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INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT: 2021 AND 2022*

ARRIVAL IDPs: TOTAL BY YEAR (% OF TOTAL)

5,894,220 IDPs have displaced since 2012

2,587,440 (44%)
611,383 (10%)
891,034 (15%)
1,409,787 (24%)
394,576 (7%)


1,804,363 (31%) of all who displaced since 2012 have displaced between January 2021 and April 2022

TEN PROVINCES WITH MOST ARRIVAL IDPs IN 2021 AND 2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>346,468</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>177,087</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>147,508</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>121,446</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>118,189</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kunduz</td>
<td>88,644</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zabul</td>
<td>62,361</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>56,216</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Takhar</td>
<td>49,935</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Badghis</td>
<td>49,658</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This page showcases the developments in displacement during the January 2021 to April 2022 time period. For details on displacement since 2012, please see pages 8 to 11.

*The 2021 to 2022 year period includes from January 2021 until April 2022. Round 15 was collected in March and April 2022.
RETURN FROM DISPLACEMENT: 2021 AND 2022*

10,064,707 IDPs have returned since 2012

2021 to 2022
- More than 250,000
- 100,001 to 250,000
- 50,001 to 100,000
- 25,001 to 50,000
- 1 to 25,000

TEN PROVINCES WITH THE MOST RETURNED IDPS IN 2021 AND 2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kunduz</td>
<td>559,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>446,503</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>380,236</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baghlan</td>
<td>324,267</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>286,716</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jawzjan</td>
<td>280,003</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>257,860</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Takhar</td>
<td>234,124</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faryab</td>
<td>208,789</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>160,681</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This page showcases the developments in returns during the January 2021 to April 2022 time period. For details on returns since 2012, please see pages 12 to 14.

*The 2021 to 2022 year period includes from January 2021 until April 2022. Round 15 was collected in March and April 2022.
The Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) tracks and monitors displacement and population mobility. It is designed to regularly and systematically capture, process and disseminate information to provide a better understanding of the movements and evolving needs of displaced populations, whether on site or en route.

DTM has been conducting the Baseline Mobility Assessment in Afghanistan since 2016 to track mobility, provide information on population estimates, locations and geographic distribution of displaced and returnee populations, reasons for displacement, places of origin and periods of displacement. Vulnerabilities and multisectoral needs are covered in the Emergency Community-Based Needs Assessment (eCBNA) at the end of the report. Data is collected at the settlement level, through focus group discussions with community focal points and direct observations.

DTM enables IOM and its partners to maximize resources, set priorities, and deliver better-targeted, evidence-based, mobility-sensitive and sustainable humanitarian assistance and development programming. For more information about DTM in Afghanistan, please visit displacement.iom.int/afghanistan

### 4 TARGET POPULATIONS

Through the Baseline Mobility Assessments, DTM tracks the locations, population sizes and period of displacement of four core target population categories:

**Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)** are subdivided into the following two categories:

1. **Arrival IDPs**
   - Afghans who were forced to leave their place of habitual residence and have arrived in the assessed locations within the internationally recognized borders of Afghanistan.

2. **Returned IDPs**
   - Afghans who have returned to their habitual residence in the assessed locations from which they had previously fled as IDPs.

Afghans moving internationally are subdivided into two categories:

3. **Persons Who Moved Abroad**
   - Afghans who moved abroad, regardless the reason or duration of expatriation (including persons in need of international protection and economic migrants).

4. **Returnees from Abroad**
   - Afghans who had moved abroad for at least 6 months and have now returned to Afghanistan.

Data on population sizes for the 4 target population categories is collected by time of displacement, using each of the following time frames: 2012-2018 • 2019 • 2020 • 2021 • 2022 (April)

**BASELINE MOBILITY ASSESSMENT***

- **5,894,220** arrival IDPs who remain in displacement [2012–April 2022]
- **10,064,707** former IDPs have returned to their habitual residence [2012–April 2022]
- **5,676,122** individuals moved abroad [2012–April 2022]
- **5,737,462** individuals returned from abroad [2012–April 2022]

*Each IDP category is summed separately. A stock IDP number is not presented in this report.

