



# VOICE

European humanitarian NGOs.  
Standing together.

## CASE STUDIES

**VOICE REPORT: NGO PERSPECTIVES  
ON THE EU'S HUMANITARIAN –  
DEVELOPMENT – PEACE NEXUS**



# Case Studies - VOICE Report on the Nexus

## **Background to the Case Study Template and Instructions**

In 2018-2019 VOICE (Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies) undertook a study on the humanitarian-development(-peace) nexus (HDPN) to document the opportunities and challenges from a humanitarian NGO perspective. Additionally, the study provided an opportunity to engage directly with the EU in one of the six EU nexus pilot countries, Myanmar. The final recommendations provided VOICE with elements that can be used for future advocacy.

As part of the study, case studies were gathered from the membership of the VOICE DRR-Resilience working group to showcase how NGOs have implemented (or are implementing) a nexus approach. These case studies were collected from December 2018 - March 2019. The case studies informed the broader report and in some cases were included in edited form. The full case studies have now been compiled by the VOICE secretariat as a resource for those with a specific interest in nexus programming. They have been lightly edited to remove personal information and clarify the language.

## **Criteria for Choosing a Case Study:**

Case studies were asked to ideally provide examples of the following:

- Projects/programmes/work in a country (countries) that has been proven to be effective (whether through internal reviews, real-time reviews, or evaluations).
- how humanitarian and development programming and/or humanitarian/development/peace programming have worked well.
- donor funding from one or multiple sources.
- The case study should have taken place over the last decade.

## **Further Information:**

Please contact [advocacy@VOICEeu.org](mailto:advocacy@VOICEeu.org) if you require any further information.

# TABLE OF

## CONTENTS

<b>Case Study 1</b> .....	4
Save the Children/Global/Safe School Approach	
<b>Case Study 2</b> .....	8
Save the Children/Ethiopia/Early Action	
<b>Case Study 3</b> .....	11
CARE/Jordan/Unified, holistic response model program approach	
<b>Case Study 4</b> .....	14
CARE/Sudan/"Promoting Peace in East Darfur" Project	
<b>Case Study 5</b> .....	16
CARE/Middle East/"Doing the nexus differently"	
<b>Case Study 6</b> .....	18
CARE/Niger/Integrating for distinct programmes	
<b>Case Study 7</b> .....	20
CARE/West Bank and Gaza/Transitional approaches	
<b>Case Study 8</b> .....	22
INTERSOS/Iraq/Provision of emergency primary health care services	
<b>Case Study 9</b> .....	25
Action Against Hunger/Mali/Implementing a Nexus Approach in Timbuktu	
<b>Case Study 10</b> .....	31
ADRA and RISE Network/Myanmar/Education	
<b>Case Study 11</b> .....	35
WeWorld-GVC/occupied Palestinian Territories/Community Protection Approach	
<b>Case Study 12</b> .....	45
Plan International/Chad/Regional Lake Chad Programme	
<b>Case Study 13</b> .....	50
Save the Children/Malawi/PREPARE & FUTURE Programmes	
<b>Case Study 14</b> .....	53
Norwegian Refugee Council/Somalia/Crisis Modifier and Adaptive Programming	
<b>Case Study 15</b> .....	55
Oxfam/Myanmar/ Durable Peace Programme	
<b>Case Study 16</b> .....	61
Mercy Corps/Nigeria/humanitarian action, peacebuilding and development	

# Case Study 1

## **Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors**

The Safe Schools approach collaborates with a wide range of actors, civil society partners and state actors, especially the Ministry of Education. For example, in Nepal, Save the Children (SC) has been working very closely with the Ministry of Education and has been able to lift up comprehensive school safety and make it part of the national curriculum and guidelines for teachers and schools, while in Uganda SC has been working closely with the Office of the Prime Minister where the entity of disaster management lies. In Nicaragua SC has collaborated closely with the Civil Defence on trainings and implementation. When the Safe Schools programming was done in a conflict context, SC also collaborated with the military, for example on trainings of the Safe Schools Declaration, as in Niger, and in certain countries such as Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) SC has collaborated with Geneva Call, an NGO that had contact with non-state armed actors.

## **Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach**

Safe Schools, is the common name for projects that work with Conflict/Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) or interpersonal violence (such as Central-America) within the education sector. Its aim is to keep children safe in an around school adapted to the risk landscape in different contexts.

Save the Children has through the years implemented Safe Schools programming in a variety of countries. Fiji, Vanuatu, Cambodia, Lao, Nepal, Philippines, Bhutan, India, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, Colombia, Bolivia, Haiti, Ethiopia, Niger, Uganda, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, DRC, Nigeria, Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT), Ukraine, Somalia, South Sudan to mention a few.

