Each year, Sida conducts a humanitarian allocation exercise in which a large part of its humanitarian budget is allocated to emergencies worldwide. The allocation and subsequent disbursement of funds takes place in the beginning of the year to ensure predictability for humanitarian organizations and to allow for best possible operational planning. In an effort to truly adhere to the humanitarian principles, Sida’s humanitarian assistance is grounded in the four humanitarian principles, and in particular impartiality, with its compelling urge to ensure that humanitarian action is carried out based on “needs alone”, giving priority to the “most urgent cases of distress”. Therefore, Sida’s allocation methodology is grounded in several objective indicators such as; the scale of humanitarian needs (number of people in need), the severity of humanitarian needs (including food insecurity/IPC levels), the number of people targeted for the humanitarian response, the financial coverage of the respective humanitarian appeal, national capacities to respond and underlying risks, as well as distinct indicators related to forgotten crises. Sida also strongly supports the humanitarian coordination structures. Besides this initial allocation, another part of the humanitarian budget is set aside as an emergency reserve for sudden onset emergencies and deteriorating humanitarian situations. This reserve allows Sida to quickly allocate funding to any humanitarian situation throughout the year, including additional funding to (name of Country/Crisis).

For 2019, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is allocated an initial 220 MSEK. Close monitoring and analysis of the situation in DRC will continue throughout the year and will inform possible decisions on additional funding.

1. CRISIS OVERVIEW

1.1. Conflict

Background and underlying cause:

Armed conflict and violence continue to terrorise the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) causing one of the world’s worst humanitarian protection crises of a protracted nature. After years of a repressive colonial rule followed by armed conflict, the Congolese people's capacity to withstand shocks has since long been eked away at, if not decimated. The weak central government, whose lack of will and capacity to guarantee security to people, has been failing to drive ahead the development needed to lift people out of vulnerability.

The continuous armed violence is fueled by ethnic and land disputes, poor governance, tremendous under-development and poverty and competition for mineral resources, which in turn further aggravates the impact of the conflict. Massive and repeated human rights violations and waves of forced displacements are the effect. Domestic food supply remains low and high costs make access cost-prohibitive for the population. Grave protection concerns (such as detention, torture, forced eviction, forced recruitment, gender-based violence), food insecurity and malnutrition and an aggravated impact of epidemics (Ebola, cholera) and natural disasters (floods) are the outcome, adding stress on a population where the majority live under the poverty threshold, despite the country’s enormous natural resources and therefore inherent wealth.

According to preliminary HNO figures, it is estimated that 12.8 million people will need emergency humanitarian assistance in 2019. Yet in parallel, the number of people presumed to be acutely food insecure is higher at 13.1 million. Widespread donor skepticism and fatigue continues to hamper the humanitarian response. Currently, only half of the HRP is funded. The humanitarian appeal for 2019 is USD 1.65 billion, roughly equal to last year’s numbers yet more than double that of 2017. Resource deficiency continuously causes severe delays of direct life-saving efforts. The OCHA office is Africa’s largest but still faces a funding gap despite a modest increase in 2018.

Although some areas of the country experienced a relative level of stability during the past year, the overall tendency of the humanitarian context in the DRC remained negative. In January 2018, large scale intra-ethnic violence flared up in Ituri, which for years had been relatively stable, leaving hundreds dead and adding hundreds of thousands newly displaced to the already record high figure. After a few months of relative calm, violence and displacement are again on the rise. Ongoing mass deportation from Angola of Congolese citizens into the Kasai provinces risks to reverse the trend of relative stability. Meanwhile, conflict involving armed groups and the national army continues in eastern North Kivu, South Kivu and Tanganyika provinces.