**EMERGENCY COMMUNITY-BASED NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- **69%** of households cannot afford to meet basic food needs
- **16%** of households eat one meal or less per day
- **55%** of households have no source of income
- **2,852,494** households are in debt across Afghanistan

For more information, please contact: DTMAfghanistan@iom.int displacement.iom.int/afghanistan
DTM's field enumerators collect data at the settlement level, predominantly through focus group discussions with community focal points (CFPs). While assessing communities, enumerators also observe the living conditions and availability of multi-sectoral services. In the rare case that enumerators cannot physically reach a community, due to insecurity, conflict, or risk of retaliation, they meet the focus groups at safe locations or conduct the assessments by phone.

DTM has made significant strides to improve gender inclusion in focus group discussions, although there is much room for improvement. Women represent 0.5% of the community focal points, which is lower than the 0.8% of female representation in the previous round (conducted in November and December 2021). However, this marks improvement, although marginal, since DTM’s first round (conducted in March 2017) when female community focal points constituted only 0.1% of all focal points. Including female community focal points became increasingly challenging after the change of government in August 2021 due to restrictions on female participation in leadership and mix-gender activities as well as lack of female enumerators to conduct the interviews due to the same restrictions.

86,210 CFPs interviewed

- 85,740 male CFPs (99%)
- 470 female CFPs (<1%)

9,092 CFPs are IDPs or returnees from abroad (11%)

21,882 CFPs from host communities (25%)

6.2 average number of CFPs per focus group

18,321 CFPs from local authorities (21%)

29,339 CFPs from multi-sectoral and social services (34%)

Community Focal Points by Type | 2012 to April 2022

- Community Development Council (CDC) Representative
- Community/Tribal Representative
- Other District Authority Representative
- Displaced Groups Representative
- Education Representative
- Health Sector Representative
- Humanitarian/Social Organization
- Small/Medium Enterprise Representative
- Agriculture Representative
- Other

The overall objective of DTM’s Baseline Mobility Assessment in Afghanistan is to track mobility and displacement, provide population estimates, locations, and geographic distribution of displaced and returnee populations. DTM captures additional mobility information, including reasons for displacement and return, places of origin and destination and periods of displacement and return.

DTM’s field enumerators collect quantitative data at the settlement level through focus group discussions with community focal points (CFPs). Through direct observations, enumerators also collect qualitative data on living conditions, basic services and the security and socio-economic situation. When DTM assesses a province, enumerators collect data through two rounds of two-layered assessments:

1. District-level assessment (B1): it aims to identify settlements with high inflows and outflows of Afghan nationals and provide estimated numbers of each target population category.

2. Settlement-level assessment (B2): based on the results of B1, this assessment collects information on inflows and outflows of each target population category at each settlement (village), identified through B1. Additional villages are also identified and assessed, based on referrals from CFPs.

Since December 2019, the Community-Based Needs Assessment has been included as a standard component of the Baseline Mobility Assessment (BMA) exercise.

In Round 15, the DTM team in Afghanistan deployed a limited version of the CBNA questionnaire, called the Emergency Community-Based Needs Assessment (eCBNA) in order to focus on communities’ most acute needs and vulnerabilities.

DTM enumerators targeted the same communities that host IDPs and returnees from abroad. The objective of the one-time eCBNA is to understand communities’ most acute needs in order to facilitate programming priorities and geographical targeting of assistance, by supplying summary statistics of food-related needs and coping mechanisms, and basics of household finances.

Enumerators collected quantitative data on the aforementioned topics at the community level through focus group discussions with community focal points (CFPs).
In Round 15, the DTM team witnessed a net increase in the number of all four target populations compared to the previous round (Round 14, collected in November and December 2021). At the province level, some provinces witnessed an increase in one or up to all of the four target populations while others witnessed a decrease in one or up to all of the categories. In the table below, the "% Change" column indicates whether the province recorded an increase or decrease in each target population category.

