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Executive Summary

Since 2009, nearly 15 million people have been affected by the violence of Jama’atu Ahlis Sunna Lidda’awati Wal-Jihad, also known as Boko Haram and the resulting military operations in North-East Nigeria. The fighting became particularly intense from 2014, leading to the loss of an estimated 20,000 lives and the displacement of 1.8 million people directly attributed to the violence, while further aggravating the weak economic development of the North-East with an estimated infrastructure damage of US$ 9.2 billion and accumulated output losses of US$ 8.3 billion.

The government response to the crisis has primarily been a nationally based security and humanitarian response, with limited and unsuccessful attempts at negotiation, and some actions aimed at preventing and addressing radicalisation. Nigeria’s National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), in coordination with State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs) and in partnership with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), has been monitoring Internally Displaced Persons’ (IDPs) movements and providing a range of humanitarian relief support to affected communities.

The Humanitarian Response Plan for 2016 has requested US$ 248 million and is 7 percent funded, as of 16 March 2016. Currently 62 partners are providing urgent multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance to conflict-affected people in Adamawa, Borno, Gombe and Yobe. Humanitarian assistance is defined as support that addresses the urgent life-saving needs of the affected people and in these states currently includes food, water and sanitation, health and hygiene services, shelter and non-food items, education, protection (including targeted responses for children and Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) survivors), early recovery activities, and livelihoods. The State Governments and some 20 national Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) operating in the North-East are playing a critical role in the delivery of assistance, especially in areas where international actors are not present or have no access.

On 21 August 2015, the Government of Nigeria requested assistance in assessing the needs associated with peace building and crisis recovery. Support has been provided in accordance with the 2008 Joint European Union (EU) – United Nations (UN) – World Bank (WB) Declaration on Post-Crisis Assessments and Recovery Planning. A Recovery and Peace Building Assessment was initiated and findings are presented in this report. The assessment was launched with a workshop in Abuja on 25-26 January 2016, which was attended by more than 250 participants representing Federal and State Governments, the WB, EU, UN, CSOs, IDPs and other stakeholders.

Objectives

The Recovery and Peace Building Assessment (RPBA) informs a collective vision and strategy on peace building and recovery, and provides a framework for coordinated and coherent support to assist conflict-affected people in the North-East. The assessment covers the six states of Borno, Yobe, Adamawa, Gombe, Taraba and Bauchi, and provides an overarching framework for stability, peace building and recovery.
The RPBA is founded on the recognition that a durable resolution to the conflict in the North-East requires addressing the structural and underlying drivers of violent conflict. This understanding has also underpinned the identification and prioritisation of needs presented in this report.

As in other complex crises, there are many factors contributing to the violent conflict in the North-East. The violent repression of what was initially an ideological non-violent movement played a central role to turn an extremist movement into extreme conflict. The Boko Haram armed conflict is further taking place in a setting characterised by a number of factors, which include poverty and inadequacies in governance, poor social and economic outcomes, high income inequality, perceived social injustices, low accountability and legitimacy of State, low levels of human security, human rights abuses, lack of economic infrastructure, climate change and environmental degradation.

Methodology

The assessment has been prepared and implemented jointly by the Federal Government, led by the Vice President’s Office, the six affected states, and supported by the World Bank, United Nations, and European Union. The assessment builds on initiatives incorporated in the Presidential Initiative for the North-East (PINE) and the North-East States Transformation Strategy (NEST), and on the substantial activities already being undertaken in the North-East in response to the on-going humanitarian needs. The RPBA supplements the PINE and NEST by providing: (a) a systematic analysis of the impact of the crisis and displacement and its distribution across states and sectors of the economy; (b) the means for the sector, geographic and temporal prioritisation of needs in PINE and NEST; and (c) a detailed analysis and quantification of the corresponding short to medium term needs for stabilisation and recovery to complement longer term development.