In 2018, two outbreaks of Ebola have devastated the DRC. The first in the DRC’s western province Equateur led to 54 cases of which 33 dead. The second, in eastern DRC’s North Kivu province is still not under control and counts 373 infections and 168 deaths despite a solid international response (November 2018). The number of infected is the highest number recorded in the country since Ebola was first detected in the early 1970s. The security situation in the area as well as popular distrust in the response has been a further impediment to controlling the outbreak. Since March 2018, one of the worst cholera outbreaks in recent years claimed an even higher death toll in nearly all the country’s provinces.
Main stakeholders in the conflict:
The DRC has an extremely complex and constantly changing landscape of armed actors, agents, proxies as well as underlying interests that fuel a security and protection crises. The Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) and more than 120 armed groups take part in the armed conflicts across the country. The United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the DRC (MONUSCO) military units sometimes carry out operations in coordination with the FARDC. Most armed groups are operating in the eastern provinces of North- and South Kivu and in neighboring Tanganyika. After some time of relative stability and limited IDP returns, the number of security incidents involving Kamwina Nsapu and other militias are again rising in the Kasais. Civilians are caught in between and regularly harassed by weapon-bearers from both government and militias, causing stress on communities and their livelihoods.

Cross border implications:
The violence in the DRC and neighbouring nations has fuelled cross-border movement of civilians and armed groups. The DRC is host to 536,000 refugees from conflict zones along its borders, mainly the Central African Republic, South Sudan and Burundi. More than 200,000 Rwandan post-genocide refugees still reside in the DRC. As of mid-October 2018, large numbers Congolese citizens have been deported from Angola. It is estimated that they range from 300,000 to 500,000 and have mainly come to the troubled Kasai provinces, demanding yet another large-scale humanitarian emergency operation. Numbers are believed to possibly double in the weeks to come, adding to the growing humanitarian needs.

The question of foreign military involvement in the armed conflict, either directly or by proxy, is sensitive and a constant cause of dispute. Although several of the armed groups active in the DRC have shared interests with one or more of the neighbouring countries, there is at present no clear evidence of direct external involvement.

Trends:
In 2018, DRC’s macroeconomic performance began to show some signs of recovery. Public engagement in social and humanitarian sectors remains, however, nearly insignificant. The practice of the central and provincial government to close IDP camps is likely to continue into 2019. 2019 is also the year that MONUSCO is meant to continue scale down towards its eventual departure, raising questions towards how security will be guaranteed. The FAO cites 2018 as a year of poor yield from crops driving low food supply. Long overdue, elections have been set to take place on December 23, 2018. The international community is placing their hope on a new government that would be willing to engage and reform. Yet risk that the humanitarian context will further worsen, driving the need for a multi-sectoral response, which will be underfunded are high.

1.2. Geographical areas and affected population
The crises hotspots largely correlate with areas where armed conflicts and inter-community violence are ongoing or has recently taken place and where the number of displaced is high. The eastern provinces of North- and South Kivu, where 364,000 people were displaced between January to August 2018, are since two decades the centre of the armed conflict and its effects (violence, human rights abuses and IHL violations). It remains the scene of the largest accumulated numbers of displaced by far. The ongoing Ebola outbreak is further stretching humanitarian capacities in the Kivus. In 2018, armed conflict and ethically motivated violence spread to the previously relatively peaceful Ituri province (491,000 new IDPs). Massive violence against civilians has continued in parts of Tanganyika province (34,000 new IDPs) and the Kasai provinces (close to 90,000 new IDPs) are again facing increased tensions and risk of further destabilization following mass influx of deportees from Angola and an increase in security incidents involving armed groups.

The 2019 update of the multi-year HRP (2017-2019), estimates that there will be 12,8 million people in need of humanitarian assistance, roughly corresponding to 16% of the country’s total population, and aims to target 9 million people. Meanwhile, according to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC, June 2018), 13,1 million people live in acute food-insecurity (level 3 and 4), corresponding to 23 % of the total rural population and concentrated to areas of conflict and post-conflict. It also estimates that 4,28 million children under the age of 5 will suffer from acute malnutrition in 2019, of which 1,42 million are severe cases (SAM). If not treated, SAM has a mortality rate of up to 50% and is the single factor that claims the highest number of victims in DRC.

