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About DTM Libya

Co-funded by the European Union and the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in Libya tracks and monitors population movements in order to collate, analyze and share information packages on Libya’s populations on the move.

DTM is designed to support the humanitarian community with demographic baselines needed to coordinate evidence-based interventions. DTM’s Mobility Tracking package includes analytical reports, datasets, maps, interactive dashboards and websites on the numbers, demographics, locations of origin, displacement and movement patterns, and primary needs of mobile populations. For all DTM reports, datasets, static and interactive maps and interactive dashboard please visit www.globaldtm.info.libya

Libya Reference Map

This map is for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.
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CHAPTER 1 - SITUATION OVERVIEW & KEY FINDINGS

This report presents the findings of Round 10 of data collection, which took place between 2 April and 4 May 2017.

In this round the number of IDPs identified continued to decrease in the continuation of the trend identified in the start of the year, mirrored by an increase in the number of returnees during the same time period.

Several instances of recent displacement were also recorded during the time of data collection.

Clashes in Albawanees baladiya led to the displacement of some households from Tamnhnt muhalla, as reported in DTM’s Displacement Event Tracker for that period. At the time of data collection, those IDPs had not yet returned.

Recent displacement on a smaller scale was also reported in Azzahra, Janzour and Abusliem baladiyas. However, at the time of reporting, those who were displaced were reported to have already returned to their homes.

In Abusliem, armed clashes persisted for two days leading to displacement from Abusliem Al Janubi; however, IDPs were reported to have returned.

In Janzour, clashes took place in Sidi Abdel Latif muhalla between local militias for a week during the reporting period. At the time, some residents in the muhalla were displaced but returned since to their homes.

Armed clashes took place for several days in Azzahra leading to the displacement of 150 individuals from the muhallas of Azzahra and Nasiriyah. They were reported to have returned at the time of data collection.

| Table 1: Changes in IDP and returnee figures by round |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                 | R8       | % Change | R9       | % Change | R10      |
| IDPs            | 294,436  | -13%     | 256,615  | -6%      | 240,188  |
| Returnees       | 196,852  | 16%      | 227,866  | 9%       | 249,298  |

Returnee families in Sirt receive non-food aid, © IOM/2017
IDPS AND RETURNEES
KEY FINDINGS, MAY 2017

DATA COLLECTION PERIOD
APRIL - MAY 2017

914 KEY INFORMANTS
INTERVIEWED

240,188 IDPs

MAIN DRIVER OF DISPLACEMENT
96% Threat/fear from general conflict and armed group presence

33% displaced in 2011-2014
45% displaced in 2015
21% displaced in 2016

MAIN BALADIYAS OF RESIDENCE
Benghazi (18%) Misrata (9%)
Abusliem (8%) Ejdabla (7%)
Bani Waleed (6%)

MAIN BALADIYAS OF ORIGIN
Benghazi (35%) Sirt (16%)
Misrata (14%) Ubari (7%)
Kikkla (3%)

MAIN SHELTER SETTING
75% Self-paid rental

249,298 RETURNEES

76% returned in 2016
24% returned in 2017

MAIN BALADIYAS OF RETURN
Benghazi (53%) Sirt (23%)
Ubari (10%) Abu Qurayn (4%)
Kikkla (3%)

RETURNEES MAINLY BACK FROM
Benghazi Tripoli
Bani Waleed Al Khums
Tarhuna

MAIN SHELTER SETTING
92% Previous home

1 - Figures are from Round 10 of data collection, conducted in April - May 2017. Only key findings are shown.
For full dataset and report go to www.globaldtm.info/libya
CHAPTER 2 - IDP PROFILES

Overview

DTM identified and located 240,188 IDP individuals (48,004 households) across 87 baladiyas in Libya. This represents a decrease of 16,427 IDPs identified since the previous round (6% decrease).

The largest increase in IDP figures took place in Benghazi, where the number of IDPs increased by 3,500 since the previous round. IDPs were displaced from the muhalla of Bu Fekhra to the muhalla of Thawra Echaabia.

