



INTERNATIONAL
RESCUE
COMMITTEE

Multi-sector support to the displaced in Adamawa and Borno States

Background

Dec. 1, 2016 – Feb. 28, 2019

Sectors: Livelihoods, Nutrition, WASH

Objectives:

- IDPs, host communities, and returnees in Nigeria access basic needs and improved livelihood opportunities
- IDPs, host communities and returnees in Nigeria have access to improved WASH and health services

Locations: Mubi North and South, Michika and Maiha, MMC/Jere and Askira Uba



Livelihoods

by the numbers

3,200 households
received 4 rounds of UCT

800 persons
engaged via 81 cash-for-work schemes

\$22,100 USD +
in pooled VSLA savings
(YR1 only)

1,000 farmers
trained and provided
material support

Nutrition

by the numbers

17,399 children with SAM
discharged as cured

51,687 mothers
provided group or individual
counselling by MTMSGs

4,782 caretakers
attending cooking
demonstrations

21,388 men
reached with critical child
nutrition messages





WASH

by the numbers

5,801 households
received hygiene kits (NFIs)

59,798 persons
benefiting from improved
water supply

100% of facilities
using soap or ash
handwashing

109,202 persons
receiving key hygiene
messages

Lessons Learned

- Project implementation in Adamawa (Mubi Axis) and MMC/Jere benefited from relative stability despite proximity to emergency context
- Government/community stakeholders in an emergency/protracted crisis conflict can become over-reliant on humanitarian actors to provide critical assistance (i.e. expectation of INGO response to cholera in Fufore LGA, Adamawa State)
 - Be careful that humanitarian imperative to provide respond does not result in reduced local ownership and resilience
 - Projects that support stakeholders to better prepare for and respond to shocks (natural disaster, conflict, etc.) would be beneficial

Lessons Learned cont.

- Inadequate government support for local ministries (possibly due to diversion of resources to geographies of heightened conflict) leads to high turnover of staff, resulting in need for regular training and re-training of gov. agencies/partner institution staff
- Integration of programming in humanitarian response has proved challenging due to various donor and implementing partner priorities which is then reflected by local stakeholders working in silos
 - Separating sectors (i.e. primary health, WASH, etc.) can be highly effective in responding to acute emergency needs, but is not sustainable in longer-term development

Livelihoods Strategies

- Farmer Field School
- VSLA start-up and support
- Business, financial management and life skills training
- Business start-up grants and business plan review

Strategies are adapted to the unique context of Mubi Axis (Mubi North, Mubi South, Askira Uba), including:

1. Inaccessibility of formal marketplaces
2. Destruction/ closing of formal banking institutions

Livelihoods Strategies cont.

- Economic development as livelihoods, not “job creation”
 - Many individuals, especially farmers, pursue a variety of livelihood activities at different times of the year
- Obtaining and maintaining buy-in from community leadership and creating community accountability mechanisms is essential to the sustainability of non-formal livelihood schemes, for example:
 - The Chairman of Michika LGA became a very strong partner in the promotion of CFW schemes and made a commitment to IRC and community members to continue such schemes in the future
 - Joint meetings were held between the IRC, CFW beneficiaries, local CFW committees and community leaders to finalize sustainability plans