1.3. Critical assumptions, risks and threats
In 2018 DRC scored 7.1/10, constituting a very high risk, on INFORM’s risk assessment scale and the trend is worsening. The list of underlying patterns and drivers to the conflict and thus the humanitarian needs is long: an absence of effective political and military control of vast territories, foreign interests through proxy actors, widespread impunity and absence of an independent judiciary, an under-resourced public social sector, including health and education systems, competition for natural resources, geopolitical instability, inter-ethnic tensions, lack of political will and absence of genuine and resourced domestic agendas for peace, development and humanitarian recovery. These are all crucial factors to break the decade-long vicious cycle of conflict, human rights violations and forced displacement. There is little sign of a substantial improvement to the humanitarian situation within the foreseeable future. The crises response is facing a growing donor fatigue sustaining a constant emergency response while political and economic root causes are left untouched. Severe underdevelopment exacerabates the population’s vulnerability in risk areas. The DRC is one of
the world’s most underfunded crises contexts and there is a serious risk of a further growing gap between humanitarian needs and available resources.

1.4. Strategic objectives and priorities of the Humanitarian Response Plan

The idea behind the current multi-year Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) 2017-2019 was to allow for the response to extend over time and thereby improve coherence, durability and interplay with development interventions. However, the vastness and diversity of humanitarian crises patterns in DRC, together with the drastically worsening security situation and increase of humanitarian needs during the first two years of the three-year period, have proven the need for a profound yearly update of the plan. Due to the magnitude, as well as broad geographic and sectorial scope, the strategic objectives of the plan are fairly generic and remain the same throughout the cycle: i) Immediate action to improve living conditions of people affected by the crisis, and in priority the most vulnerable, ii) Protection of those affected by the humanitarian crisis, and the assurance of the respect of their human rights, iii) Reduced excess mortality and excess morbidity of people affected by the crisis, iv) Prompt, effective and adequate humanitarian assistance, in accordance with humanitarian principles and standards. The plan’s geographic focus does largely, but not exclusively, correlate with the conflict hotspots in North and South Kivu, Tanganyika, Ituri and the Kasai provinces.

2. IN COUNTRY HUMANITARIAN CAPACITIES

2.1. National and local capacities and constraints

- **Government** (national, sub-national, local):
  To date, the government of the DRC has not been actively engaged in neither building up the national social sectors (including health services) nor responding to the population’s massive humanitarian needs. 2018 has seen a deterioration in relations between the DRC government and the international humanitarian community. Following the March UNSC debate on DRC, where parallels were drawn to crises in Yemen and Iraq, the government’s attitude to the international humanitarian response has been increasingly ambiguous and sometimes close to obstructive. Refusal to participate in the DRC donor conference in Geneva in April, was followed by a consistent contestation of reported IDP numbers and a refusal to recognize any IDPs not residing in camps, although the clear majority is living in host communities. At the same time, the government has taken steps to dismantle the camps, in some cases using excessive violence and forced evictions. These tensions and the need for government approval has delayed HRP processes, including the HNO methodology and outcome (numbers). An overall assessment is therefore that the further deterioration of the humanitarian crises in the DRC is not fully reflected in official numbers.

- **Civil society incl. NGOs** (national, sub-national, local):
  DRC is home to numerous associations and local NGOs, not least in the humanitarian sector. The absence of a state presence leaves a vacuum in which the local civil society initiatives operate despite being severely hampered by lacking finance and skilled personnel. National humanitarian NGOs represent an important, and growing, portion of the implementing partners to the DRC Humanitarian Pooled Fund and other humanitarian organizations such as the UNHCR. Churches and the national Red Cross society engage many thousands of volunteers, that are often the first responders to humanitarian crises and often remain the only source of relief for victims of conflicts and disasters.

- **Community and household level**:
  Survival depends primarily on the capacities of affected households as well as the surrounding (host) community, including resistance and recovery. Self-reliance and solidarity within and between communities remain the most important response factors to humanitarian needs. Women as a rule bear the brunt as first responders. External assistance is generally insufficient, delayed, or, as in most cases, completely absent. Chronic severe underdevelopment remains a fundamental obstacle for communities, households and individuals to develop their strengths to withstand recurrent humanitarian shocks and threats to their lives, security and livelihood. In the absence of adequate public policies, resilience-oriented development cooperation is very much needed in large parts of the country. The Swedish development cooperation with the DRC, notably in the health and livelihood sectors, puts large emphasis on contributing to improve the ability of individuals, households and communities to better withstand shocks and thereby mitigate disasters.

