



Brussels, **XXX**  
[...] (2016) **XXX** draft

**COMMISSION DECISION**

of **XXX**

**on the individual measure in favour of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to be financed  
from the 11th European Development Fund**

## COMMISSION DECISION

of **XXX**

### **on the individual measure in favour of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to be financed from the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund**

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EU) 2015/322 of 2 March 2015 on the implementation of the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund<sup>1</sup> and in particular Article 9(1) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EU) 2015/323 of 2 March 2015 on the financial regulation applicable to the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund<sup>2</sup> and in particular Article 26 thereof

Whereas:

- (1) The Commission has adopted the National Indicative Programme for the Federal Republic of Nigeria<sup>3</sup> for the period 2014-2020, point 3.1 of which provides for the following priorities: to contribute to a reduction in poverty through improving policy and institutional governance to strengthen the resilience of the most vulnerable households, especially in Northern Nigeria.
- (2) The objectives pursued by the measure to be financed under the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) Internal Agreement<sup>4</sup> ('Internal Agreement') is to contribute to the stabilisation of North Eastern Nigeria through strengthening the resilience of internally displaced persons, host communities, returning refugees and the local population affected by insurgency.
- (3) It is necessary to adopt a financing decision, the detailed rules of which are set out in Article 94 of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012<sup>5</sup> in accordance with Article 2(1) and Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323.
- (4) The Commission should entrust budget-implementation tasks under indirect management to the entity specified in this Decision, subject to the conclusion of a delegation agreement. In accordance with Article 60(1) and (2) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, applicable in accordance with Article 2(1) and Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323, the authorising officer responsible needs to ensure that this

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 58, 3.3.2015, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 58, 3.3.2015, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Commission Decision on the adoption of the National Indicative Programme between the European Union and Nigeria, C(2014)3611 of 12.06.2014.

<sup>4</sup> Internal Agreement between the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States of the European Union, meeting within the Council, on the financing of European Union aid under the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014 to 2020, in accordance with the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement, and on the allocation of financial assistance for the OCTs to which Part Four of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union applies, OJ L 210, 6.8.2013.

<sup>5</sup> Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012 of 29 October 2012 on the rules of application of Regulation No 966/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union (OJ L 362, 31.12.2012, p. 1).

entity guarantees a level of protection of the financial interests of the Union equivalent to that required when the Commission manages Union funds. This entity complies with the conditions of points (a) to (d) of the first subparagraph of Article 60(2) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 and the supervisory and support measures are in place as necessary.

- (5) It is necessary to allow the payment of interest due for late payment on the basis of Article 92 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 and Article 111(4) of Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012, applicable in accordance with Article 29(1) of Regulation (EU) 2015/323.
- (6) Pursuant to Article 94(4) of Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012, applicable in accordance with Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323, the Commission should define changes to this Decision which are not substantial in order to ensure that any such changes can be adopted by the authorising officer responsible.
- (7) The measure provided for in this Decision is in accordance with the opinion of the European Development Fund Committee set up by Article 8 of the Internal Agreement.

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

#### *Article 1*

##### **Adoption of the measure**

The individual measure in favour of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to be financed from the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund, as set out in the Annex, is approved.

The measure shall include the following action:

- Annex: EU Support to Strengthening Resilience in Northern Nigeria.

#### *Article 2*

##### **Financial contribution**

The maximum contribution of the European Union for the implementation of the measure referred to in Article 1 is set at EUR 37 000 000 and shall be financed from the 11<sup>th</sup> EDF.

The financial contribution provided for in the first paragraph may also cover interest due for late payment.

#### *Article 3*

##### **Implementation modalities**

Budget-implementation tasks under indirect management may be entrusted to the entity identified in the Annex, subject to the conclusion of the relevant agreements.

The elements required by Article 94(2) of Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012, applicable in accordance with Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323, are set out in the Annex.

#### *Article 4*

##### **Non-substantial changes**

Increases or decreases of up to EUR 10 000 000 not exceeding 20% of the contribution set by the first paragraph of Article 2, or cumulated changes to the allocations of specific actions not exceeding 20% of that contribution, as well as extensions of the implementation period shall not be considered substantial within the meaning of Article 94(4) of Delegated Regulation (EU) No 1268/2012, applicable in accordance with Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323, provided that they do not significantly affect the nature and objectives of the actions.

The authorising officer responsible may adopt such non-substantial changes in accordance with the principles of sound financial management and proportionality.

Done at Brussels,

*For the Commission*  
*Neven Mimica*  
*Member of the Commission*



## This action is funded by the European Union

### ANNEX

of the Commission Decision on the individual measure in favour of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to be financed from the 11<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund

### Action Document: EU Support to Strengthening Resilience in Northern Nigeria

|  |  |                          |                                  |                           |
|--|--|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>1. Title/basic act/<br/>CRIS number</b>                   | EU Support to Strengthening Resilience in Northern Nigeria<br>CRIS number: NG/FED/039-469<br>financed under the 11 <sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF)   |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>2. Zone benefiting<br/>from the<br/>action/location</b>   | The Federal Republic of Nigeria<br>The action shall be carried out at the following location: Selected Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Borno and Adamawa in the north-east of Nigeria.  |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>3. Programming<br/>document</b>                           | 11 <sup>th</sup> EDF National Indicative Programme   |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>4. Sector of<br/>concentration/<br/>thematic area</b>     | Health, Nutrition and Resilience   |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>5. Amounts<br/>concerned</b>                              | Total estimated cost: EUR 42 000 000<br>Total amount of EDF contribution EUR 37 000 000<br>This action is co-financed by:<br>- German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) for an amount of EUR 5 000 000 |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>6. Aid modality<br/>and implementa-<br/>tion modality</b> | Project Approach<br>Indirect Management with Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)   |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>7 a) DAC code(s)</b>                                      | 52010  |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>b) Main Delivery<br/>Channel</b>                          | 13000 Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)   |                          |                                  |                           |
| <b>8. Markers (from<br/>CRIS DAC form)</b>                   | <b>General policy objective</b>  | <b>Not<br/>targeted</b>  | <b>Significant<br/>objective</b> | <b>Main<br/>objective</b> |
|  | Participation development/good governance  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>         | ✓                         |
|  | Aid to environment   | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓                                | <input type="checkbox"/>  |
|  | Gender equality (including Women In Development)   | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓                                | <input type="checkbox"/>  |

|  |   |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Trade Development                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <b>RIO Convention markers</b>                     | <b>Not targeted</b>                 | <b>Significant objective</b>        | <b>Main objective</b>    |
|  | Biological diversity                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Combat desertification                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Climate change mitigation                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | Climate change adaptation                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## SUMMARY