### Overview of Four Target Populations by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Base Population*</th>
<th>Assessed Communities</th>
<th>Arrivals IDPs</th>
<th>Returned IDPs</th>
<th>Persons Who Moved Abroad</th>
<th>Returnees from Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Pop.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Pop.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badakhshan</td>
<td>1,017,499</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>83,274</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>166,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badghis</td>
<td>530,574</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>136,309</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>197,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghlan</td>
<td>977,297</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>90,982</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>859,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>1,442,847</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>419,375</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>298,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamyan</td>
<td>478,424</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>42,726</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>118,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daykundi</td>
<td>498,840</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>33,418</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>543,237</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>181,484</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>185,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faryab</td>
<td>1,069,540</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>122,782</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>329,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazni</td>
<td>1,315,041</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>176,240</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>161,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghur</td>
<td>738,224</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>117,693</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>94,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>1,395,514</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>496,546</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>889,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>2,050,514</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>989,696</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>178,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawzjan</td>
<td>579,833</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>111,493</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>445,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>4,860,880</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>755,266</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>132,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>1,337,183</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>246,339</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
<td>481,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>471,574</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>52,914</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>208,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khosh</td>
<td>614,584</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>94,678</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>51,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunar</td>
<td>482,115</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>115,187</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>147,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunduz</td>
<td>1,091,116</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>171,713</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,948,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghman</td>
<td>476,537</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>57,936</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>138,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logar</td>
<td>419,377</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>29,595</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>39,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>1,635,872</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>401,134</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>920,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimroz</td>
<td>176,898</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>97,409</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuristan</td>
<td>158,211</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10,805</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>33,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paktika</td>
<td>748,910</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>54,261</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>49,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paktya</td>
<td>590,668</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>64,778</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>165,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjsher</td>
<td>164,115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4,159</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parwan</td>
<td>711,621</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>62,666</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>199,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samangan</td>
<td>415,343</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>33,726</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>130,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar-e-Pul</td>
<td>599,137</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>131,778</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>132,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhar</td>
<td>1,053,852</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>121,976</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>786,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urugan</td>
<td>420,964</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>109,872</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>131,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardak</td>
<td>637,634</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>43,103</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>110,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabul</td>
<td>371,043</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>232,927</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>262,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistics on the base population come from Afghanistan’s National Statistical and Information Authority (NSIA) Population Estimates for 2018 to 2019. According to the BMA assessment, the current population consists of 19% infants, 30% children, 41% adults, and 10% elderly members. Among the adults, 48% are male 52% are female.
In Round 15, DTM enumerators assessed 14,107 settlements for the Baseline Mobility Assessment. Nineteen per cent are classified as urban, meaning up to 30% of the land is used by members of the community for agriculture and livestock purposes. Peri-urban settlements are classified as having between 31% and 69% of the land used for agriculture and livestock. Around 35% of settlements in this assessment classify as peri-urban. Finally, 46% of settlements classify as rural, meaning 70% or more of the land is used by the residents for agriculture and livestock.

Among the arrival IDPs, 42% are urban settlements, while 30% are in rural and 28% are in peri-urban settlements.

Forty-two per cent of individuals who were previously displaced and have returned to their habitual residence (place of origin) are in rural settlements, followed closely by peri-urban settlements (38%). One in five (20%) returned to urban settlements.

Almost half of Afghans who moved abroad are from rural settlements (48%), followed by peri-urban (33%) and urban settlements (19%).

Over one-third of Afghans who have returned from abroad to Afghanistan returned to rural settlements (39%) followed by peri-urban (31%) and urban settlements (30%).

The number of all four target populations increased nationwide between the previous round (Round 14 was conducted in November and December 2021, thus covering the entire year) and Round 15 (March and April 2022), although to different extents.

Arrival IDPs increased by 1%, from 5,832,454 individuals recorded in Round 14 (November and December 2021) to 5,894,220 individuals in Round 15. Most arrival IDPs are hosted in Herat province (17%).

Returned IDPs reached over 10 million, increasing by 18% between Rounds 14 and 15 (from 8,495,365 to 10,064,707 individuals). Almost half (46%) of these individuals returned in 2021 and 2022 alone.

The number of Afghans moving abroad also increased significantly between Rounds 14 and 15, with a 26% increase from 4,519,522 to 5,676,122 individuals. The most common destinations are the bordering countries of the Islamic Republic of Iran (66%) and Pakistan (19%), followed by Europe and Türkiye (12%).