The largest decreases in IDP figures was observed in Tarhuna, Abusliem, Ejdabia, Ain Zara and Azzintan. IDPs in these baladiyas were reported to have returned to Benghazi and Sirt following the de-escalation of conflict in those baladiyas.

The largest number of IDPs was hosted in Benghazi; other baladiyas hosting large numbers of IDPs were Misrata, Abusliem, Ejdabia and Bani Walied.

Table 2: Baladiyas with the largest change in population figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baladiya</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>Difference (IND)</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Zara</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>-2,090</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejdabia</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusliem</td>
<td>23,395</td>
<td>20,075</td>
<td>-3,320</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarhuna</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>-4,950</td>
<td>-68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline of Displacement

IDPs are categorized by the time during which they were initially displaced. The three periods of displacement considered are as follows: 2011-2014, 2015, and 2016 to the time of reporting.

Round 10 results indicate that 33% of all identified IDPs had been displaced between 2011 and 2014 (see Figure 1). 45% of IDPs had been displaced during 2015, at the peak of civil conflict in Libya, and 21% had been displaced in 2016.

The proportion of those who were displaced in 2016 decreased from 24% of all IDPs in the previous round to 21% in the current round largely as a result of the reduction of IDPs from Sirt, more of whom had returned to their homes during the time of data collection.

Figure 1: Proportion of IDPs identified by period of displacement
83% of identified IDPs in Libya were displaced from the ten baladiyas shown in Figure 2.

42% of those displaced between 2011 and 2014 were from Misrata (Tawergha IDPs), followed by IDPs from Benghazi (20%), Yefren (8%), Ubari (5%) and Sirt (4%). Those displaced in 2015 were also predominantly from Benghazi (53%), with others having fled from Ubari (10%), Kikkla (5%), Sirt (4%) and Derna (3%).

At the time of data collection, 60% of IDPs who had been displaced in 2016 were identified as being from Sirt. Others were displaced from Benghazi (19%), Ubari (4%), and 1% from Sebha and Alkufra respectively.

Drivers of Internal Displacement

The main factor driving the initial displacement of the majority of IDPs was the threat or fear from general conflict and armed group presence (Figure 3). This driver accounted for 94% of IDPs. 4% of IDPs were mainly displaced due to other security related issues such as political affiliation, and the remaining 2% were displaced due to economic factors.

In addition to drivers that initially drove IDPs displacement data was also collected on reasons preventing the majority of IDPs in each baladiya from returning to their homes. In 78% of baladiyas IDPs were reported to continue being displaced due to the threat or fear of ongoing conflict (Figure 4).

The reasons preventing the return of the remaining 22% of IDPs varied. Other security issues were reported to be preventing 10% of IDPs from returning to their baladiyas of origin. Damaged public infrastructure was another factor prolonging the displacement of IDPs (4%), the threat or presence of explosive hazards was hindering the return of 2% of IDPs and economic factors, which include the lack of livelihood opportunities, accounted for the continued displacement of 2% of IDPs. The reason was unknown for the remaining 3% of the IDP population.
Multiple Displacements

DTM identified 8,169 IDPs in Round 10 who were displaced in 2016 and had been displaced at least once prior. 88% of these (7,194 individuals) had been displaced twice and 12% (975 individuals) had been displaced three times.

75% of IDPs who were multiply displaced were originally from Sirt and were residing mainly in Bani Waleed, Sirt itself or Ejdabia.

17% were from Benghazi originally and were displaced either within Benghazi or to Zliten.

A further 6% were from Ubari and were residing in Ghat and Algatroun and the remaining 2% were from Misrata, and Azzawya.

Table 3 provides details on the baladiyas of origin and residence of these IDPs along with the number of times they had been displaced up to the time of reporting.