The action is compatible with the first sector of concentration of the National Indicative Programme for Nigeria 2014-2020, which addresses issues of health, nutrition and resilience particularly in the northern states of the country. In this region, the development indicators are the most negative, and Global Malnutrition Rates and Infant Mortality Rates are the worst in the country. This situation has been greatly aggravated by a massive ongoing insurgency in the northeast and attacks on civilians by terrorist groups, which are estimated to have killed over 20,000 people and have led to the displacement of over 2.2 million people with a further 5 million people considered severely affected by violence. Humanitarian aid has been provided to many of these people in response to the immediate needs. With the situation becoming increasingly protracted and given the significant development needs of both the displaced and the host populations, there is now a need to go beyond humanitarian aid by simultaneously providing development assistance to strengthen local institutional capacity in recovery and reconstruction and to promote self-reliance and boost the resilience of the most vulnerable households, in the framework of an LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) approach. In this context, and especially given the fluidity of the unfolding situation in the northeast, this action will coordinate with on-going humanitarian support and at the same time work in parallel to strengthen the resilience of the target beneficiaries.

The two northeast states selected for this intervention, Borno and Adamawa, are the two states most affected by the insurgency and resultant crisis. They have been selected following needs assessments of internally displaced persons (IDPs). The IDP population of Maiduguri, capital of Borno, is estimated at over 1,500,000 with the vast majority (90%) living in informal settlements and host communities with inadequate or non-existing access to infrastructure, health and education. The IDP population of Yola, capital of Adamawa, is estimated at over 160,000. These large displaced populations in both states are placing an impossible and unsustainable burden on the host communities and the insalubrious informal settlements are breeding grounds for disease, criminality, recruitment to insurgency and a potential source of irregular migration.

The intervention logic of the action is to enhance the capacity of local government and community institutions to respond to a rapidly moving and evolving situation. In cases (mostly in Adamawa) where security conditions permit IDPs to return freely and voluntarily to their places of origin, material, financial and technical assistance will be provided to help rebuild shattered homes and communities, restore basic services and livelihoods and provide social safety nets until the communities have become self-reliant again. However, in other cases such as in Borno, where continued insecurity and attacks on civilians are blocking the return of IDPs, it requires a more structured approach than short term humanitarian aid.

Urban planning is required to expand basic services and boost revenue generating activities to enhance the resilience of the IDPs and reduce the stress on existing overconsumed services. Initially 500,000 IDPs and a number of returnees, host community population and other violence-affected populations will benefit in one way or another from this multi-sector programme. The intervention is designed to be flexible and responsive to the evolving situation on the ground.

It should be noted that this project is in full conformity with the recently completed joint Government of Nigeria/EU/World Bank/UN Recovery and Peace Building Assessment of needs in north-east Nigeria as the baseline for the implementation of a major Strategic Action Plan for the reconstruction of the north-east. Indeed many of the interventions foreseen in this project are pilot operations that will be evaluated for possible massive scale-up in the Strategic Action Plan.

## **1 CONTEXT**

### **1.1 Country context**

Despite being one of the largest oil exporters in Africa, Nigeria remains one of the world's poorest countries with more than 70% (140 million Nigerians) living on less than USD 1.25 per day. Poor governance and poor service delivery, mismanagement and corruption are all contributing factors to the development deficit. The situation is aggravated by demographic growth of over 3% which means that the population doubles every 25 years, high illiteracy rates especially amongst females, unequal distribution of wealth, the political and economic marginalisation of large parts of the population, and high unemployment rates, particularly among the youth.

This widespread poverty has provided fertile grounds for insurgent groups to take up arms against the state. In the northeast in particular since 2009, Nigeria has experienced a series of deadly attacks by the terrorist group, popularly known as Boko Haram. As a result of this violence, over 20,000 people have been reported to have been killed while more than 2 million have been displaced from their homes and communities. Over 200,000 people have taken refuge in the neighbouring countries of Chad, Niger and Cameroon. Traditional economic and agricultural activities in the region have been severely disrupted for years, increasing the people's vulnerability. Access to education in the most affected areas of the northeast states has come to a halt and local government administrations have been forced into exile. The abduction and enslavement of girls and women have worsened the disparity between men and women in a context of already existing social and economic inequalities.

Refugees have started to return from the neighbouring countries and some IDPs are preparing to return to areas which have been declared secure. The local authorities have commenced plans to rebuild destroyed communities, particularly those in Adamawa state and some in local government areas close to Maiduguri, the state capital in Borno. The states and local authorities are aware that the return of IDPs has to be free and voluntary under the Kampala Convention. It is expected that over the project time-frame, many more areas will be secured and cleared, so that the number of people able to return to their communities of origin will substantially increase.

The relevance of strengthening the resilience of the beneficiaries continues to be of paramount importance given the protracted insurgency that has led to loss of livelihoods and people's general inability to neither plough nor till the lands. Presently without sufficient

support as presented in this programme and others working in the region, there is every likelihood of the people missing out on the in-coming planting season thereby further putting additional pressure on the food situation, stability and security in general.

### ***1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework***

Nigeria is signatory to a number of international treaties and conventions to protect the rights of persons in armed conflict, e.g. the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of IDPs in Africa (Kampala Convention) and the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. At the Federal level a newly established Presidential Committee for North-East Initiatives (PCNI) was set up to coordinate existing initiatives, strategies and stakeholders in order to ensure a concerted action to support the northeast.

It should be noted that this project is in full conformity with the recently completed joint Government of Nigeria/EU/World Bank/UN Recovery and Peace Building Assessment of needs in north-east Nigeria as the baseline for the implementation of a major Strategic Action Plan for the reconstruction of the north-east. Indeed many of the interventions foreseen in this project are pilot operations that will be evaluated for possible massive scale-up in the Strategic Action Plan.

This intervention is in line with the 11<sup>th</sup> EDF National Indicative Programme signed in 2014 between the EU and Nigeria which identifies issues of health, nutrition and resilience particularly in the northern states of the country as a sector of concentration. It also forms part of the EU's comprehensive approach to the situation in the North East of Nigeria which draws on support from various EU instruments including humanitarian funding and development assistance within the NIP and under the EU Emergency Trust Fund.

