Each year, Sida conducts a humanitarian allocation exercise in which a large part of its humanitarian budget is allocated to emergencies worldwide. This allocation takes place in the beginning of the year as to ensure predictability for humanitarian organisations and to allow for best possible operational planning. In an effort to truly adhere to the humanitarian principles, Sida bases its allocation decisions on a number of objective indicators and parameters of which the most important are related to the number of affected people, vulnerability of affected people and level of funding in previous years. One of the indicators is also related to forgotten crises in order to ensure sufficient funding to low profile crises. 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 Nigeria.

For 2018, the Nigeria crisis is allocated an initial 130 Million Swedish Kronor (MSEK). Close monitoring of the situation in Nigeria will continue throughout the year for potential additional funding or amendments.

1. CRISIS OVERVIEW

1.1. Type of Crisis/Disaster

Conflict

- **Background/Underlying cause:** The conflict between Nigerian security forces and the armed group that calls itself the Islamic State’s West Africa Province, also known as Boko Haram, continues in Nigeria’s north-eastern states. Hostilities escalated into conflict in May 2013, and in 2014 Boko Haram had reportedly seized control of a territory the size of Belgium. Despite government forces regaining control in most of the Local Government Areas of the three states most affected by the conflict (i.e. Borno, Yobe and Adamawa), their control is limited to major towns and roads, and Boko Haram still has a substantial capacity for inflicting destruction and casualties. Among other tactics that the group employs, it is noted for its use of suicide bombers. Since mid-2016, Boko Haram has been split into two rival factions – one operating in the Sambisa forest in the eastern part of Borno state and loyal to Abubakar Shekau, the group’s leader since 2009; the other operating in the north of Borno along Lake Chad and the Niger border, led by Abu Musab al-Barnawi proclaimed to the group’s commander-in-chief by the Islamic State. Although violence erupted in 2009, the underlying causes are what many refer to as a development crisis dating back to the days of the British colonial rule. The disparities between north and south that were established then have since been further exacerbated by the oil-induced economic upswing of the south and extensive neglect of the north. The petroleum industry has created revenues that have enabled Nigeria to become a middle-income country and Africa’s largest economy, something that is difficult to comprehend when visiting the desperately poor north-eastern Nigeria. In fact, 46% of the population in Nigeria and 77% in the northeast live below the poverty line and has no, or very limited, access to health care, education, safe drinking water or other basic goods and services. More than a religious fundamentalist movement, Boko Haram should consequently be understood as the result of the longstanding neglect of the people living in the north-eastern part of the country.

- **Main stakeholders in the conflict:** In addition to the Nigerian army, forces deployed by Cameroon, Chad and Niger are also fighting the group near their borders, in particular as part of the Multinational Joint Task Force. The United States and United Kingdom are also known to be undertaking advise-and-assist missions throughout Nigeria and the Lake Chad area. But even though the Nigerian government receives foreign support and the conflict has a spill-over effect on neighbouring countries, this is in essence a conflict between the Nigerian state and a salafi-jihadi insurgency whose stated goal is to overthrow the state and create an Islamic state.

- **Cross border implications:** The conflict in Nigeria has led to over 200,000 refugees crossing the border to neighbouring countries, mainly Cameroon and Niger. An intensification of the Nigerian army’s military operations to defeat Boko Haram has contributed to the group crossing the borders
into neighbouring countries and carrying out attacks on the territories of Cameroon and Niger in particular.

- **Trends:** The present humanitarian situation should be understood within a context of protracted conflict where a large portion of the population remains displaced and in dire need of humanitarian protection and assistance. The improvements that have been made since the last quarter of 2016 would most likely not be sustained if humanitarian support was discontinued. A shift can however be observed with an increasing focus on early recovery and more sustainable outcomes.