Returnees from abroad numbered 5,149,245 in Round 14 and by Round 15, the total increased by 11%, reaching 5,737,462 individuals. Almost half (48%) returned from Pakistan, 44% returned from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and only 6% returned from Europe and Türkiye.

### SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION

An explanation of the categorization of urban, rural, and peri-urban communities is below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of land used by the community for agriculture and livestock</th>
<th>Settlement Classification</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% to 30%</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% to 69%</td>
<td>Peri-Urban</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% or more</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO ARE ARRIVAL IDPs?

Arrival IDPs are Afghans who fled their communities of origin and have arrived in the assessed locations within Afghanistan as a result of, or in order to avoid, the effects of armed conflict, generalized violence, human rights violations, protection concerns, or natural and human-made disasters. This section breaks down the findings on arrival IDPs only, it does not include other categories of IDP populations or cross-border movements.

CHANGES FROM 2021 TO 2022

Herat hosts the most arrival IDPs (989,696, or 17% of IDPs in the country), the majority of which arrived in the period of 2012 to 2018.

Kandahar province witnessed an increase in arrival IDPs of 53% between December 2021 and April 2022. Over the same time period, Samangan province witnessed a decrease in arrival IDPs of 40%.
The 2019 through 2021 period witnessed a steady but large increase in the number of Afghans displaced by conflict and natural disasters. In 2021, an unprecedentedly high number of individuals were displaced nationwide. According to DTM’s most recent estimates (Round 15), over 1.4 million Afghans fled their homes as IDPs in 2021, which is 131% higher than the number displaced in 2019.

**ANNUAL TRENDS**

The 2019 through 2021 period witnessed a steady but large increase in the number of Afghans displaced by conflict and natural disasters. In 2021, an unprecedentedly high number of individuals were displaced nationwide. According to DTM’s most recent estimates (Round 15), over 1.4 million Afghans fled their homes as IDPs in 2021, which is 131% higher than the number displaced in 2019.

**PROVINCE OF ORIGIN**

Almost two-thirds of arrival IDPs displaced between 2012 and 2022 remain within their province of origin. Uruzgan hosts the most IDPs from within the same province (98%). Panjsher hosts the largest portion of IDPs from other provinces (94%).

1 For a breakdown of displacement dynamics in 2021, see the Round 14 report Baseline Mobility Assessment Summary Results (November—December 2021).
Between 2012 and 2022, 68% of arrival IDPs have displaced due to conflict while 32% have displaced due to natural disaster. Kunar province has witnessed the highest proportion of displacement due to conflict (100%) among all provinces, while Bamyan province has faced the highest proportion of displacement due to natural disaster (79%).

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used in the maps on this page do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM or the United Nations. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu & Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.
SHELTER AND SETTLEMENT TYPE

Two out of five IDPs are in displacement in urban areas (42%), followed by rural areas (30%) and peri-urban areas (28%).

Arrival IDPs by Type of Settlement | 2012 to April 2022

Over one-third of IDPs are hosted by a family (36%). Just shy of one-third of IDPs own the home they live in (31%), another third rent the home they live in (32%). A small proportion lives in tents (1%) or open air (<1%).

Among the almost 5.9 million IDPs currently in displacement, 5% (291,693 individuals) in informal settlements. Khost province hosts the most arrival IDPs living in informal settlements (177,372 individuals), followed by Nangarhar (40,600) and Herat (31,780).
Returned IDPs are Afghans who have returned to their home or place of origin in the assessed location or settlement from which they had previously fled as IDPs, as a result of, or in order to avoid, the effects of armed conflict, generalized violence, human rights violations, protection concerns, or natural and human-made disasters. This section breaks down the findings on returned IDPs only, it does not include other categories of IDP populations or cross-border movements.

Kunduz province has the most returned IDPs compared to all provinces (1,948,537 individuals, or 19% of all returned IDPs), the majority of which returned between 2012 and 2018.

Nuristan province witnessed a 91% increase in returned IDPs between December 2021 and April 2022. Daykundi province saw fewer IDPs compared to the previous round, a decrease of 31%.
ANNUAL TRENDS

Between 2019 and 2020, the number of IDPs returning to their places of origin increased slightly (by 12%).