In addition, the proposed intervention is in line with a number of EU policies as follows:

- EU Communication on Social Protection in Development Cooperation of 2012
- EU Communication on Resilience of 2012
- Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013 – 2020
- EU's Comprehensive Approach to external conflict and crisis (2013)

### ***1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis***

The primary stakeholders are the Government of Nigeria through its relevant agencies, implementing agencies such as the Borno State Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement and other relevant state and civil society organisations (including women groups). The proposed action will complement ongoing humanitarian interventions, particularly those supported by the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO). Currently, ECHO is one of the largest and most active humanitarian donors in Nigeria providing immediate assistance to cover the basic needs of a large number of IDPs in the states of Borno, Yobe and Adamawa providing food assistance, protection, health care and the provision of water and sanitation infrastructure.

Input and comments from consultations with development partners (United Nations Children's Rights & Emergency Relief Organisation – (UNICEF), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs – (OCHA), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations – (FAO), the World Health Organisation (WHO), and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as Action Against Hunger, OXFAM, Danish

Refugee Council, Save the Children, International Rescue Committee – (IRC), Mercy Corps, and Norwegian Refugee Council, etc.) as well as agencies of the federal, state and local government authorities and civil society organisations working on the situation in the north-east have been taken into consideration during project conceptualisation and the discussion on implementation options.

In addition, the private sector is expected to play a major role in reviving trade and service provision based on the local economy especially regarding reconstruction work, employment creation, job placement and training in adherence to international best practice in quality standards. Attracting the private sector to return to the northeast would boost investment confidence and expand the scope of economic growth and diversification in the region. The infrastructural deficiency provides significant attraction for the private sector interest and full participation in the rehabilitation efforts.

The primary beneficiaries of this project are IDPs in informal settlements, host communities, voluntary returnees to their places of origin in rural areas and community members who stayed in affected communities. Within these groups, special attention shall be given to female-headed households, women and girls, orphans and youths. As mentioned previously, over 5 million people have been seriously affected by the violence, including 2.2 million IDPs. Within the resources available to this project and in the context that this can be seen as a series of pilot actions that will help the design of the much larger scale interventions identified in the Recovery and Peace Building Assessment, the initial target number of beneficiaries for this project is estimated at 500,000. This is based upon known factors such as already identified IDP needs in Maiduguri for more structured access to basic services (approximately 400,000) and estimates of the scale of the possible return of IDPs to places of origin initially in Adamawa (approximately 100,000). However, it needs to be noted that the number of actual beneficiaries is likely to be much higher as many of the planned interventions will have direct and indirect beneficiaries. The project will seek to reach the maximum number of beneficiaries. The actual scale and potential of this will only become apparent during implementation. It is also certain that the interest that other donors have expressed in following this project will leverage other funding for this type of intervention and result in an overall high number of beneficiaries.

Secondary beneficiaries of the project include national, state, Local Government Area (LGA) and community level actors. These include the federal and state agencies such as the National Commission for Refugees, the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), the State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMA), and the Borno State Ministry for Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement. Potential associated implementing partners include NGOs (Non-Government Organisations), CSOs (Civil Society Organisations) and CBOs (Community Based Organisations) active in the area.

### ***1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis***

The constantly evolving situation in the 2 target states in north-east Nigeria demands a flexible project design which will permit rapid adaptation to a dynamic and complex context. While continued short-term post humanitarian assistance from ECHO remains important to respond to the needs of some victims especially those newly arrived in the settlement areas, a much more structured and longer term approach based on reinforcing local institutions and service delivery agencies is now essential to stabilise the situation and put in place the

foundations for socio-economic development of the region once peace and security is fully restored. It is to be noted that over 90% of the IDPs are in informal settlements or in host communities. Less than 10% are in organised settlements. Priority action includes strengthening local capacity both at institutional and community levels to provide basic services such as access to clean water, education, primary health care and shelter. Support to IDP efforts to be self-sustaining and find revenue generating activities will be a particular focus. Another priority will be easing the burden on the facilities and resources of the host communities from the massive number of additional users and dependents.

## **Component 1**

### **Strengthening of basic service delivery to IDPs in formal/informal settlements and in host communities**

The programme will improve access to services and infrastructure through strengthening local institutional capacity in the areas of WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene), primary health care, access to education and social protection especially social safety nets and food and nutrition security. An important objective of the project will be support to the newly created Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (MRRR) of the Borno State Government. The proposed interventions are in conformity with the conclusions and recommendations of the recently completed major Recovery and Peace Building Assessment' (RPBA) of needs in the north east. The RPBA has provided much baseline data for the project.

As a particular focus of Boko Haram (roughly translated as "western education is forbidden") attacks is to shut down the education system (over 600 teachers have been killed and 1,200 schools destroyed), an important objective of this project will be to improve access to education for children (3-17 years). This is vital to the long term socio-economic development of the region as a whole generation risks growing up without access to education which will reduce their contribution to the development of the nation. Inter alia, damaged and destroyed schools will be rehabilitated and reconstructed, incentives for voluntary teachers provided and temporary spaces for education set up.

Assisting the IDPs and the local authorities to move the most vulnerable population from the current improvised unsanitary temporary shelter to more permanent settlement with access to more structured and sustainable basic services such as clean water, electricity, drains and road access will vastly improve the quality of life of the IDPs especially in the forthcoming rainy season and reduce the risk of disease and social unrest. Activities will include the reconstruction of basic housing with the participation of the IDPs and the local authorities and support for community action groups.

IDPs will also be encouraged to become more self-sustainable through vocational training and assistance with setting up revenue generating activities. Social safety nets (cash transfers) will be provided to the most vulnerable and to cover needs until self-sustainable status has been reached. The target groups for this will include members of the host communities which have borne a heavy burden in sustaining the IDPs over the past years. This will reduce the risk of further tensions between the IDP and host communities.

## Component 2

**IDPs are supported when they voluntarily return to their places of origin; economic, social and physical infrastructure in selected communities is rehabilitated.**

Assisting the voluntary return of IDPs to their places of origin where feasible is a major activity of the proposed action. Once security is provided in areas of return and law and order are restored, IDPs who have chosen to return freely and voluntarily will be helped to resettle in their places of origin, restore their shattered houses and community facilities and rehabilitate their livelihoods. This will involve providing material, technical and financial assistance, the provision of social safety nets (cash transfers) until revenue generating activities have been restored, distribution of seeds and tools to resume farming activities, and the reactivation of trading and commercial activities. Community Action Planning (CAP) tools will be used to help encourage inclusive rehabilitation processes identified by the needs and priorities of the communities. Social cohesion shall be promoted and the LGA institutions will be supported.