2.2. International operational capacities and constraints

- **Leadership and coordination**:
  The work of the humanitarian coordination led by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), the Deputy HC, OCHA and the Humanitarian Country Team is strongly affected by the tense relationship with the government and the politicization of aid. This is further exacerbated by the double-hat construction of the HC-function, as one person carries the mandate of HC and Deputy Head of MONUSCO, who responds to political priorities that might conflict with humanitarian principles. The Deputy HC-function (new since 2018) has considerably increased the presence of the HC-function in the field response, while the foreseen strengthening of relations with the donor community has not yet materialized. The OCHA office largely depends on HC decision making but appears well-functioning and with an extensive geographic presence. That said, the office remains underfinanced despite being one of few offices worldwide to receive a budget increase in 2018. The regional and local humanitarian coordination (CRIOS and CLIOS) were new in 2018, their aim to
strenthen regional coordination and decentralize decision-making at the expense of central structures given the diversity in geography and features of the different crises. The HCT is open to participation from UN agencies and a limited number of local NGOs and INGOs, either direct or through the INGO Forum, as well as the most important donors. Sweden holds an observer seat.

- **Humanitarian agencies:**
  WFP, UNICEF, IOM and UNHCR, among others, represent a relatively strong UN-presence in the humanitarian response in the DRC, with offices and sub-offices spread throughout the country’s provinces. The slow and centralized decision-making procedures, not least for staff recruitment, pose challenges to flexibility and timeliness of humanitarian interventions. The HCT concluded, at the time for the L3 declaration of October 2017, that the operational capacities and resources of the UN humanitarian actors in the DRC are far from living up to international minimum standards. Severe underfunding throughout the UN-system is the single most limiting factor to improving capabilities and fulfilling their humanitarian responsibilities. The L3-declaration expired in March 2018 without any significant lasting results. Today, priorities continue to be set by opportunities and media attention. The international readiness to swiftly and generously contribute to the Ebola response has been a sharp contrast to the insufficient donor engagement in combatting much more devastating health concerns, such as cholera and malnutrition.

- **Implementing partners:**
  Implementing partners in the humanitarian sector include a vast range of international and local NGOs and other non-state actors. NRC, ACF and ICRC are important partners to Sweden. Sweden’s contributions to Congolese NGOs are channelled through the humanitarian pooled fund and UNICEF’s Rapid Response Mechanism for Displaced Populations. Cluster leadership is shared between UN agencies and INGOs.

- **Development actors:**
  In the DRC, extreme underdevelopment and humanitarian crises often coincide in time and location, underscoring the need for enhanced methodological development of the humanitarian-development nexus and closer cooperation between development and humanitarian assistance. Many of the organizations implementing development programs in the DRC are in fact the same as those taking part in the humanitarian response; the same applies to donors. Organizations such as the EU and the World Bank are also present. Sweden remains a strong voice for implementing resilience programming and strengthening thinking on the nexus between humanitarian and long-term development programming. Among initiatives is Sweden’s decision to channel development funding to resilience oriented longer-term humanitarian assistance through the humanitarian pooled fund.

2.3. **International and regional assistance**

Humanitarian assistance in the DRC is upheld through contributions from a relatively limited number of donors. The biggest supplier of direct humanitarian assistance to the DRC is the USA, followed by the UK, the EU and Sweden. Others are Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Canada, France, Germany and Japan. Together with the UK, Sweden is the most important donor to the Humanitarian Pooled Fund. Despite increased humanitarian funding in 2018, following the deterioration of the humanitarian crises, the Geneva humanitarian conference in April and the L3-declaration, funding levels remain alarmingly low, with approximately half of the HRP currently covered. Unfortunately, the international attention around the DRC humanitarian crises has not led non-traditional humanitarian donors such as Qatar, UAE or China to engage. Regional organizations such as AU and SADC remain engaged in the political dialogue with and about the DRC, but do not actively contribute to the humanitarian crises response.