Table 3: IDPs displaced multiple times by baladiyas of origin and residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baladiya of Origin</th>
<th>Baladiya of Residence</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total Number of IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azzawya</td>
<td>Al Maya</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengazi</td>
<td>Bengazi</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zliten</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrata</td>
<td>Ain Zara</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Maya</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bint Bayya</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirt</td>
<td>Bani Waleed</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirt</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejdabia</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khaleej Assidra</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hrawa</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidi Assayeh</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aljufra</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al Maya</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aljufra</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubari</td>
<td>Algatroun</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghat</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDP Regions and Baladiyas of Residence

50% of identified IDPs were in the West of Libya. 39% were in the East and the remaining 11% were in the South during this round.

The mantikas (regions) with the highest reported presence of IDPs were Benghazi (46,380 individuals), Misrata (40,290 individuals) and Tripoli (30,635 individuals). See Map 1 on the following page for the number of IDPs identified disaggregated by region.

In Benghazi region 91% of IDPs identified were residing in Benghazi baladiya and the rest were in Alabyar, Gemienis, Toukra and Suloug baladiyas.

In Misrata region IDPs were reported to be residing mainly in Misrata baladiya (51%) and Bani Waleed (35%).

In Tripoli region the majority of IDPs were reported to be residing in Abusliem (66%) with smaller numbers in Ain Zara (16%), Tajoura (8%), Tripoli (4%) and Hai Alandalus (4%).

The top 10 baladiyas hosting IDPs are shown in Figure 5. Benghazi continued to be the main baladiya hosting IDPs, followed by Misrata, Abusliem and Ejdabia.

The majority of IDPs in Benghazi were displaced within the baladiya during the conflict over the course of 2015. Those in Misrata arrived mainly from Benghazi and Sirt. IDPs in Abusliem were mainly from Kikkla, Misrata and Benghazi, and the majority of those in Ejdabia arrived from Misrata and Sirt.

Table 4 displays the top 5 baladiyas of origin with the top 5 baladiyas of destination for IDPs from each one.
Map 2: Baladiyas of destination for IDPs from top 5 baladiyas of origin
IDP Sex-Age Disaggregated Data (SADD)

Round 10 data indicated that children (0-18) accounted for 53% of the IDP population (see Figure 6). Adults (19-59 years) made up 39% of the IDP population and older adults (60+) were the remaining 8% of IDPs.

Figure 6: Age disaggregation of IDP sample

![Figure 6: Age disaggregation of IDP sample]

Figure 7 provides a more granular gender disaggregation by age group of identified IDPs relying on an IDP sample of 26,204 individuals taken from all across the country. Across all age categories males made up 49% of the sampled population and females accounted for 51%. This differs slightly for each age category as can be seen in Figure 7.

Figure 7: IDP male-female ratio by age group

![Figure 7: IDP male-female ratio by age group]

IDP Shelter Settings

86% of IDPs were reported to be in private accommodation (either in rented accommodation or hosted with others), 12% were reported to be residing in public or informal shelter settings, and accommodation type was not specified for the remaining 2% (Figure 8).

Map 3 displays the distribution of IDPs in public and private shelter settings by region in Libya.

Figure 8: Shelter settings by public/private classification

![Figure 8: Shelter settings by public/private classification]
Map 3: IDPs in private/public shelter settings
86% of IDPs in private shelter were in self-paid rented accommodation. 8% were hosted with relatives, 4% were in rented accommodation paid by others and the remaining 2% were hosted with other non-relatives (see Figure 11).

**Figure 9: Proportion of IDPs in each private shelter setting**

![Proportion of IDPs in each private shelter setting](image)

35% of IDPs in public shelter settings were reported to be in unfinished buildings. 23% were reported to be in informal settings such as tents, caravans, and makeshift shelters and 13% in other public buildings. 14% were residing in schools, 12% in deserted resorts and the remaining 3% were reported to be squatting on other peoples’ properties (see Figure 10).

**Figure 10: Number and proportion of IDPs in each public shelter setting**

![Number and proportion of IDPs in each public shelter setting](image)
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Map 4: IDPs in public shelter settings by type

Total number of IDPs residing in public shelter: 27,740

Legend:
- Shelter Type
- Map: DTM

Sources:
- DTM: DTM REC

Note: This map is for illustrative purposes only. It does not imply official or unofficial acceptance by IOM.
IDP Priority Needs

Muhalla level assessments identified the three primary needs for IDPs in each muhalla ranking them in order from first priority need (most important) to third priority need.