### 1.2. Geographical areas and affected population

The conflict has in particular affected Borno, Yobe and Adamawa states, with Borno being the epicentre of the crisis. The humanitarian consequences are dire and include massive destruction of vital infrastructure, a collapse of livelihoods and markets, widespread displacement and brutal attacks on the civilian population. Over 20,000 people have been killed, more than 4,000 people have been abducted, 1.7 million remain displaced, mainly in Borno state, and over 200,000 Nigerians have fled to neighbouring countries. The number of people estimated to be in need of humanitarian assistance in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe has been reduced from 8.5 million in 2017 to 7.7 million. The massive scale up of humanitarian assistance since late 2016 has been critical to this reduction. It is estimated that during the next lean season (June-Aug 2018), approx. 3.7 million people may be within the three critical food insecurity situations (Cadre Harmonisé 3-5) with over 12,000 facing famine. 6.7 million people are considered to be in need of protection and 2.7 million out of those are targeted in the HRP. Under-five and maternal mortality rates are amongst the highest in the world. An estimated 930,000 people still remain in areas controlled by Boko Haram and are cut off from basic services and humanitarian assistance. These people are, without any doubt, extremely vulnerable. In addition, women- and child-headed households are considered to be amongst the most vulnerable including a higher risk of sexual and physical violence. Men and adolescent boys are at risk of forced recruitment by armed actors, arrest and detention, as well as being disadvantaged in terms of access to assistance because of suspicions that they might be members or supporters of Boko Haram.

### 1.3. Critical Assumptions, risks and threats

Having been thwarted in its insurgency, Boko Haram appears to be increasing its use of suicide bombers. A trend, where the level of hostilities has been reduced but asymmetric warfare has increased, can be expected to continue as government forces continue their efforts to defeat the group. This increases the risk of civilians, including humanitarian staff, being killed in suicide attacks. Many fear that the elections in 2019 might have a negative impact on the conflict dynamic, such as politicians using military operations in the northeast to profile themselves in the running for elections. Risks related to humanitarian operations include challenges to recruit qualified and experienced staff leading to poor quality of the response, corruption (Nigeria ranking 136/176 in Transparency International’s Corruptions Perception Index, 2016), and decreasing levels of funding that could be seen already in 2018. Attacks directly targeting humanitarian operations could have an immediate and devastating impact on humanitarian support being provided as it would most likely lead to a suspension of humanitarian operations.

### 1.4. Strategic Objectives and Priorities of the Country Humanitarian Response Plan

While an estimated 14.5 million people across six states in north-eastern Nigeria are in need of humanitarian assistance, the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) 2018 will focus only on the needs in the three most affected states of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe. An estimated 7.7 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance in these three states and the HRP targets the needs of the most vulnerable 6.1 million people.

The Strategic Objectives of the Nigeria HRP 2018 are:

- Provide **life-saving emergency assistance** to the most vulnerable people in conflict-affected areas.
- Ensure that all assistance promotes the **protection**, safety and dignity of affected people, and is provided equitably to men, women, boys and girls.
- Foster **resilience and early recovery**, and strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus by working towards collective outcomes.
As a result of the scaling up of food, livelihoods and nutrition assistance in 2017, food security and nutrition levels have improved throughout the northeast. Nevertheless, with 3.5 million people in need of nutrition interventions and 3.7 million projected to be food insecure and considered to be in crisis or emergency phases of food and nutrition insecurity (Cadre Harmonisé 3-5) during the upcoming lean season (June to August 2018), food security and nutrition account for almost half of the HRP budget (49.5%). There will also be an increased focus on protection, in particular the issue of sexual violence.

As the crisis enters its 9th year, the UN shifts to a multi-year strategy to cover the period 2018-2020. This move represents a paradigm shift that is accompanied by a commitment from the international humanitarian community to align with the Government’s Economic and Recovery Growth Plan (2017-2020), the Buhari Plan for the comprehensive humanitarian relief and socio-economic stabilization of the North-East and the UN Sustainable Development Partner Framework (2018-2022), and to bridge the humanitarian and development divide in north-east Nigeria. The overall objective of the 2018-2020 strategy is to continue to deliver life-saving assistance and protection in the North East of Nigeria, while simultaneously strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus to lay the foundations for recovery and development, and advocate with government and development actors to effectively address the drivers of vulnerabilities, underlying structural issues and the root causes of the crisis. A shift that is to some extent similar to the UN’s shift can be noted in the operational priorities of the ICRC projecting to shift the focus of assistance activities in the northeast to livelihood support. The ICRC will also continue to expand its protection and assistance activities, prioritizing remote areas that few or no other organisations can reach while gradually handing over some activities in other areas to organisations that have been scaling up their operations.