Almost four out of five returned IDPs (78%) returned within their province of origin. Just over one in five returned IDPs (22%) had been displaced to and returned from another province.

Almost all of the IDPs who returned to Uruzgan province were displaced within Uruzgan province (94%). Virtually all of the IDPs who returned to Panjsher province were in displacement in another province (98%).

4,603,766 individuals returned in 2021 and 2022 alone (46% of all returned IDPs).

In 2021, the number reached an unprecedented level, increasing to almost 4 million returned IDPs, a 255% increase compared to 2020. In the first four months of 2022 alone, almost 700,000 IDPs have returned to their places of origin. The high number of returned IDPs in 2021 and 2022 could be attributed to changes in the security situation and encouragement from the government for IDPs to return.
**RATES OF NON-RETURN**

The rate of return differs significantly among provinces. Logar province has the highest rate of non-return: 74% of those who have displaced from Logar have not yet returned to their habitual residences.

**SETTLEMENT TYPE**

Forty-two per cent of individuals who were previously displaced and have returned to their habitual residence (place of origin) are in rural settlements, followed closely by peri-urban settlements (38%). One in five (20%) returned to urban settlements.
This section covers individuals who have moved abroad from the assessed locations, regardless of the reason or duration of expatriation. This category includes persons in need of international protection and economic migrants (it does not include other categories of IDP populations or cross-border movements).

Since 2012, most Afghans who have moved abroad originate from Faryab province (518,476 individuals, or 9% of all individuals who moved abroad from Afghanistan), the majority of whom left between 2012 and 2018.

The largest increase in Afghans moving abroad were from Nuristan province, which witnessed a 135% increase between December 2021 and April 2022. The province that witnessed the largest decrease in individuals moving abroad between Rounds 14 and 15 was Uruzgan province, which saw a decline of 59%.
HIGHLIGHTS

5,676,122 individuals left their habitual residence and crossed international borders

699,329 moved to Europe and Türkiye (12%)

3,738,637 moved to the Islamic Republic of Iran (66%)

1,094,879 moved to Pakistan (19%)

9% of Afghans who have moved abroad originate from Faryab province (518,476 individuals)

ANNUAL TRENDS

Between 2019 and 2021, there was a significant increase in the number of Afghans moving abroad. From 2019 to 2020, the number of individuals who moved abroad increased by 42%. Then, 2021 saw a significant surge in those moving abroad, increasing 183% compared to 2020.

This large increase is likely due to an intensifying environment of conflict accompanying the withdrawal of international troops and the change of government that occurred in the summer of 2021.

The number of Afghans going to all four of the most common destinations for those moving abroad (Europe & Türkiye, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Pakistan) increased between 2019 and 2021.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is the most common destination for Afghans moving abroad. Movement to the Islamic Republic of Iran increased by 50% between 2019 and 2020, followed by a larger increase of 190% between 2020 and 2021. As of this round of data collection, a total of 3,738,637 Afghans have moved to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Similarly, those moving abroad to Pakistan increased by 31% between 2019 and 2020 and later by 212% between 2020 and 2021. As of this round of data collection, a total of 1,094,879 Afghans who have left Afghanistan are residing in Pakistan.

Most Afghans who moved to the Islamic Republic of Iran are from:
1. Herat (43%)
2. Faryab (34%)
3. Takhar (23%)

Most Afghans who moved to Pakistan are from:
1. Nangarhar (42%)
2. Zabul (31%)
3. Kunduz (27%)
Afghans moving abroad to Europe and Türkiye also increased, although to a lesser extent: 30% more moved abroad to Europe and Türkiye in 2020 compared to 2019, and 126% more moved to those locations in 2021 compared to 2020. Afghans who have moved to Europe and Türkiye has reached 699,329, according to the most recent round of data collection.

Almost half of Afghans who moved abroad are from rural areas (48%), followed by peri-urban areas (33%) and urban areas (19%).

Most Afghans who moved to Europe and Türkiye are from:
1. Faryab (36%)
2. Jawzjan (33%)
3. Nangarhar (31%)

A returnee who was provided with a job opportunity in Herat Province. ©IOM 2022/Léo Torréton
WHO ARE RETURNEES FROM ABROAD?