2.4. **Access situation**

While the topography of the DRC together with extremely poor infrastructure play a large role in making access to affected populations challenging, the security situation and disrespect for international humanitarian law (including the responsibility to facilitate access) is the main impeding factor. Criminality, including kidnapping, and access fees also prohibit humanitarians’ movement, putting some in danger. Repeated security incidents are continuously compromising, delaying and increasing cost of assistance in many of the most exposed humanitarian crises areas in North Kivu, South Kivu, Ituri and Tanganyika. Numerous cases of violence against humanitarian personnel have been recorded in 2018, of which a few cases of killings. Politically motivated government obstruction of humanitarian access has been a recurrent problem in Tanganyika and North Kivu, often in and around IDP-camps.

The humanitarian space is, as in many contexts, viewed as a security issue invoking an idea that stabilization actors are needed to protect. This became more notable in 2018 when the response to the ongoing Ebola outbreak has been mired by challenges related to access, and a discussion on accompanying medical teams with armed escorts. Sweden will in 2019 continue to support partners to access hard to reach areas where the needs are often the most urgent as well as drive dialogue on the potential this carries in transferring risk to staff and partners. This will include the availability of rapid response mechanisms as well as flexible funding to partners. The question of I

3. **SIDA’S HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLAN**

3.1. **The role of Sida**
Sida has, during recent years, maintained robust and continuously growing support to the humanitarian response in DRC, with its contribution reaching nearly 350 million SEK ranking not only amongst the highest of bilateral donors, but also of the highest amongst Sida’s contributions to other crises. In previous years, Sida has responded with a view to providing principled assistance that targets the most vulnerable. Practically, this has included support to both non-governmental organizations and multilateral partners who work with people directly affected by the conflict, across all sectors, with a pronounced focus on displaced people, the latter including also returns.

Sweden’s recent humanitarian support has contributed to the response in various important ways:
- Responding to the tremendous needs in the food security sector, Sweden has contributed significantly to organizations like WFP in addressing acute malnutrition. Sweden is a major donor in the response to the influx of Congolese citizens returning from Angola and funds more than half of the intervention (November 2018).
- Sweden has in various ways contributed to the efficiency and timeliness of the humanitarian response by being a prominent contributor the Country Based Pooled Fund (the Fund), supporting rapid response mechanisms and in supporting NRC with a program-based approach. The latter has given the organization an increased ability to quickly respond to needs and meet shift priorities. The Fund increased the possibility for Congolese NGOs to access funding and therefore contribute to the increased localization of the response.
- Sweden aims to keep the centrality of the humanitarian principles at the forefront of the response by ensuring that initiatives are based on needs alone. Through the support to IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix, Sweden is contributing to continuous displacement monitoring, making evidence accessible to guide the response.
- Integrating sexual and reproductive health continues to be a priority for Sweden and programming in this area has responded to the seven needs of women and girls affected by the conflict in DRC.

The efforts of Swedish partners in 2018 met challenges that provide important lessons learned:
- Securing access was challenged due to the security situation. Likewise, partner programming that did not take necessary preparatory steps to ensure access or integrate protection thinking throughout the program met challenges to implement. This only confirmed the importance of maintaining an eye to the centrality of protection both on a macro (response) and micro (project) level. Confusing elements of protection can risk interfering with an ability to implement a principled response.
- The politicization of humanitarian aid and the humanitarian context. Politics and policies related to tracking, settling and responding to the needs of IDPs proved at times a challenge, particularly in gathering a holistic understanding of the problem based on evidence, which is a necessary element to serve as a basis for an effective and targeted response.
- Keeping key staff was difficult in part due to projects’ short-term perspectives as well as the security situation in conflict affected areas.
- Integrating a gender perspective, including addressing the challenge of stigma related to reporting GBV, proved an important consideration to reach women and girls.
- Differentiating and understanding the root causes for vulnerabilities to be able to better prioritize and thus direct humanitarian assistance, as compared to more development or resilience-oriented programming proved an ongoing challenge in DRC. Ensuring that humanitarian funding is not stretched too thin when the needs are so overwhelming remains a responsibility of all.