2. IN COUNTRY HUMANITARIAN CAPACITIES

2.1. National and local capacities and constraints

- **Government** (national, sub-national, local): Although the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is responsible for disaster response according to national legislation, other government institutions compete to play a lead role in the humanitarian response. This contributes to making an already challenging coordination with the government even more problematic. The government has addressed humanitarian needs to some extent and has provided assistance to affected people during 2017, mainly food. However, considering the strong Nigerian economy they should be able to do more which indicates that the willingness to provide resources to the crisis is limited. In Nigeria, the government has the lead in the humanitarian response, UN agencies and NGOs being partners and co-lead in the sectors. At the state level, the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) coordinates the humanitarian response. NEMA coordinates the crisis response between OCHA and relevant ministries. Both NEMA and SEMA have limited capacities though, both when it comes to response to existing humanitarian needs and coordination between the different actors involved resulting in the humanitarian community taking a greater responsibility.

- **Civil Society** (national, sub-national, local): Civil society organisations in Nigeria have a low capacity to manage humanitarian operations. As the need for implementing partners is big the number of national/ local NGOs engaged in the crisis has increased and the establishment of a CBPF has opened up the opportunity for these organisations to get direct funding. An important national humanitarian actor is the Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS). In the North-East, the NRCS works in close collaboration with the ICRC and can reach areas inaccessible to other actors.

2.2. International operational capacities and constraints

- **Leadership and Coordination:** Nigeria has a Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), supported by a Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator, who leads the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT). OCHA plays a critical role in coordination and information management, and assists the HC in the management of the Nigerian Humanitarian Fund (NHF). Cluster/sector coordination mechanisms exist to provide sector level coordination and leadership. In 2017, Sida’s engagement and key messages to both humanitarian organisations and donors to the crisis have focused on the importance of improving the quality of the response as well as ensuring the response reaches people in hard-to-reach areas. Support to the establishment of humanitarian hubs outside of Maiduguri and field trips to hard-to-
reach areas to follow up on the implementation of projects have been important elements of this engagement. Sida also sits on the Advisory Board of the Nigerian Humanitarian Fund (NHF).

- **Humanitarian Agencies**: Sida’s partners all work in the most severely affected areas that are accessible to humanitarian organisations. The ICRC is focusing on hard-to-reach areas that cannot be reached by others and there appears to be a good coordination between the ICRC and other humanitarian actors when it comes to geographical coverage. The organisations working in Nigeria have since late 2016 focused extensively on scaling up humanitarian assistance. It was noted during 2017 that many organisations were facing difficulties to absorb the funding received and there is now a need to focus on improving the quality of the response and ensure that staff with the right expertise and experience are recruited.

2.3. **International and Regional assistance**

**Donors**: As of 5 December 2017, the US$1.1 billion HRP appeal was funded by 69.3% (US$731 millions). The US alone contributed to approximately 37% of the funding of the HRP, followed by the UK (18%), Germany (13%) and ECHO (12%). Sweden is the fifth largest institutional donor to the Nigeria HRP (4%).

2.4. **Access Situation**

Although access to affected populations has improved, it remains a major challenge. Most places in Borno State, outside of Maiduguri, can only be reached by helicopter. This limits the possibility for humanitarian staff to visit project sites for support to implementing staff and partners, and follow up on the implementation which has a negative impact on the quality of the response. Access to affected populations is only possible in areas controlled by Nigerian security forces which poses challenges for a principled humanitarian approach.