This section covers Afghan nationals who have returned to the assessed locations after having spent at least six months abroad. This includes both documented persons (Afghans who were registered as refugees in host countries and requested voluntary return with UNHCR and relevant national authorities) and undocumented persons (Afghans who returned spontaneously or were deported from host countries, irrespective of whether or not they were registered as refugees with UNHCR and relevant national authorities). This section breaks down the findings on returnees from abroad, it does not include other categories of IDP populations or cross-border movements.

CHANGES FROM 2021 TO 2022

Among all provinces across Afghanistan, Nangarhar received the most returnees from abroad (659,187 individuals, or 11% of all returnees from abroad).

Between Rounds 14 and 15, Nuristan province witnessed the largest increase in returnees from abroad, with an increase of 142%. Uruzgan province saw the largest decrease in Afghans returning from abroad: -39% between December 2021 and April 2022.
HIGHLIGHTS

5,737,462 individuals returned after moving across international borders

out of which:

- 2,758,335 returned from Pakistan (48%)
- 3,926,133 undocumented returnees from Pakistan & the Islamic Republic of Iran (74%)
- 2,539,977 returned from the Islamic Republic of Iran (44%)
- 1,372,179 documented returnees from Pakistan & the Islamic Republic of Iran (26%)
- 439,150 returned from non-neighbouring countries (8%)

ANNUAL TRENDS

From 2019 to 2021, Afghans returning from abroad increased steadily but not significantly. Almost one half of a million Afghans returned from abroad in 2019. Over 700,000 individuals returned from abroad in 2020, marking an increase of 51% compared to 2019. Returns from abroad slowed in 2021, only increasing by 9% compared to 2020.

Returnees from Abroad | Annual Trends

![Graph showing annual trends of returnees from abroad]

From 2019 to 2021, returns from Europe and Türkiye to Afghanistan grew steadily. The years 2019 to 2020 saw a 55% change, while 2020 to 2021 saw a 43% change.

In 2021, twice as many returned to Afghanistan from Europe and Türkiye compared to 2019. The total number of returns from Europe and Türkiye from 2012 to 2022 are 340,078, which is much lower than those from the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan.

Returnees from Europe & Türkiye | Annual Trends
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Afghans returning from the Islamic Republic of Iran grew significantly from 2019 to 2020; there was a 63% increase (from 225,262 to 368,134 individuals). By 2021, this trend slowed, by 2021 compared to 2020, there was a 16% increase in Afghans returning from the Islamic Republic of Iran (from 368,134 to 426,884 individuals).

A total of 2,473,057 Afghans (both documented and undocumented) have returned from Iran since 2012.

Returnees from Pakistan & Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Annual Trends
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Most Afghans who returned from Europe & Türkiye returned to:

1. Herat (37%)
2. Faryab (33%)
3. Kabul (30%)

Most Afghans who returned from the Islamic Republic of Iran returned to:

1. Faryab (38%)
2. Nangarhar (35%)
3. Jawzjan (27%)
The number of Afghans who have returned from Pakistan is higher than those who traveled to and returned from Iran, 2,758,335 individuals, but the rate at which this number grew between 2019 and 2021 was slower than the rate of those returning from the Islamic Republic of Iran. From 2019 to 2020, the number of Afghans returning from Pakistan increased by 5% (from 208,655 to 218,296 individuals), and then by 22% from 2020 to 2021 (from 218,296 to 267,407 individuals).

The overwhelming majority of Afghans who have returned from Pakistan have returned to Kabul province (78% of all who have returned).