A multi-stage consultation process was followed for the development of the assessment methodology, collection and validation of data and progressive corroboration of results. This entails: (a) the September 2015 scoping mission to agree on the geographical, sector, and temporal scope of the assessment; (b) the inaugural workshop in January 2016 to agree on the methodology and data collection templates with the State Governments; (c) field visits over February 2016; (d) consultations over sector recovery strategies between sector teams, and discussions over preliminary findings with State focal points in a combined technical meeting in February 2016; and (e) validation and consensus building workshops with a wider range of stakeholders over March-April 2016. Consultation and validation of the RPBA findings took place throughout the process and culminated in a workshop from 31 March-1 April 2016. The event brought together State and Federal Government authorities, civil society representatives, the private sector, and other stakeholders in Abuja. The purpose of these efforts was to facilitate validation of RPBA’s results, and a more granular understanding of inter- and intra-State differences.

The assessment is divided into three main components: Peace building, stability and social cohesion; Infrastructure and social sectors; and, Economic recovery. See the breakdown of component structure in Table 1 on page 8.

Recovery Strategy and Framework

The RPBA confirmed the need for recovery and peace building efforts, to be carried out in tandem with the on-going scaling up of humanitarian assistance. Therefore, the Recovery and Peace Building Strategy (RPBS) will need to be closely coordinated with the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) in order to build on the HRP’s achievements and avoid overlaps.

The basic principles and values to be upheld in the process of recovery include humanitarian principles; human rights; national leadership and ownership at Federal, State and Local levels; engagement of civil society and private sector; conflict sensitivity; and building back better and smarter. It is imperative that the most vulnerable segments of affected populations (which include women, children, youth, widows, elderly and the disabled) are targeted. Efforts should include a bottom-up approach, broad-based participation, and effective communication.

Careful and coordinated sequencing of the RBPA and subsequent support will be critical in view of the fluidity of the security environment, and the marked variation in security within and among the six states. Priorities should be carefully assessed on a continuous basis, and adjusted as needed in light of the prevailing situation on the ground. In some areas, a humanitarian response combined with stabilisation will be needed, while in other areas, the context will permit more substantial movement towards recovery.
An integrated and balanced approach to recovery is essential. As peace building and social cohesion form the backbone of the assessment, it is crucial to properly balance peace building, stability and social cohesion interventions with other interventions aimed at reconstructing or rehabilitating social, physical and productive assets. Peace building, stability and social cohesion interventions will ensure the sustainability of recovery interventions on the ground and lay the foundation for human security to prevail.

The assessment sets out four strategic outcomes for recovery and peace building:

- **Outcome 1**: Contribute to the safe, voluntary and dignified return and resettlement of displaced populations.
- **Outcome 2**: Improved human security, reconciliation and violence prevention.
- **Outcome 3**: Enhanced government accountability and citizen engagement in service delivery.
- **Outcome 4**: Increased equity in the provision of basic services and employment opportunities.

**Financial Impacts and Needs from the Crisis**

The assessment indicates that the economic impact of the crisis is substantial, reaching nearly US$ 9 billion across all six North-East States. Two-thirds of the damages (US$ 5.9 billion) are in Borno, the most affected state; damages in Adamawa and Yobe account for US$ 1.6 billion and US$ 1.2 billion respectively. Three-quarters of the overall damages are on agriculture (US$ 3.5 billion) and housing (US$ 3.3 billion). The conflict resulted in more than 400,000 damaged and destroyed housing units, 95 percent of which are located in Borno.

The total need for recovery and peace building across the three strategic areas of interventions in both the stabilisation and recovery phase is US$ 6.7 billion, as shown in Table EX1.

Interventions for Peace Building, Stability and Social Cohesion require substantial resources estimated at US$ 151 million. Interventions include:

(a) strengthening the resilience of host communities, supporting safe and voluntary return and resettlement of displaced populations;
(b) social cohesion and violence prevention, including sexual and gender based violence (SGBV);
(c) local governance and citizen engagement; and
(d) justice, small arms control and community security.

The Infrastructure and Social Services interventions are estimated at a total of US$ 6 billion. The highest needs are for the reconstruction of houses (US$ 1.2 billion), followed by agriculture (US$ 881 million), and education (US$ 721 million). Infrastructure sectors of energy, information and communication technology (ICT), transport and water and sanitation require US$ 1.2 billion for reconstruction, constituting over 20 percent of total needs. In addition a provision for community infrastructure and non-formal services has been taken into account.