3. **SIDAs HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLAN**

3.1. **The role of Sida**

- **Earlier assistance and results**: Prior to 2016, Sida’s humanitarian support to Nigeria was limited to only a few partners and projects. As the extent of the crisis unfolded, and humanitarian organisations began to gain access to affected populations, Sida increased its support. At the end of 2017, Sida’s support had reached 240 MSEK, including 105 MSEK to the new CBPF established in February 2017. Sida’s contribution at the launch of the fund (35 MSEK) helped swift recruitment and setting up of the fund was made possible. Sida’s support to MSB in 2016 (55 MSEK) has also allowed MSB and IOM to move on from the establishment of a base camp for humanitarian staff in Maiduguri to the establishment of field hubs in, so far, 4 strategic field locations in Borno state. Other organisations that were supported in 2017 were OCHA, WFP, FAO, Unicef, IOM, ICRC, ACF, IRC and Plan International.

- **Lessons learnt**: Through its visits to follow up on its strategic partners’ implementation of projects and programs, Sida notes that there is a need to consolidate the humanitarian operations that have been established and massively scaled up since late 2016, as well as a need to improve the quality of the response. Sida’s initial allocation for Nigeria in 2018 will therefore remain the same as for 2017.

3.2. **Response Priorities 2018**

- **Humanitarian Focus**: The focus of Sida’s humanitarian support in Nigeria will, as in the HRP, be on life-saving emergency assistance to the most vulnerable people in conflict-affected areas. Enhancing the protection of affected populations will also be critical. While early recovery and livelihood support will be in focus in areas with relative stability, expanding to newly accessible areas will also be in focus. Geographically, the most affected states, Borno, Adamawa and Yobe, will be prioritised.

- **Field follow-up**: Sida will continue its efforts to follow up the implementation of partner organisations’ interventions as far out in the field as possible. As there is a risk that the situation deteriorates in terms of food security and nutrition during the next lean season, this will be followed closely. The appropriateness of the response will also be assessed in terms of emergency response versus early recovery, as well as the geographical focus to avoid duplication on the one hand, and little or no services on the other, in particular in hard-to-reach areas.
3.3. **Partners**

Based on the needs and priorities in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), as well as on operational capacities and technical expertise, Sida will provide support to OCHA, NHF (CBPF), WFP, FAO, Unicef, IOM, ICRC, NRC, ACF, IRC and Plan International. Sida monitors each partner’s adherence to gender marker codes, conflict sensitivity and resilience, and reviews project proposals for 2018 to ensure that supported projects are coordinated within the broader humanitarian response to the crisis.

**OCHA**: Sida will continue to support OCHA who plays a critical role in the coordination of the humanitarian response in Nigeria, and has contributed to an improvement in coordination amongst humanitarian organisations as well as with local and national authorities.

**NHF (CBPF)**: The NHF is another critical instrument for ensuring a better coordination of the humanitarian response and also enables local NGOs to receive direct funding. The fund has encountered challenges in staffing but does now have most of its staff in place. Sida’s support to the NHF in 2017 was very significant to allow the fund to be set up quickly after its launch and to enable a first allocation. As of 2018, the level of funding will be lower to pair with Sida’s support to CBPFs in other contexts.

**WFP**: The scale up of food assistance has been massive since the third quarter of 2016 and WFP has been absolutely critical in averting the famine that was threatening the north-eastern part of Nigeria in early 2017. Not reaching the initial target set at the beginning of the year, WFP will have to carry over part of the 2017 budget to 2018. Sida will therefore, in its initial allocation, focus its support to WFP’s contributions to the humanitarian community’s logistics (UNHAS and ETC).

**FAO**: In order to prevent people from falling back into extreme food insecurity, a balance between lifesaving support and more durable solutions is essential. With a large portion of the population in north-eastern Nigeria being farmers, FAO’s support to agriculture is therefore critical. Sida will consequently continue its support to FAO in 2018.

**Unicef**: Unicef is sector lead in nutrition, education, WASH and the child protection sub-sector in Nigeria and an important partner in especially nutrition and health. Like other actors, Unicef has scaled up its operations in the northeast and Sida will continue to support them in 2018.

**IOM**: IOM plays an important role in camp coordination and camp management and does also provide the humanitarian community with critical data on displacement through its Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). They are also an important provider of psychosocial and livelihood support. As they have experienced difficulties in implementing their planned activities in 2017, Sida will reduce its support in its initial allocation.