Returnees from Abroad by Country/Region of Destination | 2012 to April 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2012-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2,758,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>2,539,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe + Turkey</td>
<td>340,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>67,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Asia</td>
<td>26,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Afghans who returned from Pakistan returned to:
1. Kabul (78%)
2. Faryab (14%)
3. Herat (8%)

Returnees from Abroad by Type of Settlement | 2012 to April 2022

- Rural: 39%
- Urban: 31%
- Peri-Urban: 30%

Over one-third of Afghans who have returned from abroad to Afghanistan returned to rural areas (39%) followed by peri-urban areas (31%) and urban areas (30%).
HIGHLIGHTS

2.9 million households are in debt, a 6% decrease since the previous round

42% of households rely on less preferred or less expensive foods as a coping mechanism

55% of households have no source of income (excluding debt)

69% of people cannot afford basic food needs

71% of people in urban settlements cannot afford basic food needs, compared with 68% of rural and 68% of peri-urban settlements

10% of households rely on food aid for bread

16% of households eat one meal or less per day

23% of people are unable to access basic food needs

1% of households resort to extreme measures such as selling organs, selling children, or child marriage to afford food

FINANCE

On average throughout Afghanistan, over half of households in all communities (55%) have no source of income. Households in Bamyan province on average face the highest rate among all provinces, where almost 9 out of 10 households are without a source of income (89%). Ghor, Kabul, Paktya, Kapisa, and Baghlan provinces also face high rates of over 70% of households without a single source of income.

Rural, urban, and peri-urban settlements report similar percentages of households without an income (54%, 57%, and 56% respectively).

2.9 million households in Afghanistan are in debt. This marks a 6% decrease in indebted households compared to the previous round (which found 3,024,350 households were in debt). Kabul and Nangarhar provinces have the highest overall number of indebted households (436,996 and 363,909 respectively).

Indebtedness is a major factor in decision-making, both for internal displacement and cross-border movements.
When Afghan households need to repay debt, they are most likely to sell assets, move abroad or within Afghanistan, or sell land or their houses in order to do so, according to community focal points. Households may also engage in performing unpaid labor in order to repay debts. Extremely vulnerable households sometimes engage in child marriage or sell their children or bodily organs in order to afford food, although these coping mechanisms are not commonly practiced (see the graph above).

The political events of 2021 led to complex economic impacts. Inflation soared in 2021, and by March 2022, basic household goods were 20% more expensive than in August 2021. The Afghani currency depreciated by 18.4% between August 2021 and January 2022, before appreciating slightly in March and April 2022. These overlapping, hard-hitting economic realities push families into practicing extreme coping mechanisms in order to pay off debt.

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Afghanistan’s vulnerability to conflict and natural disasters frequently leads to high levels of food insecurity. As a result of overall food scarcity in the country, the diversity of food intake by families in the country is limited. Sixteen per cent of households consume one meal or less per day. Faryab province has the highest prevalence of households eating one meal or less per day (37% of households).

One in five households (18%) in urban areas eat one meal or less per day, compared with 14% of peri-urban households and 16% of rural households.

One out of 10 households in Afghanistan relies on food aid as a source of staple food (bread). Twenty-seven per cent of households produce bread themselves, and almost two-thirds of households purchase bread in markets. Daykundi province shows high rates of purchasing bread in markets (86%), while most households in Samangan produce bread themselves (71%). The province that relies the most on food aid for bread is Badakhshan (43%). Rural areas report higher rates of producing their own staple food (35%), compared with peri-urban (24%) and urban settlements (13%). Urban areas report higher rates of purchasing staple food from markets (78%), compared to 62% in peri-urban and 56% in rural settlements. Lastly, all areas report similar levels of receiving food aid for staple food: 14% in peri-urban areas, 9% in urban areas, and 8% in rural areas.

---

Almost one quarter (23%) of people in communities across Afghanistan cannot access their basic food needs. Wardak province faces the worst rates of individuals being unable to access basic food needs (88%). On average, similar shares of people in rural, peri-urban, and urban settlements are unable to access basic food needs: 23%, 24%, and 22% respectively.

In the face of these common barriers to affording and accessing basic food needs, families continue to rely on a variety of coping mechanisms. The most common coping mechanism is relying on less preferred foods, which is practiced by over two out of every five households (42%) on average across the country. Nuristan, Khost, Herat provinces reported the highest rate of this practice (67%, 64%, and 64%).

Eight per cent of all households borrow money for food, this is the most common in Paktika (21%), Zabul (17%), and Nimruz (15%) provinces. Ten per cent of households rely on humanitarian assistance for food, especially in Badakhshan (31%), Faryab (24%), and Nimruz (22%) provinces.