3.2. Response Priorities 2019

 Entirely in line with the HRP 2017-2019 and as has been the focus to date, Sida will prioritize serving people who have been directly affected by the conflict, specifically the most vulnerable where displacement is a significant factor (including internal displacement as well as cross-border). Sida will aim to work specifically to respond to consequences of the crisis, most notably malnutrition and the impact of protection-related risks (i.e. excessive violence, forced recruitment, GBV). As with the HRP, Sida’s humanitarian contribution aims to be principled, flexible and rapid. Considering the protracted nature of the crises, Sida will aim to support initiatives that work either to bridge humanitarian and development programming, such as providing durable solutions for displaced persons, as well as to increase community resilience, building community capacity (individual and institutional) to respond to shocks.

In 2019, Sweden will continue to focus its humanitarian programming in the areas most affected: Ituri, North and South Kivu, Tanganyika and the Kasaïs. Specific response modalities will be adapted to best suit the actual context and can therefore range from in-kind to cash as well as service delivery or combinations thereof. A multi-sectoral response is often necessary to respond to the compounded needs that affected people experience linking sectors such as WASH and shelter, health and protection.

During 2019, Sida will focus follow up on the following areas:
- IDP/displaced persons: Responding to the needs of IDPs, and particularly following up on the role of specific organizations in fulfilling this mandate
- Nexus: Multi-year programming and the possibilities related to bridging humanitarian and development funding, with an eye to the humanitarian/development nexus, particularly in the area of health and protection,
- Resilience: Community-based programming and its possibility to build community capacity to better respond to humanitarian needs
- Protection: the integration of protection in programming, as well as stand-alone protection programming. Efforts to follow how protection risks affect other programming (i.e. the delivery of the Ebola response) will also be followed closely.
- Multi-sectoral rapid response: The effectiveness of different forms of coordinated rapid response programming and their ability to meet immediate needs.

3.3. Partners
Sida works with a range of actors in the DRC response, including both INGOs and multilateral organizations, whose reach span sectoral needs and geographic areas, as well as contribute to improved access and coordination. In 2019, Sida humanitarian assistance aims to finance organizations that provide a multi-sectoral response to persons affected by the conflicts, predominantly those displaced, including organizations operating within a rapid response framework (NRC, ACF, UNICEF). Protection actors, including Save the Children and the ICRC, provide services, assistance and work on negotiations and dialogue. The ICRC and SRC are important actors who disseminate humanitarian principles through their work. The WFP address needs related to food security and malnutrition. IOM and UNHCR respond to the needs of displaced persons, including tracking IDP numbers. Efforts to better coordinate the humanitarian response as well as to facilitate access will be supported through OCHA, UNHAS and the INGO Forum. Sida underscores the importance that the multilateral organizations allocate to the DRC from their own core funding. The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) continues to prioritize DRC, and Sida will support its expert secondments when deemed necessary and relevant. Sida is still working with the ambition to reduce the number of partners with which it works in DRC, yet this has not yet been fully realized, in part due to the breadth of scope and needs.

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: OCHA is responsible for coordination in DRC, in what can be assessed as a difficult context with several actors fulfilling overlapping mandates. The decentralization of coordinating mechanisms that took place in 2017 was a good step. Local coordination seems to be generally positive, yet more needs to be done to strengthen the localized units particularly as related to strategic decision vis-à-vis the country based pooled funds. More work also needs to be done in information gathering and management. A concern that has been noted is that areas that are more difficult to access tend to not have as many responders, whereas in more accessible sites – such as IDP sites for example - the interventions of several implementing organizations converge and sometimes overlap. The coordination of the response needs to see to this. In 2018, Sida contributed to OCHA DRC’s budget sending a clear signal as to its importance. In 2019, Sida continues to confirm the central importance of OCHA’s role in ensuring that data is gathered so that the response is truly evidence-based as well efforts to ensure deconfliction and proper coverage are prioritized.

Country-based Humanitarian Pooled Fund: The Humanitarian Fund has been a flexible tool for emergency response to new or ongoing crisis and is an important channel to support local actors in the humanitarian response. Through this the contribution to local actors, the CBPF contributes to the localization agenda and supports organizations who have an advantage in reaching affected populations both because of access and acceptance. It is perceived to be complimentary to other funding streams (such as the CERF, which is handled through the same office) and continues to work towards improved follow up of results as well as risk management. Sida will continue to follow up on the Fund’s cost efficiency.