According to results from this round, food, health services and shelter were the three main needs for the IDP population. Table 5 lists the reported needs, along with their respective rankings and the number of IDPs affected for each priority level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Reported</th>
<th>Priority #1 IDPs affected (IND)</th>
<th>Priority #2 IDPs affected (IND)</th>
<th>Priority #3 IDPs affected (IND)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>59,145</td>
<td>62,900</td>
<td>43,393</td>
<td>165,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>28,756</td>
<td>96,497</td>
<td>39,920</td>
<td>165,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>107,117</td>
<td>16,355</td>
<td>31,130</td>
<td>154,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income</td>
<td>19,195</td>
<td>40,445</td>
<td>24,615</td>
<td>84,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td>13,531</td>
<td>40,915</td>
<td>58,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>25,165</td>
<td>34,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>17,660</td>
<td>25,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>14,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation/ Hygiene</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for Household Use</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>4,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal help</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDP Impact on Baladiyas of Residence

IDPs were reported to have good relations in general with the residents of the baladiya: relations between both population groups were reported as “excellent” in 78% of baladiyas and “good” in the remaining 22%. No baladiyas reported “poor” relations between IDPs and residents during this round.

In 64% of assessed baladiyas IDPs were reported to have no impact on the local labour market. 17% reported IDPs having a negative impact as jobs became scarce. 16% of baladiyas reported IDPs having a positive impact as they contributed to a stronger economy and more jobs. The remaining 2% did not know IDPs’ impact.

IDPs were reported to have no impact on public services in their baladiya of residence in 72% of assessed baladiyas. In 24% of assessed baladiyas they were reported to have a negative impact, and the remaining 3% of baladiyas reported that the impact was unknown or did not provide an answer.
CHAPTER 3 - RETURNEE PROFILES

Overview

DTM identified and located 249,298 returnees in 33 baladiyas in Libya during the reporting period who had returned between the start of 2016 and the time of data collection.

The increase in returnees was mainly due to the returns recorded to Sirt baladiya during the time of data collection. The number of returnees to Sirt increased by 19,200 individuals (51%) since the previous round (see Table 6). While the total number of returnees had increased due to the larger number of returns to Sirt and Benghazi, smaller increases were observed in Ubari and Suq Al Jumaa, and a slight decrease was recorded in Kikkla.

In spite of continued economic challenges, the situation in Sirt continued to improve during the reporting period, with a notable event being the restoration of internet and telecommunications networks for the first time in two years. At the same time, returnees continued to face destroyed or non-functional infrastructure in residential neighbourhoods (including water and electricity). The delay in the opening of banks has also led returnees to travel long distances to be able to access cash.

In Benghazi, returnees faced the danger posed by explosive hazards in areas of return where conflict recently ended. Shortages in non-food items and water for household use were also reported as concerns for returnees.

In Ubari, the heavy level of damage to public infrastructure and homes continued to be the main issue facing returnees. Additional reported issues included severe shortages in medical equipment.

In Kikkla, where a slight decrease in the number of returnees was observed compared to previous rounds, field enumerators reported that the health sector has seen a marked improvement during the reporting period as a specific health centre for women and childbirth was established by local authorities. The local public hospital on the other hand remained closed during the reporting period. Returnees to Kikkla have faced additional challenges including delays in repairs to their homes due to constraints in access to liquidity and increases in the price of building materials. Further, returnees continued not have access to water for household use.

Table 6  Baladiyas with biggest changes in returnee population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baladiya</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>Difference (IND)</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sirt</td>
<td>37,850</td>
<td>57,050</td>
<td>19200</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi</td>
<td>132,050</td>
<td>133,050</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubari</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suq Al Jumaa</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikkla</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>-316</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returnees in Sirt receive non-food aid, © IOM/2017
Map 5: Number of returnees by mantika (region) of residence

Legend

- Muhalla
- Mantika
- Country

# returnees identified per Mantika

- < 350
- 351 - 625
- 626 - 2,370
- 2,371 - 30,000
- 30,001 - 133,400

Total number of returnees: 249,298

Sources: IOM, DTM, BSC
This map is for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.
Main Regions and Baladiyas of Return

Returnees are defined as internally displaced persons who have returned to their place of origin or habitual residence. DTM defines returnees as any formerly internally displaced persons who came back to their baladiya of origin between the start of 2016 and the time of reporting.