The achievement of these results will be measured through qualitative and quantitative Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI), as outlined in the logical framework attached.

## 2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The prevailing security situation in north-east Nigeria will influence the implementation of the proposed project and thereby the achievement of its objectives. This refers to:

- Risk of continued and even intensified attacks by insurgent groups;
- Limited access to areas of intervention and target groups;
- Competition over services of the proposed project;
- Perceived exclusion or discrimination by some social groups.

To minimise the risks, the proposed project shall maintain open dialogue with all stakeholders, political, and implementing partners. It will identify and implement “Do No Harm” priorities, and establish close coordination and communication with all communities and security agencies.

Mitigation measures include the flexibility of the programme. The flexible conceptual framework allows for adapting measures to changes in context. Should the space to work in Borno State be temporarily restricted for example, funds could be channelled to Adamawa state. Should the security situation not allow for the return of IDPs and returnees to their areas of permanent residence, the intervention will focus more strongly on the basic needs of IDPs and returnees in informal camps in host communities. In case security improves and an increasing number of IDPs are able to return to their communities, a stronger focus will be put on infrastructure rehabilitation of the selected communities.

In the event where the security situation does not allow for international and regional staff access to the intervention areas at certain times, national programme staff will be continuously trained to facilitate implementation and remote management practices will be applied. High security standards will be applied throughout programme implementation, including secured compounds, competent security advisors, secure vehicles and escorts for field missions with regular security and risk analyses, and the elaboration of appropriate response plans.

Experienced, international, national, and local NGOs/CSOs with presence and implementation experience in the north-east will also be sub-contracted for implementation. To minimise the risk of aggravating conflict, a “Do No Harm” approach will be applied throughout the programme. The programme will maintain an open dialogue with the political partners and the implementing partners and establish close coordination and communication with all partners, communities and security agencies. The participation of all relevant stakeholders in situation assessment, planning, implementation and reflection of the action will increase the willingness of communities, local and state institutions to participate in the action. Apparent benefits for the different stakeholder groups will further contribute to increasing ownership.

| <b>Risks</b>  | <b>Risk Level<br/>(H/M/L)</b> | <b>Mitigating Measures</b>  |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Volatility of the security situation leading to reduced effectiveness and delays in the implementation of activities.               | H                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopting a flexible conceptual framework allowing for adapting measures to changes in context and adjusting resources between the components of the action as required.</li> <li>• Implementation of Do No Harm priorities, effective communication with implementing partners, communities and security agencies.</li> </ul>                                    |
| International and regional co-workers becoming targets of terrorist attacks.  | M                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High security standards, including secured compounds, secure vehicles, security advisors, escorts for field missions, regular security and risk analyses and elaboration of appropriate response plans.</li> <li>• Subcontracting parts of the programme to local and state level NGOs with presence and implementation experience in the north-east.</li> </ul> |
| Limited oversight and coordination of the proposed programme could lead to delays in implementation.                                | M                             | Enhance collaboration and partnerships amongst stakeholders in the states on the basis of enhanced frequency of field visits and improved oversight and communication by a national programme steering committee.   |
| Target groups could increasingly compete for access to programme services and stakeholder groups could feel excluded from benefits. | M                             | Close engagement with stakeholders and all partner organisations with a view of establishing the proposed programme as role model for similar actions in other local communities and settlements.   |
| Lack of willingness by communities, local government institutions and State Authorities to cooperate.                               | L                             | Participation of all relevant stakeholders in situation assessment, planning, implementation and reflection of the action.  |
| Security challenges are significantly higher in Borno than in Adamawa state.  | M                             | Implementation may need to be phased and funding may need to be channelled from Borno to Adamawa state.   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Vulnerability of IDPs and host communities is increased due to adverse climatic conditions (droughts, flash floods).  | M | Flexibility and balance between emergency and reallocation support.<br>Promotion of climate-resilient planning and rehabilitation activities. |
| <b>Assumptions</b>  |   |   |
| 1. The government will implement plans for the rehabilitation of the north-east states and efficient coordination of donor activities will be ensured at federal, state and LGA levels. |   |   |
| 2. The security situation will allow for the implementation of activities and the achievement of results in specific secured areas in the states of Borno and Adamawa.                  |   |   |
| 3. It is assumed that regular monitoring of implementation by international and regional programme staff will generally be possible.  |   |   |
| 4. It is further assumed that individuals, communities, local and national state authorities and institutions are willing to cooperate with the proposed programme.                     |   |   |

### 3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

#### 3.1 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt during the recently completed joint Government / European Union / World Bank / UN Recovery and Peace Building Assessment include the need to structure strategic action to bring sustainable peace and security and development to the north-east and the need for a phased approach emphasising a stabilisation phase before the start of full recovery action leading on to development investment.

The root causes of the instability and crisis in the north-east are diverse and deep seated. They include a historical low level of public development cooperation investment in the region with consequent frustration and alienation of local communities from government institutions due to poor access to basic services. This has fed the recruitment to insurgency and encouraged migration. A major emphasis will be given to boosting the integrated approach to full community participation, strengthening civil society participation and coordinating with humanitarian, development, public and private-sector agencies.

Volatile situations with quickly changing dynamics require a particularly high level of flexibility. Programmes need to develop implementation strategies which can flexibly respond to emerging and potentially unforeseen situations. This flexibility can ensure programme relevance and strengthen the sustainability of interventions.

Another important lesson learnt is the complexity of delivering social safety nets in a complex situation such as the north-east. The value of social protection mechanisms in these situations is evident. Effective implementation requires accurate targeting and leak proof delivery. In this context the identification of the target groups for social safety nets is facilitated by the fact that most are already registered as IDPs to ensure entitlement to assistance. Beneficiary access to social protection will be as a function of registration as a displaced person and the vulnerability of the household (capacity and number of revenue earners). The type of social transfer (conditional or unconditional) will depend on the level of vulnerability of the household.

Conditional transfers, where used, will be linked to school enrolment and attendance and to health screening. Empirical evidence will also be used such as the identification of levels of malnutrition in children (spotted thought health screening at Primary Health Centres). The survival threshold for a cash transfer in north-east Nigeria is currently estimated at 5,000 Naira per month per household which is roughly equivalent to USD 25. Delivery mechanisms will include vouchers and phone transfers. It is not expected that the implementation of a cash transfer mechanism will have any inflationary impact on the local market and indeed empirical evidence is that the presence of liquidity (consumers with cash) will stimulate the local markets and encourage small traders to bring food and goods to the market thus growing the local economy. Social protection mechanisms based on cash transfers require a supply side economy (availability of services and markets). In the context of north east Nigeria the supply side is not considered an obstacle.

