Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) - Yobe State

CONTEXT

As the protracted crisis in North-East Nigeria progressed in its tenth year in 2019, humanitarian needs in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe (BAY) States remain dire and multi-faceted. The conflict has resulted in 7.1 million individuals in need of humanitarian assistance\(^1\). 80% of internally displaced persons (IDPs) are located in Borno State only, with a majority living in urban host communities. In addition to this humanitarian landscape in accessible areas, most recently the humanitarian community has identified around 1,000,000 individuals staying in hard-to-reach areas with little hope to be reached by humanitarian assistance\(^2\).

To respond to persisting information gaps on humanitarian needs severity and to inform further the 2020 response planning, United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)'s Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG), with support from REACH, conducted a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment in the BAY States. Data collection took place between June 17\(^{th}\) and July 30\(^{th}\) 2019.

METHODOLOGY

Data collection comprised of a total of 8,019 household (HH) interviews. This assessment used a two-stage cluster sampling designed to collect data with a confidence level of 90% and a margin of error of 10% for all accessible areas within a Local Government Area (LGA) (not generalizable for each population group at LGA level). In Yobe State, 2,027 surveys were kept for final analysis after cleaning.

The Yobe State level factsheet mostly presents composite analysis at the sectoral and inter-sectoral level, such as living standards gaps (LSG) in food security & livelihoods, water, sanitation & hygiene (WASH), health, shelter, education, protection, early recovery & livelihoods; in addition to inter-sectoral composite indicators such as a vulnerability index, an impact indicator and a coping capacity gap indicator. Indicators feeding into the composite analysis have been selected together with relevant sectors and/or inter-sectoral coordination platforms.

Please find a more detailed methodology section in Annex 1 of this factsheet.

Assessment sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- IDP:</td>
<td>2,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Returnee:</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-displaced:</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Government Areas: 16 (out of 17)\(^3\)

Demographics highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female-headed households:</th>
<th>Average household size:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child-headed households:</th>
<th>HH including chronically ill/disabled member:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS INDEX (MSNI)

% of households with a MSNI severity score of at least 3: \(63\%\)

% of households per MSNI severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households</th>
<th>Severity score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>No or minimal (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MSNI is the final decision tree analysis from the MSNA analytical framework that allows for categorization of household severity of needs. It aims to measure households’ overall severity of humanitarian needs vis-à-vis their living standards, capacity gaps, and impact. It estimates severity of humanitarian needs (intensity) and proportion of households in each severity category (magnitude).

% of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, per primary driver of score:

\(^1\) OCHA, 2019 Humanitarian Needs Overview

\(^2\) OCHA, 2020 Global Humanitarian Overview

\(^3\) Only 16 out of 17 LGAs in Yobe State could be assessed due to access constraints / lack of partners active in these LGAs.

\(^4\) Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).

see Annex for details on methodology

see Annex 2 for details on how to read sunburst graphs

INTER-SECTOR WORKING GROUP

REACH
% of households per MSNI severity score, per population group:

- Non-displaced
- Returnees
- IDPs

% of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 63%
- Returnees: 49%
- IDPs: 66%

% of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, in Yobe State:

% of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced HHs
- IDP HHs
- Returnee HHs

% of households per primary driver of MSNI severity score per population group:

- Non-displaced HHs
- IDP HHs
- Returnee HHs

see Annex 2 for details on how to read sunburst graphs
% of households with an FSL LSG severity score of at least 3: 20%

# of households with an FSL LSG severity score of at least 3: 69,988

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

% of households per FSL LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>43%</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Stress-level</td>
<td>No or minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households per FSL LSG severity score, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 19%
- Returnees: 21%
- IDPs: 33%

The indicators primarily driving the severe and extreme LSG severity scores for FSL were barriers to accessing food and access to a market. Across Yobe, commonly reported barriers to accessing food include food items and transport being too expensive, the market being too far, and no food distributions available. Additionally, LGAs in Northern Yobe were more likely to report lack of access to a market and low food consumption scores.

% of households with an FSL LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 19%
- Returnees: 21%
- IDPs: 33%

The FSL composite indicator consists of food consumption, reduced coping strategy index, primary source of fuel, barriers to accessing food, access to land and agriculture inputs.

Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).
% of households with a WASH LSG severity score of at least 3: 41%

# of households with a WASH LSG severity score of at least 3: 143,474

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 16%
- Severe (severity score 3): 24%
- Stress-level (severity score 2): 39%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 21%

% of households with a WASH LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 42%
- Returnees: 21%
- IDPs: 32%

The indicators driving the severe and extreme LSG for WASH were the use of unimproved water sources such as open wells, practice of open defecation, and lack of hand soap. A high percentage of households across Yobe reported only using water when washing hands. In Yobe, households reported the practice of open defecation among adults and children, but it was especially high in Northern Yobe LGAs.

% of households with a WASH LSG severity score of at least 3, in Yobe State:

7 The WASH composite indicator consists of water source, access to latrine and use of hand soap.
8 Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).
9 Discrepancy between the overall MSNI severity scores 3 and 4 percentage and the category disaggregation is due to rounding to the unit.
The health composite indicator consists of barriers to accessing health, distance to health facilities, illnesses, maternal health and immunization. Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets). Discrepancy between the overall MSNI severity scores 3 and 4 percentage and the category disaggregation is due to rounding to the unit.
% of households with a shelter LSG severity score of at least 3: **23%**

# of households with a shelter LSG severity score of at least 3: **80,486**

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

### % of households per shelter LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Non-displaced</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress-level</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or minimal</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicators driving the severe and extreme LSG for shelter were lack of access to adequate shelters and severity of damage of shelters. A high percentage of households in Yobe reported living in makeshift shelters. Some LGAs in Yobe in particular reported high proportions of households with high levels of damage to shelters including in Machina, Nangere, Tarmua, and Fika.

### % of households with a shelter LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Non-displaced</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shelter composite indicator consists of type of shelter, ownership of shelter and damage to shelter.

14 Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).

15 Discrepancy between the overall MSNI severity scores 3 and 4 percentage and the category disaggregation is due to rounding to the unit.
% of households with an education LSG severity score of at least 3: 36%

# of households with an education LSG severity score of at least 3: 125,977

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 1%
- Severe (severity score 3): 35%
- Stress-level (severity score 2): 32%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 31%

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

The indicators driving the severe and extreme LSG for education were households with children out of school (formal and informal) and barriers to accessing education. The most commonly reported barriers to accessing education were cost of school fees, uniforms, the poor quality of teaching, and distance to school.

% of households with an education LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 37%
- Returnees: 19%
- IDPs: 31%

% of households per education LSG severity score, per population group:
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The education composite indicator consists of children currently attending education, children who have never attended formal education, barriers to accessing education.

Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).
% of households with a protection LSG severity score of at least 3: 1%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 0%
- Severe (severity score 3): 1%
- Stress-level (severity score 2): 17%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 82%

# of households with a protection LSG severity score of at least 3: 3,499

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

% of households with a protection LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 0%
- Returnees: 1%
- IDPs: 2%

The indicators driving the severe and extreme LSG for protection were psychological distress, movement restrictions and loss of documentation. A high percentage of households reported one or several children feeling a combination of tired, depressed, angry and reduced interest. Throughout Yobe, high proportions of households reported loss of legal documentation for both adults and children.

% of households with a protection LSG severity score of at least 3, in Yobe State:

- Non-displaced: %
- Returnees: %
- IDPs: %

The protection composite indicator consists of experience of security incidents, movement restrictions, loss of documentation, risk of human trafficking, risk of eviction, missing family members and psychosocial distress. Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used in Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).

Low protection needs can be explained by various reasons as mentioned in the box on p.12.
% of households with an ERLS LSG severity score of at least 3: 42%

# of households with an ERLS LSG severity score of at least 3: 146,974

% of households per ERLS LSG severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 4%
- Severe (severity score 3): 38%
- Stress-level (severity score 2): 48%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 10%

see Annex 2 for details on methodology

% of households with an ERLS LSG severity score of at least 3, per population group:
- Non-displaced: 43%
- Returnees: 23%
- IDPs: 38%

The indicators driving the severe and extreme LSG for ERLS were high levels of debt, and no physical cash. Additionally, most government and police services were over 2km away and low proportions of households reported having access to waste management services.

% of households with an ERLS LSG severity score of at least 3, in Yobe State:

The ERLS composite indicator consists of source of income, having debt, access to cash, waste management services, banking, mobile phone and internet access, and public services.

Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used in Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).
% of households with a CG severity score of at least 3: 23%

% of households per CG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 7%
- Severe (severity score 3): 16%
- Stress-level (severity score 2): 36%
- No or minimal (severity score 1): 41%

The indicators primarily driving the capacity gap were negative coping strategies for insufficient water, lack of income, and low reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) score. The most commonly reported strategies for lack of income included spending savings, borrowing money, and purchasing food on credit. Additionally, the most commonly reported strategies for lack of water included reducing washing and drinking water, and fetching water from farther away.

% of households per CG severity score, per population group:

- Non-displaced: 23%
- Returnees: 20%
- IDPs: 17%

% of households with a CG severity score of at least 3, in Yobe State:

The coping gap composite indicator consists of the reduced Coping Strategy Index, main strategies for insufficient water, income and fuel, medical treatment, and NFI needs.

Figure obtained by applying the percentage on the population figure used for the Nigeria 2019 MSNA sample (using Vaccination Tracking System, IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix datasets).
Yobe State Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates for 0-59 months infants, per livelihood domain (secondary data):25

- Southern Yobe: 13.3
- Northern Yobe: 12.6
- Central Yobe: 12.6
- Yobe overall: 13.0

Fune, Gujba, and Fika LGAs showed the highest proportions of HHs presenting a risk of labour exploitation:

- 16% of HHs in Fune, 15% of HHs in Gujba mentioned that someone in the HH worked for someone else without getting paid.
- 12% of HHs in Gujba, 5% of HHs in Fune and Fika mentioned that someone in the HH received less payment than promised for work.
- 7% of HHs in Fune, 6% of HHs in Bade, Bursari and Fika mentioned that someone in the HH worked excessive hours.

The indicators primarily driving vulnerability in Yobe were a high percentage of IDP female headed households and those including a member who was chronically ill or disabled. LGAs with the highest proportion of vulnerable households were Bursari, Gulani, and Karasuwa.

The indicators primarily driving the severe impact severity score were no access to phone network, communities living in an area with facilities affected by conflict and IDP households reporting movement restrictions.
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% of households with LSG severity scores of at least 3 in one or more sectors, per population group:

- 100% of households were found to have at least one LSG severity score and/or a CG severity score of at least 3:
  - 73% of households were found to have at least one LSG severity score of at least 3 but a CG severity score lower than 3;
  - 3% of households were found to have both at least one LSG severity score and a CG severity score of at least 3;
  - 3% of households were found to have all LSG severity scores lower than 3 but a CG score of at least 3.

Most common needs profiles of households found to have LSG severity scores of at least 3 (% of households):

100% of households were found to have at least one LSG severity score and/or a CG severity score of at least 3:

- 73% of households were found to have at least one LSG severity score of at least 3 but a CG severity score lower than 3;
- 24% of households were found to have both at least one LSG severity score and a CG severity score of at least 3;
- 3% of households were found to have all LSG severity scores lower than 3 but a CG score of at least 3.

As observed on the radar graph above, while the sectoral LSG composite indicator for Protection was informed by the Protection sector and sub-sectors, it resulted in low % overall and compared to other sectoral LSG. Explanations for this include:

- General under-reporting of protection information through HH surveys;
- Low interplay of indicators within the Protection LSG composite indicator;
- Low prevalence of protection issues in some specific areas.
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The Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) is a crisis-wide assessment that aims to provide a broad understanding of humanitarian needs in the areas and for the population groups assessed. In North-East Nigeria, for the 2nd year in a row, REACH facilitated this MSNA in all the accessible areas, and covering all population groups in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States - non-displaced, IDP and returnee households. Due to the deteriorated security environment, the 2019 MSNA had a lower geographical coverage than the 2018 MSNA. Notably, teams could not cover Abadam, Guzamala, Kukawa, Marte, and Nganzai LGAs in Borno State; as well as Geidam LGA in Yobe State. More than a mere logistical impediment to field operations, this should be considered as a findings in itself.

The Multi-Sector Needs Index (MSNI) is an analysis approach proposed by REACH for the 2019 MSNAs, which incorporates some elements of the draft Joint Inter-Sectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF), an analytical framework being developed at global level aiming to enhance understanding of needs of affected populations at a more inter-sectoral level. The Nigeria MSNA analysis tried to follow as much as possible the draft JIAF: the Context informed by a secondary data review developed jointly with sectors through the Information Management Working Group (IMWG); the Event and Shock pillar also informed by the secondary data review and primary data collection on household vulnerabilities; the Impact pillar informed by a composite indicator looking at impact on people, on systems and services, and on access; and finally the Humanitarian Conditions pillar informed by the sectoral analysis as well as inter-sectoral indicators such as the coping capacity gap. This MSNI analysis is considered an interim approach until the JIAF is fully endorsed and implemented at the global level.