The overall estimated needs for macroeconomic and fiscal recovery total US$ 473.5 million. Interventions focus on the private sector, trade and finance, job-creation, livelihood support and facilitating economic restoration.

**TABLE EX 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Recovery and Peace Building Needs by Component</th>
<th>Adamawa</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Yobe</th>
<th>Gombe</th>
<th>Taraba</th>
<th>Bauchi</th>
<th>Federal/ Regional*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace building and social cohesion</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>150.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and social services</td>
<td>594.9</td>
<td>3933.3</td>
<td>668.3</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>144.9</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>6040.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Recovery</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>473.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>4040</td>
<td>721.5</td>
<td>164.9</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>268.2</td>
<td>345.4</td>
<td>6664.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-cutting Issues

Reconciliation and sustainable peace can only be achieved through a human rights-based response, which addresses both the root causes of the conflict as well as its impact. Violence in the North-East has contributed to the rise in abduction, mainly of women and children, while men and boys are targeted for killings, forced recruitment and forced conversions. Addressing SGBV and other forms of violence is critically important, and to that end, all interventions will take key gender-related issues into account. Urban and rural youth need urgent training and skills development as artisans and technicians. Youth engagement will be considered in all interventions to enable youth-led development. Through a mix of emergency actions and capacity development, the Government of Nigeria, the security forces and development partners should undertake a mine action program in line with international standards.

Critical Success Factors for Implementation and Financing

The recovery and peace building process will be highly demanding for the limited capacity at every level of government. There may be need for significant strengthening of policy, programme and project implementation capacity to enhance the effectiveness of scarce public spending and revenue mobilisation efforts. However, there is the opportunity to enhance the government’s ability to use evidence and data to inform policy and implementation decisions, as well as to strengthen accountability mechanisms.

Strong government leadership can help to ensure coordination across stakeholders, with representation from the wide range of actors at different levels of government, as well as NGOs and beneficiaries. The institutional set up will have to strike the right balance between strategic integration and decentralised implementation. It is important to build on existing government capacity and structures.
where possible, while ensuring an effective division of responsibility between the core institutional functions of the three tiers of government; Federal, State and Local.

Based on a review of international good practices, the following institutional options can be considered for implementing the recovery and peace building programme: (a) ad hoc set up such as the establishment of a discrete implementing agency; (b) existing government capacity and structures of Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) and; (c) a hybrid framework built on both existing government structures and where possible, while ensuring an ad-hoc organisation. The pros and cons of these three options have been discussed in the report together with the effective division of responsibilities between the core institutional functions of the three tiers of the government.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are needed to inform the implementation of the recovery strategy that covers the whole value chain from financial inputs to outputs. The implementation of the recovery strategy will require both the mobilisation of existing M&E systems across sectors and the triangulation of information from different sources. Social accountability mechanisms such as grievance redress could also be mobilised to help monitor the impact of the recovery strategy on the conflict situation and affected population.

**Recovery Financing and Public Expenditure Management**

Recovery will entail a significant increase of capital expenditure and calls on all tiers of the Nigerian government for considerable improvements in public investment management in the North-East. The effectiveness of allocated funds for the implementation of the recovery strategy needs to be ensured through adequate financial management at Federal, State, and Local levels.

Revenue mobilisation calls for coordinated efforts among the three tiers of the Nigerian government. Establishing a financing strategy involves three key steps: (a) agreeing on a set of priorities within the overall cost envelope of the RPBA; (b) mapping the various financing sources; and (c) identifying the range of specific financing instruments.

**Next Steps**

This assessment is a step towards implementing interventions, which are critical to the future stability and recovery of the North-East. A number of further steps will need to be undertaken in support of implementation. It is important that the RPBA is now translated into (a) an action plan including the prioritisation and sequencing of integrated community-based interventions; (b) an institutional framework that will include coordination structures at Federal, State and Local levels, and implementation arrangements at State and Local levels; (c) a monitoring and evaluation system that will also be the “home” of the data base set-up during the RPBA at the appropriate levels; and (d) financing modalities, including the allocation of national and external resources and a resources mobilisation strategy.