### **3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination**

The programme will contribute to strengthening stability and resilience of the north-east through continuous assessment of activities going on within the focal region with a view to ensuring that there is no duplication of actions or support saturation within certain areas. To achieve effective complementarity of actions with other development and government partners, specific information exchange shall be part of the programme strategy with existing coordinating units at the federal, state and local Government levels. The conclusions and recommendations of the Recovery and Peace Building Assessment (RPBA) of needs in the north east will provide the strategic framework for projects such as this one. Indeed in many ways this project is viewed as a large scale pilot for many of the interventions that are expected to be launched by the RPBA.

Implementation will complement ongoing humanitarian interventions, especially those supported by ECHO, in an LRRD framework.

EDF funded development cooperation projects in the health, water and sanitation sectors are currently being implemented in Adamawa and the project will create synergies and linkages to these. The proposed action will also build upon the achievements of the ongoing EU project 'Strengthening community-based psychosocial support and protection services for children and adolescents in Borno State', implemented in cooperation with UNICEF.

Donor and agency coordination is good in Nigeria, both at the Abuja level where most agencies have their main offices and at field level such as in Borno and Adamawa. There are sector and thematic working groups and close inter-action with relevant government institutions is encouraged. In both Borno and Adamawa the state governments will lead coordination of efforts to build stability and IDP resilience. The role of the newly established Borno state Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement is expected to be very important in this and will be supported by the project.

### **3.3 Cross-cutting issues**

Crosscutting issues like gender, inclusion of people with disabilities, environment, good governance and human rights will be mainstreamed into all programme components. Interventions will also be balanced to ensure geographical representation. The programme

will be implemented in a non-discriminatory manner with equal opportunities observed independent of sex, race, ethnicity, religion or other social categories. Gender equity principles will be respected in all phases of the programme design including the adoption of gender-sensitive criteria during the selection of beneficiaries and the identification of modalities of support. The project will specifically target socially deprived groups such as female headed households in order to facilitate a fair and equitable access to inputs and services. Of particular concern in the IDP population is the complete gender imbalance with many more females than males (imbalance estimated at 70% female to 30% male). The reasons for this are not clear but include the fact that a large number of males have been killed and imprisoned or may be confined to areas still controlled by insurgency groups. Males of fighting age in the north east have been targeted for recruitment and suspicion by the forces on both sides of the conflict.

Other groups with special attention to be provided for are youth, orphans and persons with disabilities.

Environmental sustainability will be considered particularly under the aspects of urban /spatial planning, the resumption of agricultural production activities and the analysis of potential environmental impacts with regard to the implementation of Community Action Plans.

Mainstreaming good governance will include transparency in beneficiary selection based on clearly spelled out selection criteria, close collaboration with CBOs and other organisations which are trusted by the population. Support will be given to local government bodies to increase the transparency of their actions.

The programme addresses the fulfilment of human rights at several levels, including education and other basic resources and social services through direct supportive measures as well as strengthening duty-bearers to enable them perform their duties. Aspects of participation and empowerment through community action planning and support of CSOs strengthen the rights-holders and put them in a position to demand for and exercise their rights.

## **4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION**

### **4.1 Objectives/results and options**

The **overall objective** of the programme is to contribute to the stabilisation of north-east Nigeria through strengthening the resilience of IDPs, host communities, returning refugees and the local population affected by insurgency.

#### **The specific objectives:**

##### ***Component 1:***

**To strengthen basic service delivery to IDPs in formal/informal settlements and to host communities to alleviate acute poverty, improve the quality of life and mitigate the risk of tensions and stress.**

**Objective 1:** To reinforce the resilience of IDPs and strengthen their capacity to become self-sustainable and reduce the burden on host communities.

**Objective 2:** To strengthen the capacities of host communities to continue to offer hospitality to the internally displaced including expansion of basic services to mitigate the risk of inter-community tensions.

### ***Component 2:***

**IDPs are supported when they voluntarily return to their places of origin; economic, social and physical infrastructure in selected communities is rehabilitated**

**Objective 3:** To support the free and voluntary return to communities of origin of IDPs where it is feasible.

**Objective 4:** To rehabilitate economic, social and physical infrastructure in selected areas of origin of IDPs.

### **Expected results of the project:**

#### ***Component 1:***

**Result 1:** Improved access to basic services and social protection including access to education and primary health care for IDPs, returnees and members of host communities in selected intervention areas and improved food and nutritional security.

**Result 2:** State institutions have improved the planning, implementation and distribution management of basic services and link temporary humanitarian solutions and urban development.

**Result 3:** Transparency of service delivery and local ownership will be increased.

**Result 4:** Civil society organisations are strengthened and place their needs and interests in the context of the overall action for reform and recovery.

#### ***Component 2:***

**Result 5:** IDPs voluntarily return and livelihoods are restored.

**Result 6:** Physical infrastructure and basic services in areas of return are rehabilitated

**Result 7:** Teams for Community Action Planning (CAP) are trained and development plans produced

## **4.2 Indicative main activities**

The evolving situation in north-east Nigeria demands a flexible project design, which allows for rapid adaptation to a dynamic and complex context. Targeting and programming will therefore be based on continuous data collection and analysis.

The following provides a general overview of necessary actions in the development of the programme in order to produce the desired results:

**Result 1:** The current condition of basic services available to IDPs and host communities and provided mostly by humanitarian agencies will be assessed and action taken to improve service delivery. This will include improving access to education, health services, food and nutritional security, shelter and social protection for IDPs, returnees and members of host communities in selected intervention areas. IDPs currently housed in schools will be relocated to enable the schools to return to their original purpose. Technical financial and

material assistance will be provided to IDPs and host communities in cooperation with the local authorities to resettle IDPs in areas where basic services can be more easily provided in a cost-effective and sustainable manner. This will include provision of building materials and assistance with construction of more suitable permanent shelters, improved supply of clean water, proper sanitation and drains, water resistant roads especially for the rainy seasons and adequate school and basic health facilities. IDP self-sustainability will be supported through vocational training and assistance in establishing revenue generating activities. The most vulnerable will be assisted with social safety nets (cash transfers).