Over half of people in communities across Afghanistan cannot afford their basic food needs. The worst case is in Bamyan province, where over 9 out of 10 people in communities (92%) are unable to afford their basic food needs.

Urban settlements face slightly more difficulty achieving their basic food needs, with 71% of the people in the community being unable to afford basic food needs, compared with 68% among both peri-urban and rural settlements.

% of People in Community Unable to Afford Basic Food Needs | By province

In the face of these common barriers to affording and accessing basic food needs, families continue to rely on a variety of coping mechanisms. The most common coping mechanism is relying on less preferred foods, which is practiced by over two out of every five households (42%) on average across the country. Nuristan, Khost, Herat provinces reported the highest rate of this practice (67%, 64%, and 64%).

Eight per cent of all households borrow money for food, this is the most common in Paktika (21%), Zabul (17%), and Nimruz (15%) provinces. Ten per cent of households rely on humanitarian assistance for food, especially in Badakhshan (31%), Faryab (24%), and Nimruz (22%) provinces.

% of People in Community Unable to Access Basic Food Needs | By province
Certain food-related coping mechanisms that are less common but more severe include marrying off children, selling children, or selling body organs in order to afford food. The harsh economic impacts of 2021 pushed families into engaging in extreme coping mechanisms in order to afford food. Across the country, only one per cent of households engage in these coping mechanisms.

A total of 552 people engaged in selling organs in the six months prior to data collection; one-third of these cases (32%) were in Badghis province, and a high number (29%) were in Sar-e-Pul province.

Across Afghanistan, 2,113 children were sold in the six months prior to data collection as a food-related coping mechanism. One-third of these cases (34%) were in Sar-e-Pul province and one-fifth of these cases were in Balkh province.

Additionally, 31,458 children were married off as a food-related coping mechanism in the six months prior to data collection. Thirty per cent of these cases were in Sar-e-Pul province. Sar-e-Pul province thus shows high rates of all extreme coping mechanisms.
STORIES FROM THE DISPLACED

Jamal Uddin has lived in a mountainside in Bamyan province for five years. He displaced from his village of origin in Wardak province five years ago due to drought and poverty. Because he cannot afford rent, he was forced to live in this cave with his family.

He works as a farmer for the owners of the land where he resides. Last year he earned 28,000 Afghanis (318 USD) from the sale of potatoes, of which he received a share, and a total of 210 kilograms of wheat.

Jamal Uddin has six children, three boys and three girls, who have not been going to school because he cannot provide clothes, supplies or transportation for them.

He said, “This year, there is less opportunity to find a job. My family and I have been facing a severe shortage of food and groceries, and I have been asking for help from charities and relevant government officials.” He added, “During the last six months, we have received little help and we are severely affected by the food shortage problems.”

*The names have been changed and village locations have been kept anonymous to protect the identity of the interviewee.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Returned IDPs (Individuals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>KABUL</td>
<td>1 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAPISA</td>
<td>1,001 - 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARWAN</td>
<td>2,501 - 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WARDAK</td>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOGAR</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NANGARHAR</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAGHMAN</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PANJSHER</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BADAKSHAN</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAJIKISTAN</td>
<td>&gt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Arrival IDPs & Returned Migrants from Abroad per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Data Source: IOM, AGCHO, AIMS, CSO, OSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This map is for illustration purposes only. Names &amp; boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu &amp; Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu &amp; Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emergency Needs Assessment (ENA) Round 15 | Overview | Arrival IDPs & Returnees from Abroad | Percentage of Households Eats One Meal or Less per Day | April 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Arrival IDPs &amp; Returnees from Abroad per District</th>
<th>Percentage of Households Eats One Meal or Less per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,001 - 25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,001 - 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Emergency Community-Based Needs Assessment (eCBNA) Round 15 | Overview | Arrival IDPs & Returnees from Abroad | Percentage of Households Eats One Meal or Less per Day | April 2022
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Arrival IDPs & Returned Migrants from Abroad per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Arrival IDPs &amp; Returned Migrants from Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76 - 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>% of Households in Community with No Income Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76 - 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data Source: IOM, AGCHO, AIMS, CSO, OSM. This map is for illustration purposes only. Names & boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu & Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.
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Jammu and Kashmir