

The **Protection Monitoring Snapshot** provides an **area-based analysis** of **household-level data** collected by protection partners under the North-East Nigeria Protection Monitoring System (NEN-PMS). The analysis provides an overview of the main threats affecting the population in the location, the differential effects of the threats on population groups, and their capacities, or lack thereof, to withstand the threats. Details on the NEN-PMS methodology can be found [here](#).

In the months of May and June 2023, 4 NEN-PMS partners conducted quantitative assessments with **325 households, comprising 1591 persons including 253 HHs of internally displaced individuals**, 57 host community HHs, 9 returnees and 1 refugee in Gwoza Local Government Area (LGA).

**MOST CRITICAL PROTECTION RISKS:** The NEN-PMS data in Gwoza for May and June 2023 suggests that households confront the following priority protection risks:

- **Risk 1: Attacks on civilians, other unlawful killings, and attacks on civilian infrastructures**
- **Risk 2: Theft, extorsions, eviction or destruction of personal property**
- **Risk 3: Sexual and gender-based violence.**
- **Risk 4: Child and Early Marriages**
- **Risk 5: Other types of protection risks followed closely by discrimination and stigmatization, denial of resources, opportunities, services and/or humanitarian access.**

## **CONTEXT**

### **Displacement:**

- 57% of the displaced respondents residing in Gwoza has been displaced within the state at least one time and 35% of them have been displaced two times. Interestingly, Gwoza is the primary area of displacement (destination of internally displaced people's movement) among all Borno LGAs based on data collected in May and June 2023. The majority of households in Gwoza (70%) have been displaced for at least 3-4 years. The major reasons of displacement are attacks by NSAGs (78%) and attacks by government armed forces (13%), qualifying their situation as conflict-driven, protracted displacement. Compared to the average situation of interviewed households in the BAY states, the population's displacement in Gwoza represents 17 percent of the overall population displaced in the same period. The displacement to Gwoza LGA was more regularly caused by NSAG activities (comprising 11% of the total NSAG activity in all LGAs monitored during the same period) and attack by government forces (comprising 8.4% of attacks by government in all LGAs monitored during the same period).
- It seems that most of the IDPs displaced at this time have been within Gwoza LGAs boundaries based on the top areas of displacement data.

### **Household vulnerabilities:**

- 474 HH population interviewed in Gwoza (55%) has at least 1 vulnerable member within their household, ranging 180 the BAY states' average (8.3%). The most prevalent vulnerabilities of household members are children supporting the HH by working child labour 17.54%, child not attending school or out of school child 12.82% and single women with dependent children who faces challenges in supporting her HH 11.80%.
- Lack of financial resources to pay for schooling including for uniform books 38.10% and lack of teachers 16.67% are major reasons why school children do not go to school.

## **MAIN THREATS AFFECTING THE POPULATION IN THE LGA**

### **Protection threats**

- Approximately 16 percent of monitored households reported a protection incident in the last six months with around 22% of the incidents reported as attacks on civilians and other unlawful killings and attacks on civilians' infrastructures for Gwoza. Community leaders represent the main reported perpetrators (27%) followed by members of community committee (18%), humanitarian organisations (11%), and the police (11%). Complaints are mainly reported to community leaders (25%) and through a complaint and desk feedback service provider (22%), which also shows that perpetrators of protection incidents are also the ones who receive most of the reports about any violations and may easily use this access for their own benefits. This may enhance risks and community tensions.
- Population perception of safety in Gwoza for the months of May and June is very good as 72% (elderly 18.3%, men and boys 17.5%, women and girls 17.9%, people living with disabilities 18.3%) feel very safe. However, 19% (elderly people 4.3%, men and boys 5.5%, people living with disabilities 4.4%, women and girls 4.9%) somewhat unsafe and less than 2% (men and boys 0.5%, elderly persons 0.4%, people living with disabilities 0.5%, women and girls 0.4%) felt very unsafe. 62.5% consider that Gwoza would be somehow unsafe due to proximity to conflict zone 19%, presence of NSAG 17%, criminal activities 11%, GBV 8%. Women and girls interviewed in Gwoza reported that they felt somehow unsafe due to ethnic, religious or social bias (women accounted 100% of those who responded with this response) and actual secondary occupation of housing, land and property (66.7% out of those who gave this response) and presence of NSAGs (64.5% out of who respondent with this reason). This shows that men and women have different experiences in communities. Locations where women feel most unsafe in Gwoza are in some blocks in camps and communities (women accounted 71% out of all who responded with this response), houses and tents (63% out of all who responded with this reason) and other places (83% of all who responded with this answer) while men are feeling the most unsafe in some camps and community streets which may showcase control exercised over women who feel more unsafe in locations where they have 'settled' or could considered 'homes'.