**Result 2:** The capacity of state level institutions (through technical assistance and lessons learned) to plan and improve the delivery of basic services and move from temporary humanitarian solutions to more structured urban development will be assessed and measures taken to strengthen such. In the particular case of Maiduguri, assistance with urban planning and development will be important, as the population of the city has doubled as a result of the influx of IDPs. This will include integrating informal temporary settlements into more structured and planned urban settings and development to prevent the creation of slums and reduce the risk of social hot spots in the future. Temporary solutions initially provided by humanitarian actors will be consolidated and connected with the existing supply network of the city. In this particular case, specific services, such as the water supply and waste water systems, would be potential starting points. Depending on needs for more permanent installations, opportunities to transform informal settlements into housing areas will be developed considering appropriate solutions for affordable housing.

**Result 3:** Local ownership will be encouraged and stimulated. Local community participation is essential to a sustainable needs based improvement of services and livelihoods. Participation and transparent public decisions are also key to social cohesion between IDPs and their host communities, e.g. on the allocation of funds. Transparency of service delivery and citizen participation processes will be promoted by facilitating public hearing/town hall meetings and by developing feedback mechanisms to consider public opinions in political decision making. More transparency in public finance management (PFM) will be encouraged including public access to an updated and comprehensive PFM federal and states level government websites.

**Result 4:** Capacities of civil society institutions such as cooperatives, associations and local NGO/CSOs to undertake initiatives will be developed to strengthen their voice and role in the current crisis situation and the possible rehabilitation/reconstruction process in the future. Capacity development and technical assistance will be provided to CSOs on organisational development, agenda development and lobby and advocacy strategies for influencing political decision making and public opinion. Based on necessity and evolving situation, local NGOs/CSOs shall play an important role in delivering certain critical aspects of the programme actions at community level. Through this participation, their capacity shall further be strengthened.

### **Component 2:**

**Result 5:** Once security is provided in areas of return and law and order restored, IDPs will need support to return to their communities and rebuild their homes and communities and rehabilitate their livelihoods which are often based on agricultural production. This will

include the provision of conditional social cash transfers, the distribution of seeds and tools to resume farming activities, and the reactivation of trading and commercial activities.

**Result 6:** Physical infrastructure in selected communities is rehabilitated

Rehabilitation / reconstruction of communities will be assisted through the repairs and restoration of basic services in areas of return and repairs to local infrastructure including bridges, roads, water, community-centred solar-powered lighting, health and reconstruction of basic education facilities. The action is designed to be catalytic and encourage replication by the state, local government authorities and organised communities.

**Result 7:** Teams for Community Action Planning (CAP) trained and development plans produced. Within these processes social cohesion shall be promoted and LGA institutions and agencies will be involved. The expected outcome of this would be strengthened capacity for holistic planning, participatory implementation and developmental dialogue amongst stakeholders.

### **4.3 Intervention logic**

The intervention logic of this programme is based on the objectives of increasing stabilisation, empowerment and resilience of violence affected populations in a fragile region and of alleviating poverty and improving the quality of life for highly vulnerable populations of internally displaced and host communities. This will be done through a mixture of activities that boost the self-reliance and sustainability of the most vulnerable households as well as reduce the risk of tensions between the displaced and the host communities. Helping to restore the presence of government in the provision of basic services will help build confidence between the local communities and government and reduce the alienation that has been feeding recruitment to insurgency and encouraging migration.

The programme takes a two-pronged approach described as components 1 and 2 for this intervention. Component 1 builds stability and resilience as envisaged in the overall objective by restoring access to basic services, permanent shelter and livelihoods thus improving development status and strengthening self-sustainability and alleviating acute poverty through cash transfers. Component 2 of the programme gives emphasis to the resettlement in regions of origin with the provision of basic housing materials and livelihood inputs such as seeds and tools and conditional cash transfers to further reinforce stability.

The programme is clearly compatible with the EU Resilience approach, the EU Comprehensive approach and the EU Communication on *Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development* (LRRD). It reflects the currently on-going elaboration of a new development-oriented approach to addressing forced displacement in the full complementarity to humanitarian assistance.

## **5 IMPLEMENTATION**

### **5.1 Financing agreement**

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 17 of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

## **5.2 Indicative implementation period**

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.2 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 48 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement. Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute non-substantial amendment in the sense of Article 9(4) of Regulation (EU) No 322/2015.

## **5.3 Implementation of the budget support components and modules**

Not Applicable

## **5.4 Implementation**

### **5.4.1. Indirect management with a Member State agency**

This action may be implemented in indirect management with GIZ (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable in accordance with Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323. This implementation entails strengthening basic service delivery to IDPs in formal/informal settlements and to host communities and support to IDPs when they voluntarily return to their places of origin, including rehabilitation of economic, social and physical infrastructure in selected communities. This implementation is justified because GIZ has a long history of development cooperation in Nigeria and willingness to work within the current situation in the north-east of Nigeria. GIZ also has considerable credibility with the Nigerian Government having implemented many development programmes in the past throughout the country and they have extensive experience (livelihoods development and IDP support) across the world as well as specific experience in the sector in Nigeria. It is to be noted that the project will be co-funded with Germany (BMZ) who had already selected GIZ as the implementing agency for German funded work of this nature in Nigeria.

The entrusted entity would carry out any budget-implementation tasks required for the activities described in section 4.2 such as: launching calls for tenders and for proposals where appropriate; definition of eligibility, selection and award criteria; evaluation of tenders and proposals if appropriate; award of grants and contracts; concluding and managing contracts, carrying out payments, recovering moneys due, etc.

If negotiations with the above-mentioned entrusted entity fail, part of this action may be implemented in direct management, in accordance with the implementation modalities identified in section 5.4.2.

### **5.4.2 Changes from indirect to direct management mode due to exceptional circumstances**

If negotiations with GIZ fail, part of this action may be implemented in direct management, through a call for proposals.

(a) Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

The objectives, actions and expected results of the grant would be in line with those identified in section 4.1.

## (b) Eligibility conditions

The following eligibility conditions will be applied. Initiatives should:

- Be mainly carried out in states of Borno and Adamawa;
- Be proposed by non-profit organisations (individually or through the creation of consortia);
- Include a set of combined activities identified under both Component 1 and Component 2;
- Include documentation, knowledge management and communication activities aimed at facilitating the scaling-up and the dissemination of good practices, within other projects and within national policies;
- Include activities supporting the engagement with local stakeholders including local and state authorities, decentralised public service providers, private sector, etc.

Initiatives can include sub-granting schemes.

Potential applicants for funding include all non-profit legal entities (NGOs) as set forth in the PRAG Guidelines for grant applicants (annex E3a).