Safe Schools is an education sector-based approach that works with school communities, but also involves the broader community, and education, disaster management, and child protection authorities at national and sub-national level to prevent, mitigate and prepare for the impacts of natural and man-made hazards within the education sector. The approach is supporting the operationalisation of the Safe Schools Declaration, stopping attacks on schools and supporting the goals of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework, namely:

- to protect learners and education workers from death, injury, and harm in schools;
- to plan for educational continuity in the face of all expected hazards and threats;
- to safeguard education sector investments;
- to strengthen risk reduction and resilience through education.

## **Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study**

Save the Children has worked on what has now evolved into the Safe Schools Approach for at least 20 years.

### Donor/Funding Sources

Save the Children has and is receiving funding for the Safe Schools projects from a variety of institutional and private donors. ECHO has been fundamental in creating specific funding opportunities that has allowed SC to innovate both the work done on natural hazards and also the work done with conflict. Other funds, for example Norad, have made it possible to mainstream elements of Safe School into broader education projects.

Development donors have been less inclined to fund larger components of Safe Schools programming, while humanitarian donors often wish to work more on response. In that sense, risk reduction often falls between two chairs as it is working towards the shocks to minimise the impacts. ECHO is the exception, although it focuses on response preparedness within schools, limiting at times a broader Safe Schools programming. In the past years, with more funding being targeted to conflict contexts, it has become easier to access funding from humanitarian donors.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

Safe Schools programming in many ways operationalises the nexus approach because:

- it builds the bridge between development and humanitarian contexts as it aims at preventing and preparing for a humanitarian crisis. When successful, it limits the damages from the crisis and reduces the need for external humanitarian assistance;
- it has an all-risks approach as it works with both conflict risks, natural hazards and interpersonal violence. This means that it is also apt for high violence contexts that are not declared as emergencies, such as the context of gang violence in Central America.
- it is used both in development and in humanitarian contexts. In the aftermaths of the 2015 Nepal earthquake it was a central part of the recovery phase. In DRC and the Diffa district in Niger, Safe Schools programming is used in conflict settings to limit the impact of conflict on schools and education. In Eastern Colombia it is being used in areas with high presence of guerrilla.

### Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**A whole school approach** is crucial to address **all of the hazards** facing children in and around schools. This means the whole school community – leadership, teachers, students, parents and communities – working together to improve safety.

1. Authorities develop and strengthen **policies and systems** for school safety and protection;
2. **School safety management** protects children in and around school;
3. **School facilities** are constructed and maintained to create a safe and enabling school environment;

4. **Teachers and children** demonstrate self-protection knowledge, skills and behaviours for safety and protection.

**Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

For more in depth case studies of investing into making schools safe, please see the list on the [preventionweb](#) website. This research is funded (at least to a large extent) by SC, and it is not all specifically related to SC Safe School programming, but rather lifts up the general successes in different countries.

**Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The fact that it addresses both conflict and natural hazards, for example, in a flood-prone area of Colombia, both children and adults only focused initially on flooding. Working with Safe Schools programming, the risk imposed by armed actors also became very visible for the population where it had become normalised but now they wish to take actions to promote the protection of schools from armed conflict. In DRC where the main focus of the intervention was conflict, the school, the staff and the authorities were also very eager to cover natural hazards they were experiencing. SC in Uganda has highlighted the risk of abduction and assaults.

Also the fact that the programmes are being implemented in both humanitarian (recovery, conflict, and protracted crisis) and development contexts.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Often existing education programmes require actors to build with Ministries of education.

Safe Schools Declaration created a momentum, it put attacks on education on the international agenda and gave a framework to operationalise it on the ground.

In some contexts, such as Nepal after the 2005 earthquake, the disaster creates a window of opportunity where there is a lot of focus and political will to create changes.

International agreed upon frameworks, such as the Sendai Framework and the Comprehensive School Safety Framework, give different actors a common agenda and language.

On the ground reality: Feedback and experiences from SC staff have highlighted that, for a long time, there is need to work on a triple nexus; to work on prevention and preparedness for both manmade- and natural hazards, as well as social risks, for the programmes to have proper meaning on the ground.

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

Longer term, specific funding would be good.

Donors are not always so receptive of the broader risk/all hazards approach. For example, the interpersonal violence risk is not always easy to transmit to

humanitarian donors, while (as children reported in OPT) it might be one of the risks they feel that affects them the most.

**What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

At times it can be challenging to balance the need for simple communication and solutions with the need for comprehensiveness.

**Were any lessons learned?**

Throughout the organisation SC has seen the need to bring the approaches of tackling conflict, natural hazards and interpersonal violence together.



## Case Study 2

### Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

Save the Children (SC), in collaboration with local governments (the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Office and Woreda officials from varying Ministries)

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Country:** Ethiopia (Shinile Pastoral zone in the Somali region)

**Programmatic approach:** Early Action

SC implemented early (forecast-based) actions alongside its ongoing EU-funded RESET<sup>1</sup> programme activities.