At the time of data collection between the start of April and the first week of May 2017, 76% of identified returnees had gone back to their homes in 2016 and 24% had returned in 2017 as shown in Figure 14. The proportion of those who returned in 2017 increased from the previous round as more returns to Sirt were recorded during 2017.

55% of identified returnees were in the East of Libya, 34% in the West and the remaining 11% were in the South.

Disaggregated by mantika (region) as seen in Map 5, the majority of returnees identified during this round were in Benghazi (54%). The largest increase in returns was recorded in Sirt. Returnees to Sirt increased by 19,200 individuals between Round 9 and Round 10. A slight increase of 1,000 individuals was also recorded in Benghazi baladiya since the previous round to Ubari (400 individuals).

The majority of identified returnees were in Benghazi baladiya (Figure 15) and were reported to have returned to the muhallas of Benghazi Al Jadida, Bu Atnai, Benina, Al Guouarcha, Alfkat, Bu Fekhra and Garyounes.

Returnees to Sirt came mainly from Bani Waleed, Tripoli, and Alkhums, where they had been displaced. Those who returned to Abu Qurayn came from Misrata, Tarhuna, and Bani Waled.

Returnee Shelter Settings

92% of identified returnees were reported to have re-inhabited their previous homes (Figure 16). 6% rented new homes, 2% were hosted with relatives and the remaining 0.5% were either in new self-owned homes, hosted with non-relatives, in public buildings or other shelter settings.

When disaggregated by mantika (Map 6), it can be seen that Ubari had the largest number of returnees who were hosted with relatives, and returnees who rented new homes. Sirt had the largest number of returnees who bought new homes upon return.
Returnees’ Impact on Baladiyas of Return

Relations between returnees and baladiya residents were reported to be excellent in 56% of baladiyas, good in 38% of baladiyas, poor in 3% of baladiyas and unknown for the remaining 3% of baladiyas with returnees (see Figure 17).

Returnees were reported to have a positive impact on the labour market in 25% of baladiyas of return, contributing to a revitalized economy (Figure 18). In 63% of baladiyas they were reported to have no impact on the labour market, in 6% their impact was unknown and in the remaining 6% (Ghat and Misrata baladiyas) they were reported to have a negative impact as jobs were scarce.

Returnees were more likely to be reported as having a negative impact on public services as reported in 9% of baladiyas with returnees (Figure 19). Returnees specifically were reported to have a negative impact on public services in the baladiyas of Misrata, Kikkla and Ghat.

Returnees Priority Needs

Muhalla level assessments identified the three primary needs for returnees in each muhalla ranking them in order from first priority need (most important) to third priority need.

According to results from this round, food, security and health were the three main needs for the returnee population. Table 7 lists the reported needs, along with their respective rankings and the number of returnees affected for each priority level.

Table 7: Returnee Priority Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Reported</th>
<th>Priority #1 Retirees affected (IND)</th>
<th>Priority #2 Retirees affected (IND)</th>
<th>Priority #3 Retirees affected (IND)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>106,471</td>
<td>40977</td>
<td>153,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>41613</td>
<td>103,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>18,299</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80190</td>
<td>98,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation/ Hygiene</td>
<td>39,768</td>
<td>50500</td>
<td>50030</td>
<td>90,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>77,219</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>86,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>13020</td>
<td>55,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>44,355</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>48,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>43,055</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>44,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>32,972</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>33,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal help</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Water</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4 - MULTISECTORIAL DATA: BALADIYA LEVEL

As part of 2017 methodology some key baseline multisectorial indicators are collected as part of the baladiya assessment to facilitate a more context-based analysis of IDP and returnee vulnerabilities, conditions and needs. While this data is not meant to be a comprehensive multisectorial needs analysis it provides some flagging indicators that will enable humanitarian partners to target their assistance to address specific vulnerabilities in certain locations. While some analysis and summaries are presented in the report the Round 10 dataset provides the opportunity for a more granular analysis of all indicators at the muhalla and baladiya level. Please refer to www.globaldtm.info/libya for the dataset and full Round 10 information package.