## (c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are the financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

## (d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for this grant is 80% of the eligible costs of the action.

In accordance with Article 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 37 of (EU) Regulation 2015/323 if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100 %. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission's authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

## (e) Indicative timing to launch the call

Should this second implementation option be necessary, the call would tentatively be launched in the first trimester of the 2nd year of project implementation.

### 5.4.3 Procurement (direct management)

| Subject in generic terms, if possible | Type (works, supplies, services) | Indicative number of contracts | Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure                 |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Visibility and communication          | Services                         | 1                              | Year 1, first trimester   |
| Audit and Evaluation                  | Services                         | 4                              | For audit and evaluation: year 2 and year 4 last trimester each |

## 5.5 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 22(1)(b) of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

## 5.6 Indicative budget

| Component  | Amount in EUR     | EU Contribution   | BMZ Contribution |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 5.4.1 Indirect Management with GIZ   | <b>40 500 000</b> | <b>35 500 000</b> | <b>5 000 000</b> |
| <i>Component 1(improved access to basic services and social protection) – indicative amount</i>                                  | <i>30 000 000</i> | <i>27 000 000</i> | <i>3 000 000</i> |
| <i>Component 2(assistance with the return to place of origin &amp; rehabilitation and social protection) – indicative amount</i> | <i>10 500 000</i> | <i>8 500 000</i>  | <i>2 000 000</i> |
|  |                   |                   |                  |
| 5.9, 5.10 Audit and Evaluation   | 400 000           | 400 000           |                  |
| 5.11 Communication and Visibility  | 100 000           | 100 000           |                  |
| Contingencies  | 1 000 000         | 1 000 000         |                  |
|  |                   |                   |                  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>42 000 000</b> | <b>37 000 000</b> | <b>5 000 000</b> |

Audit, evaluation and visibility budget lines will be managed in direct management.

## 5.7 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

### Management structure

Project Steering Committee (PSC): The National Authorising Officer will establish and chair a Project Steering Committee. Members will include representatives of the beneficiary States, Civil Society and a representative of the EU Delegation with an observer status. Representatives of development organisations, consultants and technical experts may be invited on specific needs.

The PSC which shall meet bi-annually shall oversee and validate the overall direction and policy of the project. The Project Manager shall be a member of the PSC.

State Level Project Stakeholders Coordination Committees (SLPSCC) may be set up by the National Authorising Officer and chaired by the relevant State Ministries. Membership of the committees shall be drawn from the two states including the newly created Borno Ministry of Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Resettlement. Membership may include the officials of the beneficiary LGAs and the communities as well as the representative of the National Planning Commission. The committees would have the following functions:

- review progress on project implementation against work-plans,
- serve as an avenue for the project to inform the state/federal governments of activities,
- review the inputs provided by state and local governments to judge if sufficient to allow full delivery of objectives of the intervention,
- review the functionality of the project approach to confirm or establish whether it is working within the state policies and federal Strategic Action Plans for the north-east development,
- carry out mediation and advisory roles for the resolution of issues and challenges from the communities as may be required,
- assist with issues concerning security and access to relevant authorities in the course of implementation.

Project Implementation Management Unit (PIMU): A practical and functional Project Implementation Management Unit shall be established with the overall responsibility of coordinating, managing and implementing the project activities as described in this document. The PIMU, with the responsibility of full and final delivery of programme objectives and result areas, shall have offices in both Maiduguri, capital of Borno state and in Yola, capital of Adamawa State.

In addition, the project may establish Implementation Field Offices (IFO) to oversee the activities in the selected LGAs and communities directly. The IFO will have the primary responsibility and purpose of actively following up, monitoring, checking quality and delivery timeliness of project activities. It is the responsibility of the IFO to ensure the implementation of project activities, achievement and delivery of targets in the cluster LGA or communities

## **5.8 Performance monitoring and reporting**

The progress of the action will be monitored as follows:

In accordance with the rules and procedures of the EU, the overall management of the programme will follow the Project Cycle Management (PCM) approach. Logical Framework Matrices with outcome and output indicators will be used as management tools, allowing for necessary adjustments and revisions at the activity level in order to effectively achieve the expected outcome and outputs. During the inception phase, a baseline study will be carried out to feed into the logical framework.

In line with the objective the programme will develop an annual work-plan with full cost breakdown of key actions to be delivered and agreed with the EU Delegation. The logical framework shall then be adapted to respond to the work-plan for effective monitoring and continuous learning and adaptation to emerging realities.

The logical framework provides a number of key indicators on which to assess progress. An initial baseline study will establish the key data base and allow for a further quantification and specification of indicators.

The programme will establish a results-based monitoring system that will generate data on progress of the action on a regular basis. This data will be used for programme steering as well as for biannual reporting on progress.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the log frame matrix. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews)

## **5.9 Evaluation**

Having regard to the importance of the action, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out for this action or its components via independent expert missions contracted by the Commission.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partners at least 2 months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

Indicatively, one contract for mid-term evaluation services shall be concluded under a framework contract in the second semester of 2018 and a final evaluation, if considered appropriate, should be launched at the end of the operational implementation phase for an indicative total budget of EUR 200 000.

## **5.10 Audit**

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

Indicatively, contracts for audit/verification services shall be concluded under framework contracts in 2018 and 2020. An indicative number of 2 contracts with an indicative total budget of EUR 200 000 might be concluded.

### **5.11 Communication and visibility**

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.6 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

