displaced is already taxing the state and community’s resources, prompting calls for the reconstruction of destroyed communities and the resettlement of the displaced as soon as possible (Matfess, 2015). Though, the rehabilitation and resettlement process has not started in earnest, the Nigerian government and other humanitarian groups have acknowledged the fact that caring and providing for the IDPs is a herculean task. Presidential spokesman, Femi Adesina, quoted President Buhari as saying on April 21, 2016 while receiving the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Samantha Power: the federal government is compiling a comprehensive data on all Internally Displaced Persons and Nigerian refugees with a view to speeding up their resettlement (Wakili, 2016). According to the report, Buhari told his visitor that the compilation of reliable data on the IDPs
and refugees was being handled by designated federal government agencies, the military and other security agencies. According to Adesina “Now we are working on getting a comprehensive data of all the people in the camps so that the government and NGOs will be properly briefed on where and how to support them,” Buhari said. The president said IDPs, who were into farming before they were displaced by the Boko Haram, would be mobilised and assisted by the Ministry of Agriculture to return to their farms. Nigerian Senate on Tuesday, 2016 directed its Committee on Appropriation to allocate the sum of N10 billion under the Service Wide Vote (SWV) for relocation and resettlement of the IDPs returnees, after expressing worry at the welfare of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe states. In an effort to see that the rehabilitation and resettlement of IDPs is actualized the Federal Government led by President Muhammadu Buhari disclosed that a committee to rehabilitate infrastructure and resettle Internally Displaced Persons, IDPs, in the North-East geo-political zone will soon be inaugurated (Nda-Isiaiah, 2016). The committee, to be led by a frontline statesman, Lt. Gen Theophilus Yakubu Danjuma (rtd) will also include Africa’s richest man, Aliko.

There are indications that the plan to embark on resettlement of IDPs is achievable considering the recent victories recorded by the Nigerian Army. Based on this, they have changed the face of humanitarian efforts which may result to rehabilitation and resettlement of the IDPs.

**Provision of Adequate Security for the Protection and Safety of IDPs**

In Nigeria, provision of IDP camps is a common practice, as this appears to be the most important measure the government can take to regulate and provide succor to the IDPs. For instance, 8% of IDPs live in the IDP camps (IOM, 2016). Regrettably, IDPs and affected communities have witnessed horrendous atrocities (Protection Sector Working Group (PSWG), 2015). As a result, psychological trauma among both is apparent. According to PSWG, a major concern is the conduct of security forces, against which allegations of human rights violations have been made. Despite the Government’s proclamation to investigate and bring perpetrators to justice, numerous violations continue to be reported (Protection Sector Working Group (PSWG), 2015). In the past few months there has been an intensification of terrorist attacks by Boko Haram in Nigeria and Cameroon, including directly in IDP camps (UNHCR, 2016). In addition to physical violence that takes place in the IDP camps, it has been widely reported that IDP women and girls also face Gender-Based Violence (GBV) whether in camps or in host communities, particularly at night. It is claimed that measures have been taken to reinforce security in and around IDP Camps. According to UNHCR report, the UNHCR Assistant High Commissioner for Protection, Volker Turk, visited Nigeria from 18-22 February 2016, focusing on the insurgency-ravaged northeast. During his meetings with federal and state authorities, Mr. Türk stressed the necessity for Nigeria to further address the protection needs of IDPs particularly with respect to the voluntary character of returns and relocations. In the same vein,
he also expressed the availability of UNHCR to work with the States in the facilitation of tripartite framework for the return and reintegration processes.

Dietrich (2015) reaffirmed that “given IDPs’ increased vulnerability including the September 11, 2015 attack on an IDP camp in Adamawa state, IDPs have called on the government to increase security measures in order to ensure the protection of IDPs and humanitarian actors in camps. While most of the individuals are fleeing violence, many reported that they are also fleeing a humanitarian crisis defined by food insecurity, loss of livelihoods, insufficient services, and inadequate protection. Considering the level of insecurity in IDP camps, it has been observed that many IDPs had a heightened sense of personal security, and described their self-protection strategies in the camps like this: “We protect ourselves by creating well-fortified and secured camps to safeguard lives and property, conducting aggressive intelligence gathering on activities of insurgents, educating ourselves about humanitarian activities like free medical treatment, and, condemning erring personnel of rape and sexual offences accordingly (Dietrich, 2015).”

Challenges Constraining Effective Management of IDPs in Nigeria

There are a number of challenges that have negatively affected IDPs management in Nigeria. These challenges are complex and overlapping.

**Funding**

In a recent survey research carried out, respondents disclosed that although IDPs management agencies in Nigeria get funds mainly through revenue, international aids and donations, the funds they get are more often than not insufficient to meet the increasing needs of IDPs in the country (Osagioduwa & Oluwakorede, 2016). Consequently, insufficiency of funds results in deficiency in manpower, commodities, infrastructure, equipment and mobility. Where there is paucity of funds, standard facilities will be unavailable and the agencies will be inefficient. The under supply of funds is attributable to low budgeting for emergencies. This therefore justifies the position of Olagunju cited in Osagioduwa and Oluwakorede (2016) that government in Nigeria does not have adequate machinery in place to address IDPs issues and the organizations created by the government possess minimal capacity to handle IDPs related problems.

**Corruption**

Corrupt office holders in government, and in IDPs management agencies alike, have been accused on several occasions diverting funds and relief materials meant for IDPs for their
personal use and for their relatives or friends. A situation that reduces the efficiency of the agencies concerned in managing IDPs.