**Origins, drivers, and nature of the threats, including actors' responsibility:**

- While 81% of HH in Gwoza reported that there were no restrictions of movements within their current location and 74% reported no restrictions of movement to go out of their current locations, 50% of HH reported that curfews and travels restrictions, additionally to lack of civil documentation and travel documents (18%), were among main causes of some restrictions for them. 64% of those who reported lack of civil documentation as one of their main concerns are women – which could mean further risks to access facilities or even impairing their access to justice due to a lack of proof of identity and belonging. Based on the data collected, 79% of the HH interviewed faced problems sometimes due to these displaying vulnerabilities in Gwoza related to the crucial role it can play in reducing risks of stigma, discrimination and ensuring social inclusion of each individual.
- There is no significant reporting of tensions between communities, as social cohesion is depicted in Gwoza as being good (61%) to very good (17%). Only 13% of respondents described it as somewhat bad, this percentage may still show existent community tensions in Gwoza although the overall atmosphere shows positive social cohesion. Nevertheless, 73% of HH illustrate that consequences of lack of cohesion could lead to increased violence to community members.
- While HHs in Gwoza highlighted that restricted movements can lead to limited access to livelihoods opportunities (25%), no access to livelihoods (14%) and limited access to owning land and property (11%), main priorities mentioned by HHs are food (25.99%), livelihoods and vocational trainings (20.07%) and NFIs (16.45%) in line with prevalent overall needs across the BAY states. Furthermore, households' vulnerability seems to be linked to a reported lack of awareness on WASH assistance (30%), NFI assistance (29%) and mental health and psychosocial services (29%). Compared to the BAY states' average, interviewed households in Gwoza are slightly more aware of the different services provided through humanitarian assistance than in other LGAs.

MAY - JUNE 2023 / QUARTER 2 | GWOZA

- A minority of interviewed households (6%) in Gwoza indicated that humanitarian services do not respond to their household needs at all, while a majority (80%) assessed them to be somewhat meeting their needs leaving a gap to fill to ensure 100% satisfaction as it may highlight lack of consultation to improve services provided. Importantly, households in Gwoza cannot or can only partially access services with difficulties related to their highest priority needs of food (77%) and livelihoods (82%), likely pointing to the absence of services due to the overstretched response and/or barriers to access.
- Community leaders are the most preferred channel in Gwoza to receive information on humanitarian assistance (32%), followed by discussions provided by humanitarian organizations to the communities (22%) highlighting the central role of community stakeholders in meeting people's basic household needs but also showing acceptance and will to have clear communication about programmes provided in Gwoza. As noted above, while both humanitarian and community leaders may represent a trusted channel of communication, they also remain a threat to the population. For humanitarians, it could be linked to modalities of interventions while community leaders may use those trusted channels for their own benefits.

## **EFFECTS OF THE MAIN THREATS ON THE AFFECTED POPULATION**

### **Characteristics of the affected population**

- Probably in connection to the general threat resulting from the absence of rule of law and state authorities, households report a worrying almost-total absence of documentation for housing, land and property (HLP, 88). Interestingly in Gwoza, 76% of women among HH members interviewed possess HLP documentations. Nevertheless, 21% of HH reported to not possess any civils IDs, and about 45% reported that only some HH members have their documentation. It seems that 39% of those HLP documentation possessed were oral agreements only but no document and 27% were documents provided by traditional authorities which may be easily contradicted in case of crisis or new displacements creating heightened vulnerabilities for HHs.

### **Consequence on social cohesion**

- While social cohesion seems positive as mentioned above, all households consider that any disruption to it would bring an increased risk of violence to community members. This aspect is significant given that households reported that there would be no strategies to deal with lack of safety (45%) or that strategies in place would not be very effective (40%) which explains further risks of community tensions that could emerge as three main strategies reported have been community support groups (22%) and community coordination with military at local level or local authorities (16% each) exhibiting different perceptions towards them probably due to ethnic divisions and/or status (displacements/host community).

### **Consequences on movement:**

- The major consequences of the limitations of movement relate to limited access to livelihoods opportunities (25%), no access to livelihood opportunities (14%) and limited access to own land and property (11%) in Gwoza as highlighted in several sections of the snapshot.

### **Affected population's coping strategies**

- The importance of social cohesion to protect the population from existing threats is even more pertinent considering that a significant number of households would adopt negative coping mechanisms in the absence of services for primary needs including selling off their own belonging (26%) or selling off received items from humanitarian assistance (24%) rather than requesting support to friends or families or even humanitarian organizations showing a sense of distrust.

## **CAPACITIES OF THE AFFECTED POPULATION TO COPE WITH THE THREATS**

---

### **Household capacities:**

- While there is a majority of HHs interviewed who know that humanitarian aid is not transactional (75%), there are still 6% who do not know how to report PSEA incidents and 55% that still need clarifications. 34% of people do not know how to safely report or complaints which is one of the main barriers HH faced to report on SEA followed by perceived impression that reporting it would not lead to any actions (24%) or that assistance will stop (18%).
- Data relating to support received in response to reported protection incidents is better than other areas: 19% of interviewed households report that they did not receive required support while 79% partially received required service and 2% received full range of required support and services – while generally in all LGAs 39% respondents did not receive any required support or services. While reporting on protection incidents in Gwoza is quite low (16%), service provided mainly are food assistance (16%), legal support (16%) and shelters/NFI (16%).

### **Local networks and systems support:**

- Community leaders (31%) and meetings/discussion with humanitarian organisations in community (22%) are the preferred channel of communication to receive information on humanitarian services. This tendency to rely on local networks and systems is further confirmed by the general lack of confidence (61%) and language challenges (12%) reported as barriers to complain about humanitarian services. Nevertheless, as communication by humanitarians in communities were still considered as a practice mainly used by the population, it may mean that presence of NGOs still can serve to establish system of trust.