Education

Data collected on education in baladiyas includes the proportion of operational public schools, students’ ability to attend schools regularly, and if not, the reasons preventing regular attendance.

88 baladiyas reported that between 80-100% of public schools in the baladiya were operational as demonstrated in Figure 20. Six schools reported that between 61% and 80% of schools were operational, four reported that between 41% and 60% of schools were operational (Ubari, Al Aziziya, Sirt and Rigdaleen). The proportion of operational schools reported in Sirt increased from 20% reported in the previous round to 50% in the current round. For the remaining two baladiyas no answer was provided.

94% of baladiyas reported that the majority of students were attending schools regularly in the baladiya. The remaining 6% of baladiyas reporting irregular attendance of students were in Derna, Aljufra, Ubari, Al Aziziya, Janzour and Hrawa baladiyas (see Figure 21 for the breakdown by region and full Round 10 dataset for more information by baladiya).

Figure 20: Proportion of operational public schools reported by baladiya

Proportion of Operational Schools in Baladiya (%)
Reasons preventing attendance varied between baladiyas. 40% reported that schools were damaged/destroyed or occupied, and 20% respectively reported that schools were either difficult to access by road, overcrowded, or had issues related to safety.

Health

As part of baseline health indicators data was collected on the proportion of operational public hospitals in the baladiya, on the type of health facilities available in the baladiya and on whether there was regular access to medicine.

In 19 baladiyas across the country it was reported that only up to 20% of public hospitals were operational as can be seen in Figure 23. In 31 baladiyas on the other hand it was reported that between 81 and 100% of public hospitals in the baladiya were operational.
The most common type of health facilities available were health centers which were present in 82 baladiyas. Private clinics were reported in 63 baladiyas and hospitals were available in 62 baladiyas. Figure 24 presents the number of baladiyas reporting the presence of each type of health facility.

Regular access to medicine was reported in only 4% of baladiyas (Alsharguiya, Arrajban, Bani Waleed and Tajoura). In 95% of baladiyas it was reported that there was no regular access to medicine as shown in Figure 25. The level of access to medicine was unknown in the remaining 1%.

Public Services & WASH

Electricity and garbage disposal were the two most cited public services available (see Figure 26). 76 baladiyas reported the availability of electricity and 69 baladiyas reported the presence of garbage disposal services. 64 baladiyas reported having a water supply network. Sewage treatment and public infrastructure repairs however appeared to be much less prevalent with only 16 and 2 baladiyas reporting them respectively.
The main issue associated with potable water in 48 baladiyas was reported to be the high cost. In 13 baladiyas available water was not safe for drinking and cooking, and in 3 baladiyas water trucks no longer came to the area due to violence or threats. Figure 28 outlines the main issues associated with access to water along with the number of baladiyas reporting the issue. This data is available by region, baladiya and muhalla in the accompanying Round 10 dataset.

Figure 28: Main problem associated with potable water in baladiya by number of baladiyas reporting

**Nutrition**

In 69% of baladiyas with IDPs, IDPs were reported to purchase food from the market as their main source of food (see Figure 29), representing a 3% decrease from the previous round. The proportion of IDPs obtaining food on credit increased from 12% reported in the previous round to 17%.

In 10% of baladiyas the main source of food was reported to be from charity or donations and in the remaining 3% of baladiyas the main source of food was from family or friends. The main problem associated with access to food was that it was too expensive as reported in 96 assessed baladiyas (Figure 30).

Figure 29: Main source of food for IDPs in baladiya by proportion of IDPs reporting
Cases of malnutrition were also reported to be present in 15% of baladiyas mainly in the West and South of the country. To obtain more information at the baladiya level, please refer to the accompanying dataset.