UN Children’s Fund - Rapid Response to Population Movement: The UNICEF RRPM mechanism to assist affected persons has three overarching priorities: to monitor needs (and conduct multi-sectoral needs assessments), produce alerts and to deliver rapid multi-sectoral assistance to those in greatest need using prepositioned stock and staff. The mechanism is implemented in coordination with INGOs, some of which are also Sida’s strategic partners (NRC, STC). It works extensively in the prioritized areas where needs are the greatest in eastern DRC (Ituri, Tanganyika, North and South Kivu) and was extended to the Kasais in 2017. Previously considered slow and not very cost effective, substantial efforts have been made in 2018 to improve the mechanism, including in analysing the time it takes to respond to different types of displacement and better understanding vulnerability of both displaced and the host communities. In 2019, the programme target is to reach 1,325,940 people with essential household non-food items/shelter materials, conditional cash for non-food items and unrestricted cash.

World Food Program: As per the WFP’s Interim Strategic Plan for DRC (2018-2020), the number of food insecure in DRC increased markedly from 2016 to 2017, with 13.1 million expected to be food insecure in 2019. In October 2018 the third revision of WFP’s plan signalled a growing need for support to address food insecurity and malnutrition while recognizing that the plan is only able to cover 20% of the needs. As of November 2018, WFP’s needs-based plan was still only partially funded at 46.6%. Sida’s humanitarian funding prioritizes the first two strategic outcomes of WFP’s plan that delivers an emergency response to tackle food insecurity and malnutrition, so that people meet their basic food needs as well as improve their nutritional status.

United Nations Humanitarian Air Services: Logistical challenges as well as the security situation impede movement around the DRC. UNHAS is essential to the humanitarian community in facilitating access to many hard-to-reach areas. Sweden continues to take part in dialogue on UNHAS’ operations, including efforts to ensure cost-recovery.
UN High Commissioner for Refugees: UNHCR is primarily mandated in the protection of refugees and is also the lead agency for the protection of IDPs in the DRC. Under recent years, Sweden together with other donors have criticized UNHCR for not taking on a strong enough role in responding to the needs of IDPs. However, it was made quite evident during a visit in November 2018, that the organization has concertedly worked to improve in this area. In 2018 the country program budget progressively increased from USD 700,000 to USD 7,500,000 and in 2019, the program will start the year at USD 6 million. Sweden support UNHCR in its important contribution to meeting the needs of IDPs both in camps and host communities to provide basic supplies and services for (shelter), health, nutrition, WASH and hygiene.

International Organization of Migration: While working in different sectors, IOM directs efforts towards addressing the needs of IDPs in the DRC. IOM will improve quality of life and protection of IDPs by sharing accurate and timely data on displaced populations and their humanitarian needs, work to enhance Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM), and the provision protection assistance. IOM is the co-lead (together with UNHCR) of the CCCM working group. It manages the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), a system to track and monitor individual displacement and population mobility. The DTM was activated in Kasai and Tanganyika in July 2017 and South-Kivu in 2018. Expanding the DTM, and thereby ensuring access to evidence-based data, is a priority for 2019.

Red Cross Movement:  
International Committee of the Red Cross: Sweden provides significant support to the ICRC both through the humanitarian assistance unit, as well as the Swedish MFA with core funding. The ICRC is one of a few actors in the DRC that manages continued contact with the armed groups and is therefore able to negotiate on behalf of the civilian population working towards their increased protection. The ICRC will in 2019 continue to meet the emergency needs of conflict-affected people, assist them in becoming self-sufficient and help those in need receive adequate health and medical care, including psychosocial support. Key in 2019 is to, especially in remote areas, ensure safe and unrestricted access to affected people to improve the protection of the civilian population.

Swedish Red Cross: The SRC works together with the ICRC and the national society in the DRC (the Congolese Red Cross). Sida is supporting SRC’s three-year program training Red Cross volunteers and local health workers as well as members of the community (including police and taxi drivers) in emergency first aid to respond to victims of armed conflict in North and South Kivus. The project has also played an important role in disseminating information on IHL to different actors and thereby working towards improved access. In 2019, the ICRC is implementing the program and 1000 people are expected to receive first aid training.