## Logical Framework

|                                      | Intervention logic   | Indicators  | Baselines (Ref. year 2016) | Targets (Ref. year 2019 )   | Sources and means of verification   | Risks / Assumptions   |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Overall Objective: Impact</b>     | <b>Overall objective:</b> To contribute to the stabilisation of North-Eastern Nigeria through strengthening the resilience of communities, IDPs and returnees affected by the insurgency   | % change in the number of people requiring assistance* 70% females and 34% Males  | NA                         | TBD   | Programme inception baseline studies and programme closure monitoring report  | <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <p>The government plans for the rehabilitation of the North-East will be implemented, and efficient coordination of donor activities will be handled by a central Government body.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>The security situation in the states Borno and Adamawa is currently volatile. Violence might escalate. In Borno, there is an enhanced probability of attacks. International and regional co-workers could become targets of terrorist attacks.</p> <p>This might cause implementation delays or measures might not be implemented at all. Achievement of objectives and results might be limited, because access to intervention areas and target groups is restricted.</p> <p>The programme could be abused by certain interest groups (implementing partners, target groups). Interventions could</p> |
| <b>Specific objectives: Outcomes</b> | <b>Component 1</b><br><b>Specific Objective 1:</b> To reinforce the resilience of IDPs and strengthen their capacity to become self-sustainable and reduce the burden on host communities.   | Number of people in informal settlements and in host communities of the selected location benefit from measures for improving living conditions including cash transfer<br>* Number of females and Males with improved income | 0                          | 500,000 people  | Surveys on changes in living conditions, list of implemented measures and number of beneficiaries<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports                |   |
|                                      | <b>Specific Objective 2:</b> To strengthen the capacities of host communities to continue to offer hospitality to the internally displaced including expansion of basic services to mitigate the risk of inter-community tensions. | Number of individuals (% of girls and women) from host community households benefitting from education, (formal or non-formal), portable water, skills acquisition and livelihoods startup.                                   | TBD                        | Baseline figure plus 40,000 (50% girls and women)                               | Overviews of supported educational formats, photo documentation, list of sites, number of children, lists of names, Monitoring and evaluation reports |   |
|                                      | <b>Component 2</b><br><b>Specific Objective 3:</b> To support the free and voluntary return to communities of origin of IDPs where it is feasible.   | Number of individual IDPs both females and males benefitting from support return to their communities of origin   | 0                          | 300,000 IDPs  | GIZ Programme reports, lists of supported IDPs, independent monitoring report on safe communities commissioned by GIZ                                 |   |
|                                      | <b>Specific Objective 4:</b> To rehabilitate economic, social and physical infrastructure in selected areas of origin of IDPs.   | Number of infrastructure facilities such as solar powered boreholes, basic school classrooms, health posts and basic drainage systems rehabilitated or constructed  | 0                          | 200 functional facilities implemented and delivering services to 500,000 people | Programme reports<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports  |   |

|                 | Intervention logic   | Indicators   | Baselines (Ref. year 2016) | Targets (Ref. year 2019 )   | Sources and means of verification  | Risks / Assumptions   |
|-----------------|--|--|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Results/outputs | <b>Component 1</b><br><b>Result 1:</b> Basic needs are covered in selected sectors, including access to physical infrastructure, educational services for IDPs, returnees and members of host communities in selected intervention areas | Basic needs of people in informal camps and host communities are identified  | 0                          | 1   | GIZ project initiation phase needs assessment reports<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports                     | directly or indirectly provoke or exacerbate conflicts. Target groups could increasingly compete for access to programme services and stakeholder groups could feel excluded from benefits. There might be a lack of willingness by communities, local government and State Authorities to cooperate. |
|                 |  | Number of people in informal camps and host communities have their basic needs addressed (based on needs assessments, e.g. education, health) in year 1  | 0                          | 500,000 people  | GIZ project initiation phase needs analysis reports, Joint EU/GIZ Monitoring and evaluation reports            |   |
|                 | <b>Result 2:</b> State institutions have improved the planning, implementation and distribution management of basic services and link temporary humanitarian solutions and urban development   | Credible baseline data for urban planning in Maiduguri is available  | 0                          | 1   | Urban planning baseline survey documentation from State Ministries and other partners working in the northeast | The default risk of investments in North-Eastern Nigeria is very high for rehabilitation and construction measures, means of production and equipment. These can be stolen, damaged or destroyed by vandalism and armed conflict. In that case, the achievement of objectives and results is at risk. |
|                 |  | Number of Local Government Authorities with sufficient capacity for improved planning and service delivery, selected solutions to transform humanitarian set-ups into permanent public infrastructure and service delivery implemented | 0                          | 2 State agencies in charge of resettlement and recovery and 4 LGAs assisted       | Implementation reports, photo documentation, list of sites<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports                |   |
|                 | <b>Result 3:</b> Transparency of service delivery and initiating citizens' participation processes will be increased   | Activities carried out by LGA/state institutions to increase the transparency of service delivery and initiate citizen participation processes   | TBD                        | Baseline figure plus 10   | Monitoring and evaluation reports  | The volatile security situation can cause implementation delays in construction and rehabilitation and thus negatively affect the achievement of results.   |
|                 | <b>Result 4:</b> Civil society organisations are strengthened and place their needs and interests in the context of the agenda for reform and recovery   | Civil society organisations (chambers, unions, associations) in the target states develop their respective agenda coherent with state institutions for support and implementation  | 0                          | 10 Civil Society Organisations in target states supported                         | Internal CSO strategy and planning documentation<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports                          |   |
|                 |  | Selected CSOs present their agendas to political decision makers and to the public   | 0                          | 10 CSOs focusing on various issues produce agendas for support and implementation | 6- monthly CSO activity reports  |   |

|  | Intervention logic   | Indicators   | Baselines<br>(Ref. year 2016) | Targets<br>(Ref. year 2019 )   | Sources and means of<br>verification  | Risks / Assumptions |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|
|  | <b>Component 2</b><br><b>Result 5:</b> IDPs voluntarily return to their home communities and their livelihoods are supported | Number of households resettled and rebuilding their livelihoods in agriculture and related vocations                                 | 0                             | 5,000  | 6 monthly report of transfers and utilisation of funds, inputs and livelihoods support          |                     |
|  |  | Number of smallholders groups selling regularly their products,  |                               |  |   |                     |
|  | Number and type of services provided to smallholders by GoN  |  |                               |  |   |                     |
|  | Number of farmers trained on sustainable agricultural practices,   |  |                               |  |   |                     |
|  |  | Number of producers groups created, and market areas created   |                               |  |   |                     |
|  |  | Number of GoN staff trained  |                               |  |   |                     |
|  |  | Number of households receiving agricultural inputs (seeds, tools, etc.) and critical support (cash transfer) during planting seasons | 0                             | 5,000  | Overviews of distributed agricultural inputs<br>Monitoring and evaluation reports, Audit report |                     |
|  | <b>Result 6:</b> Physical infrastructure in selected communities is rehabilitated  | Number of small infrastructure projects identified during CAP implemented  | 0                             | 200 physical infrastructure projects such as solar-powered boreholes, drainage, shelter, schools implemented | 6- monthly CAP planning documentation and action plans, Monitoring and evaluation reports       |                     |
|  | <b>Result 7:</b> Teams for Community Action Planning (CAP) will be trained and social cohesion shall be promoted             | Number of action plans developed   | 0                             | 100 CAP produced by communities  | 6- monthly CAP planning documentation and action plans  |                     |