Overlapping IDPs Management Institutions

Improperly defined, unclear and overlapping policies and institutions have been identified as a challenge confronting IDPs management agencies. The overlapping responsibilities hinder agencies in the discharge of their duties. In terms of overlapping institutions, it was noticed from the testimony of key informants from government agencies that the government has established several IDPs management institutions or agencies with similar mandates and structures (Osagioduwa & Oluwakorede, 2016). According to them, a clear example cited by key informants is that of the National Commission for Refugees (NCFR). Originally, this institution was saddled with the responsibility of catering for refugees in the country and not IDPs. It is arguable understandable that as a result of upsurge of IDPs in the country, its mandate has been extended to include the responsibilities of NEMA/SEMA. Today, NCFR has eventually but nominally metamorphosed into the National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons. Considering the mandates and organizational structures of the National Commission for Refugees and NEMA one can opine that both them are analogous. Based on this, both agencies are left with the question of who has the responsibility of doing this or that, what has been done, and what has not been done already. In a situation like this a significant part of the job risks being left undone. Beyond the overlapping functions of the above stated organizations established by the government, the partnering NGOs and other humanitarian organizations equally get confused as to which of the two government establishments to be work with.

Attitude of Host Communities

Sometimes, as internally displaced persons over-burden existing community services, resources and job or economic livelihood opportunities, tension arises between the two populations, making effective local integration difficult (Kangiwa, 2012). Cost of living in host communities increases, especially cost of food, housing, healthcare and education. In spite of this ugly situation, it has been observed that a good number of host communities are usually friendly with IDPs. However, this friendly attitude usually gets frosted whenever food and non-food items supplied to the IDPs either from the government agencies or humanitarian groups. As a result of poverty and hunger members of the host communities of the IDP camp always struggle to have a share from the supplied items. Regrettably, taken cognizance of the likely consequence of refusal by the agencies, which may lead to antagonism, frustration, hostility and physical violence at the detriment of the IDPs, members of the host communities are allowed to benefit from the items. This therefore, reducing or shorting the ration meant for the IDPs. Durosaro and Ajiboye (2011) observed that influx of non-displaced young people who took advantage of
porous IDP camps to enjoy humanitarian services and later leave for their stable homes or businesses, thus making it difficult to ordinarily identify the real target individuals. This observation is in tandem with the findings of Ladan (2013) that fractions between IDPs and host communities resulting from concentration of assistance to IDPs and scarcity of resources for distribution are major hindrances to IDPs management.

Conclusions

IDPs in Nigeria are yet to be rehabilitated and resettled. As reported, 8% of IDPs lives in camps thereby making it possible for the insurgents to carry out direct physical attacks. It is imperative to note at this point that management of IDPs has not been an easy task especially in Nigeria that takes dominant position in IDPs management. Nigeria is under the attack of insurgency and also faces humanitarian challenges. The inability to adequately manage IDPs is tantamount to human rights abuse as well as human security challenges. This therefore presupposes that absence of proper management of IDPs would make them prone to social vices, violent conflicts and other several complexities that are antithetical to cordial relationships and sustainable human and national development. Nevertheless, the management of IDPs should not be left in the hands of any one group. At this point, it is timely desirable that the collaboration of government agencies, NGOs, foreign humanitarian organizations etc should be ensued with the vigour it deserves.

Recommendations

Having observed certain challenges as well as the root cause of insurgency in Nigeria, the study provides the following as practicable recommendations.

- There is an urgent need to embark on a holistic and coordinated approach with the help of foreign nations to effectively engage in technical and military actions in order to completely displace Boko Haram insurgents from the ‘evil’ sambisa forest which is believed to be the deadly haven and enclave of the terrorists.
- Government should also be more proactive in the reconstruction of destroyed houses of IDPs in their various communities so that they would have confidence to return home.
- There should be proper coordination of humanitarian items provided for IDPs so that the scenario in which food and non-food items made for IDPs are diverted to places they are not meant for would discouraged.
- Governments of Nigeria should consider the occurrence of displacement and protection of IDPs as being unavoidable. Therefore, it should be proactive rather than being retroactive. To demonstrate this, pre-crisis or disaster safe areas should be designated for IDPs specifically. This is to ensure that government would be able to respond swiftly in case of any displacement of people. This does not suggest that immovable structures
should be erected in these set out areas, but when displacement occurs tents could be erected in order to temporarily accommodate the displaced persons.

- The national and state budgetary allocation for displacement in Nigeria should be given a separate attention from allocation for disaster and/or emergency. This is possible since not all disaster and/or emergency result in displacement. If the separation is made, there is every possibility that more financial allocation would be made available for effective IDPs management in Nigeria.

- Governments of Nigeria should work hand in hand with humanitarian organizations, stakeholders, NGOs etc to sensitize and re-orient IDPs host communities on the need to be accommodating and hospitable. This is necessary to ensure the safety of IDPs in the host communities as well as discourage situation where people of the communities unduly interfere in the affairs of IDPs. If this is done, the host communities are most likely to be more cooperative with both the IDPs and their managers alike.

- Among other things, the forces from Cameroon, Chad, Niger, Benin and Nigeria need to work collectively to stamp out extremist jihadist group instead of states operating on their own accord.

REFERENCES


Matfess, H. (2015). Nigeria is Winning the Battle with Boko Haram but it is still Losing the War. Quartz Africa.


The AU Kampala Convention (2009) on the Protection and Assistance to IDPs


Wakili, I. (2016). Buhari: We’re Compiling Data for IDPs Resettlement Daily Trust, Friday, April 22.