Livelihoods

Public employment, private employment, and aid were the three most cited sources of income for IDPs as seen in Figure 32.

Livelihoods

Public employment, private employment, and aid were the three most cited sources of income for IDPs as seen in Figure 32.
Security

Indicators on security in baladiyas measured residents’ ability to move safely within the baladiya, the reasons hindering safe movement, and perception or awareness of the presence of unexploded ordnance (UXO).

The awareness of the presence of UXO was reported in 16% of baladiyas as shown in Figure 34.

Residents were reported as not being able to move safely within their baladiyas in 22% of assessed baladiyas.

In baladiyas where movement was reported to be unsafe the main reason cited was insecurity (77% of baladiyas), followed by road closures (5%), or the threat or presence of explosive hazards (18%) (Figure 36). Reasons at the baladiya level are available in the dataset.

NFIs and Access to Markets

Data was collected on the priority non-food items (NFIs) needed in each baladiya. Bedding was the most cited need as reported in 76 baladiyas followed by mattresses in 59 baladiyas, gas/fuel in 50 baladiyas and heaters in 38 baladiyas (Figure 38).

Figure 34: Reported presence of UXOs in baladiya

Figure 35: Ability of residents to move safely within baladiya

Figure 36: Reasons preventing ability to move safely within baladiya, by proportion of baladiyas reporting

Figure 37: Priority NFI items needed by number of baladiyas reporting

Figure 38: Main problem associated with access to NFIs by proportion of baladiyas reporting
CHAPTER 5 - NOTES ON THE DATA

The data in this report is gathered from DTM’s Mobility Tracking data collection module. Mobility Tracking gathers data through key informants at both the baladiya and muhalla level on a four week data collection cycle. The full description of the Mobility Tracking methodology is available on the DTM Libya website.

During Round 10 DTM assessed all 100 baladiyas and 657 of 667 muhallas in Libya.

914 Key Informant interviews were conducted during this round, an average of nearly two KIs per assessment.

180 Key Informants were interviewed at the baladiya level, and 734 at the muhalla level. 32% of those interviewed were representatives from divisions within the baladiya office (social affairs, muhalla affairs, etc.), 21% were from local humanitarian or social organizations and 16% were local crisis committee representatives. Figure 39 disaggregates KIs interviewed by their position. Of the 914 KIs interviewed 10% were female and 90% were male as shown in Figure 40.

Data Credibility

28% of data collected was rated as “very credible” during this round, 59% was rated as “mostly credible” and 13% as “somewhat credible”. This rating is based on the consistency of data provided by KI’s, on their sources of data, and on whether data provided is in line with general perceptions.
This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

This figure is as of 5 April 2017. The number of returnees to Sirt increased since then. DTM’s Displacement Event Tracker recorded 63,000 returnee individuals to Sirt as of 19 April 2017.

For more comprehensive data on health please refer to WHO Libya at [http://www.emro.who.int/countries/lish/index.html](http://www.emro.who.int/countries/lish/index.html). For DTM data at the level of the baladiya please refer to the accompanying Round 10 dataset on the website.

Please see dataset for the full list of baladiyas without regular access to medicine.

Baladiyas where cases of malnutrition were reported are Al Ajaylat, Aljatroun, Aljufra, Alsharguiya, Benghazi, Garaboll, Ghat, Janoub Azzawya, Nesma, Qasr Akhyar, Sebha, Suq Aljumaa Surman, Tajoura, Tripoli and Ubari. For more information on these baladiyas, refer to the full Round 10 dataset at [www.globaldtm.info/libya](http://www.globaldtm.info/libya).

Baladiyas reporting UXO during this round were Al Ajaylat, Aljmail, Alkufra, Alqubba, Benghazi, Daraj, Derna, Ejdabia, Gemienis, Janoub Azzawya, Kikkla, Sebha, Sirt, Ubari, Yefren and Zliten. For more information on these baladiyas, refer to the full Round 10 dataset at [www.globaldtm.info/libya](http://www.globaldtm.info/libya).

Returnee families in Sirt receive non-food aid
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