More information about the MSNA can be found in these research Terms of Reference (ToRs).

### ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY

**Population figures in Yobe State, overall, per assessed LGA, and per population group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / LGAs</th>
<th>Non-displaced HHs</th>
<th>IDP HHs</th>
<th>Returnee HHs</th>
<th>Total # of HHs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yobe State overall</td>
<td>307,699</td>
<td>17,603</td>
<td>24,436</td>
<td>349,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bade</td>
<td>17,407</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursari</td>
<td>15,942</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaturu</td>
<td>32,360</td>
<td>5,317</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>38,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fika</td>
<td>22,132</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fune</td>
<td>32,908</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujba</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>18,640</td>
<td>22,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulani</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>8,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakusko</td>
<td>18,770</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karasuwa</td>
<td>12,333</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machina</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangere</td>
<td>20,325</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguru</td>
<td>21,274</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potiskum</td>
<td>55,109</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmua</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunusari</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusufari</td>
<td>22,069</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MSNI decision tree:

1. Take the largest individual LSG score between health/protection/shelter

2. Replace it with the household impact score, if lower than previous score

3. Replace it with the score of health AND protection OR health AND shelter OR shelter AND protection, if higher than previous score

4. Replace it with the WASH, FSL OR capacity gap score, if higher than the previous score

5. If final score is 1 but individual LSG score of health/protection/shelter/education is 3+, household score increased by one scale i.e. 1→2

### Rationale for MSNI decision tree - progressive deterioration of a household’s situation towards the worst possible humanitarian outcome:

**Initial shock hits household (HH)**

HH living standards affected (for e.g. shelter needs, security concerns, access to education or healthcare), but has resources/ is coping to meet basic needs

**Complete collapse of HH living standards and coping capacities used to meet basic needs**

HH living standards deteriorated to the extent that it is unable to meet day-to-day survival needs (i.e. food and water), or relying on severe, negative coping mechanisms to meet these needs

**Increased risk to HH’s physical & mental well-being, likelihood of heightened mortality within HH**
ANNEX 2: HOW TO READ A SUNBURST DIAGRAM

The sunburst diagram shows hierarchical data. Every level of the hierarchy is represented by one ring or circle with the innermost circle as the top of the hierarchy.

The innermost circle represents the proportion of households categorised with a MSNI severity score of at least 3 (or, in the case of groups/areas of particular concern, the proportion of households categorised with the highest MSNI severity score).

The ring immediately surrounding the innermost circle shows the proportion of households whose MSNI severity score (of at least 3) was primarily driven by:

a) **Living Standard Gap (LSG) in food security/ livelihoods or WASH**; OR
b) **Capacity gap**; OR
c) **Co-occurring LSGs in health and shelter, or health and protection, or shelter and protection**; OR
d) **LSG in health, or shelter, or protection and have been severely impacted by the event/shock**.

The outer ring breaks down the primary divers of the MSNI severity score (above) even further, by showing the breakdown of the proportion of households:

i. Within a) (above) whose needs were driven by an LSG in food security, or WASH, or both;
ii. Within c) whose needs were driven by co-occurring LSGs in either health and shelter, or health and protection, or shelter and protection, or all three sectors
iii. Within d) whose needs were driven by an LSG in health, or shelter, or protection, in addition to an impact of the event/shock on households.

Example:

"In Borno, 72% of households overall were found to have severe or extreme humanitarian needs (MSNI severity score 3 or 4). For a majority of those households (83%) these needs were primarily driven by a living standards gap (LSG) in FSL and/or WASH, with in particular 44% of households whose needs were primarily driven by an LSG in WASH, 23% of households whose needs were primarily driven by an LSG in FSL, and 16% by combined LSGs in FSL and WASH. For 13% of households with an MSNI severity score of 3 or 4, those needs were primarily driven by capacity gaps, which entail a high reliance on negative coping strategies. The remaining 4% of households with an MSNI severity score of 3 or 4 had needs primarily driven by a co-occurrence of at least two LSGs in health, protection, shelter (2%) and the added impact of the crisis with two of the previous LSGs (2%)"
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