INGOs:  
Action Against Hunger (AAH/ACF): Sida’s support in 2019 proposes to complement ACF’s ECHO funding to provide a rapid, multi-sectoral response to new displacement alerts. The proposal focuses on three areas specifically (WASH, NFIs, and psychosocial support) in North and South Kivu and is to be implemented within fifteen days of a new alert. The response will also deliver psychological first aid to persons affected by violence, including survivors of sexual gender-based violence. AAH is also funded by Sida’s development strategy for the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC): In the DRC, Sida supports NRC through a program-based approach, giving NRC flexibility to direct funding towards the needs it identifies as most urgent, as well as to be able to redirect funding when necessary (such as the organization was able to do when the crisis in the Kasais erupted). The objectives of NRC’s work in DRC are to contribute to cover immediate needs holistically and promote durable solution for people at risk through integrated and community-centered programming. To achieve this, NRC will strengthen its capacity in community-based protection programming and conflict sensitive approaches. NRC will seek to empower communities towards greater sustainability and resilience, deepening impact. Cash in an important element of NRC’s work.

Save the Children Sweden (SCS): In the DRC, SCS implements programming that aims to address the protection related needs of girls and boys affected by the conflict. The impact of the conflict on these children can include protection risks such as direct violence, forced recruitment and sexual gender-based violence. During the start-up of the project SCS faced delays in implementation; steps to address this have been taken. The centrality of protection as well as to implement a strong gender-based approach has been reinforced in 2018 and will be operationalized in 2019. The ambition of the multi-year projects is to promote sustainable outcomes, with a focus on phasing out the projects in year three. These points will be important for Sida to monitor closely.
### SIDAB’s HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO DRC in 2019

(Insert total sum allocated to country. If another sum is proposed, please indicate that sum with a second/separate table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended partner for Sida support</th>
<th>Sector/focus of work (incl. cross sectoral/ multipurpose programming) and response modalities (e.g. in-kind, services, CVP or a mix)</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>14 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Country-based Pooled Fund</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>80 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO Forum</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>10 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHAS</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>10 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF-RRMP</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Cross sectoral, mix</td>
<td>25 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>220 000 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4. Strategic funding in protracted crises

Sida has three ongoing multi-year projects with NRC, Save the Children and the Swedish Red Cross. The objectives thereof is described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended partner for Sida support</th>
<th>Sector/focus of work (incl. cross sectoral/ multipurpose programming) and response modalities (e.g. in-kind, services, CVP or a mix)</th>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Time-span</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Red Cross</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral program-based approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>14 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25 000 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5. Synergies with long-term development assistance

The DRC is a country where clear divisions between development and humanitarian needs are sometimes difficult to draw, and it is therefore essential that all programming is planned with a resilience perspective, including an exit plan that hands over responsibilities. While humanitarian assistance should always prioritize those in greatest need, it is important to analyse shifting vulnerabilities and an increased propensity to protection risks across the displacement spectrum, to allocate assistance best – whether it be from a development or humanitarian funding stream.

Sweden’s development cooperation with DRC is managed under a five-year strategy that ends in 2019, at a total cost of 1,250 M SEK. The strategy prioritizes human rights, democracy and gender equality, productive employment, health and human security. In the DRC, there are several partner organizations who receive both humanitarian and development financing from Sida. In addition to humanitarian funding, Sida’s peace programming (Fred) also supports IRC and NRC within the scope of regional projects that include the DRC. In fact, in 2019, the intention is to include other former humanitarian partners to the development portfolio (such as SRC).

To further drive complimentary programming, Sida has developed a workplan for mainstreaming resilience programming in DRC that runs through 2019. The workplan examines the results areas in the country strategy and makes suggestions for how it intersects with humanitarian programming. During 2019 this document will be reviewed and revised, preparing for an extension, with an eye to its operationality. Improved understanding of how this synergy can contribute to mitigating the impact of shocks on people and thereby reduce humanitarian needs will be the main objective. Working across the different areas in 2019, Sida departments and the embassy in Kinshasa will aim to work closer together to ensure the continued complementarity and deepened impact of programming.