**NRC**: During field follow-up, Sida has noted that NRC is a strong humanitarian actor who provides an effective and adequate response. In 2018, NRC will continue to focus on food security and livelihoods, shelter, WASH, and ICLA. They do also intend to provide support to education. Sida will continue to support them.

**ICRC**: The ICRC is a critical actor when it comes to ensuring that humanitarian assistance and protection reach affected people in hard-to-reach areas. As other humanitarian organisations have scaled up their operations outside of Maiduguri, ICRC has moved into new areas not covered by others and in 2018 they are planning to expand further. The ICRC is also a central actor when it comes to protection interventions visiting people held in relation to the conflict, and urging respect for IHL and other norms through dialogue with the authorities, weapon bearers and civil society.

**ACF**: Follow-up in the field has allowed Sida to note that ACF’s interventions have an important impact for affected populations and Sida will continue to provide support to ACF in 2018. ACF’s is proposing an intervention that is similar in focus as the one Sida supported in 2017, addressing needs in the areas of nutrition and health, food security and livelihoods and WASH.

**IRC**: IRC is an important actor when it comes to addressing nutrition and health in particular, and with their mobile clinics they can respond quickly to needs that emerge. The programme that IRC is planning to implement in 2018 does also include focus on protection which Sida sees as a strategic approach for addressing violations committed against the civilian population.

**Plan International**: Many other humanitarian actors focus on IDP camps and one of Plan International’s added values is their choice to provide support outside of the camps. In 2018, the organisation is embarking on a two-year project that will focus on providing child protection, GBV and livelihood support to at-risk children and survivors of violence. Enhancing the protection of affected populations is priority for Sida who will support Plan to implement this project.
3.4. Strategic Funding in Protracted Crises

Two of Sida’s partners will receive multiyear funding in Nigeria as of 2018, FAO and Plan International. FAO will receive multi-year funding that falls in the category of *Humanitarian assistance in protracted crises, in line with multi-year Humanitarian Response Plan* (or in the case of Nigeria multiyear strategy underpinning the HRP) (Category A). Funding provided late in the year from many donors has been a challenge for FAO and Sida wants to allow for more predicable funding to ensure improved and efficient planning and programming of agricultural interventions. Plan International will receive multiyear funding that falls in the category of *Transition/phase out of humanitarian assistance (handing over to development and national/local actors according to a proposed plan within a specific time-frame)* (Category B). Multiyear funding should allow Plan International to address humanitarian needs in a more effective and sustainable way, as well as to phase out of a humanitarian assistance approach to a long-term development focused approach with support from a development donor.

3.5. Synergies with Long-term Development Assistance

Several development donors have or will engage in support to north-eastern Nigeria, such as the World Bank, DFID and EU for whom Nigeria is one of six pilot countries for the operationalisation of the humanitarian-development nexus. Moving towards early recovery and development in north-eastern Nigeria is also the goal of the Nigerian government. Sida also provided development funding from its peace and human security strategy, as well as from the unit working on strengthening civil society movements and organizations (CIVSAM). The development funding covers for instance rule of law programs, peace initiatives and support to those affected by leprosy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDA’s HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO NIGERIA IN 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Insert total sum allocated to country. If other sum is proposed please indicate that sum with a second/separate table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended partner support</strong> for Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF (NHF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Sida multi-year humanitarian investment is made with one of the following purposes:

A. Humanitarian assistance in protracted crises, in line with multi-year Humanitarian Response Plan (only in contexts with multi-year humanitarian planning)

B. Transition/phase out of humanitarian assistance (handing over to development and national/local actors according to a proposed plan within a specific time-frame).

C. Humanitarian assistance in specifically hard-to-reach areas. Based on the observation that in many of today’s humanitarian contexts, few actors tend to have access to those with the greatest needs, Sida would like to encourage partners to build strong and durable relations with concerned stakeholders in a view to facilitate swift and efficient access also to areas considered more challenging to reach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended partner for Sida support</th>
<th>Sector/focus of work (incl. integrated or multi sectorial programming)</th>
<th>Multi-year support category B</th>
<th>Proposed amount (MSEK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Child protection, GBV and Livelihoods</td>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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