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

2017

### Donor/Funding Sources

The ongoing development programme (RESET) was being funded by the EU. The Early Action programme was funded by SC-UK (an Internal “Early Action Fund (EAF)”)

The need for early action was identified. SC-UK already had in place an Early Action Fund, with pre-agreed triggers for its release, therefore, funds were transferred from headquarters to the Country Office quickly and efficiently. It was essential to have pre-agreed triggers to activate the EAF for the rapid release of funds.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

The case study is a clear example of how an ongoing longer-term development (recovery) project allowed SC to identify a deteriorating situation, and to implement early actions that ultimately protected households' food consumption and livelihoods.

SC was able to act quickly because:

- its development team's knowledge of the area and context, its existing context monitoring systems, and its acceptance by local communities and government;
- its existing operational systems (procurement, cash transfer, etc.), and HR resources (existing, skilled teams);
- flexible (internal) early action/contingency funds, that were quickly released based upon pre-agreed triggers.

### Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

---

<sup>1</sup> RESET: Resilience Building and Creation of Economic Opportunities in Ethiopia

The Early Action approach was based on the Household Economy Analysis (HEA), which investigates how households' baseline (or "normal") year access to food and income are likely to change during the upcoming season as a result of a shock, such as drought. In February 2017, through the HEA, SC used a combination of meteorological forecasts, government monitoring data on crops, livestock and prices, and local knowledge from team, government and community members to identify which households would not be able to access enough food and cash to meet their basic food and non-food needs starting from the month of May.

(For additional details, please check the [HEA website](#)).

This acted as a trigger, to release funds from the "Early Action Fund", an internal fund established by SC-UK to enable early action. The funds were released to the Country Office, where implementation began within two weeks of the triggering.

**Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

Additional details on this pilot are available in SCUK's Early Action [learning report](#).

***Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:***

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

An ongoing development programme enabled the identification of a deteriorating situation; and Early Action (humanitarian) funding allowed the implementation of interventions that enabled households to cope with the forecasted shock.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Some of the enabling elements were:

- An existing presence on the ground: including a skilled team, a monitoring system, operational systems (for cash transfers, procurement, etc.), knowledge of the context, acceptance by the communities and local government;
- Pre-agreed triggers for the release of early action funds;
- Secured funding for early action (secured during "normal" times).

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

- Hesitancy from the team to act on forecasts (which entails some uncertainty);
- A limited budget, which did not enable SC to target all impacted households.

### **What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

- Although existing systems enabled a fast reaction, more preparedness actions would have enabled even faster implementation (procurement measures, cash transfer mechanisms, etc.)
- More engagement of local early warning systems and DRR groups – their knowledge and information systems could possibly have enabled an even earlier triggering, and more thorough response analysis.

### **Were any lessons learned?**

- It is indeed possible to act early, before households have lost livelihoods, and lives have been lost;
- HEA is an extremely valuable approach for triggering forecast-based (early) action;
- Existing development programmes – and the systems, capacity, presence, etc. that come with them - are key to achieving earlier action;
- There is a continued need to build confidence in no-regrets actions – for implementing agencies as well as donors;
- It is cost effective to act early: analysis of this pilot initiative shows that EA helped beneficiaries from the worst and most damaging effect of droughts. For every £1 spent on EAF, target households received £2.58 in social value when compared to only humanitarian response.

## Case Study 3

### Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

**Name of Organisation:** CARE Jordan

**Engagement with other actors:** Partnerships with various actors at different levels: government, local civil society, international community and the private sector

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Country:** Jordan

**Programmatic Approach:** unified, holistic response model program approach

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

2014 - on-going (CARE merged all activities into one holistic program in 2014, rather than having separate humanitarian and development programmes)

### Donor/Funding Sources

Many different donors: GAC, the US BPRM, ADA, German MOFA, DIBP, DFID

Recognising that not all donors have the organisational and policy set-up to provide flexible, longer-term funding, CARE Jordan project development teams strive to include development components into humanitarian funding proposals and vice versa, wherever possible. This allows CARE not only to shift resources between humanitarian and development components during the implementation period, following approval by funding agencies, but also facilitates coordination between humanitarian and development teams as they operate under the same funding contracts and, as a consequence, are required to interact on a regular basis at the management and operational level, mitigating the risk of overlap of activities and duplication of efforts.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

CARE Jordan explores and utilises opportunities for cross-fertilisation between humanitarian work and development approaches with the aim of identifying the most appropriate responses to the needs and vulnerabilities of affected individuals and families affected, *irrespective of their nationality*- the latter is important as humanitarian programmes tend to focus on Syrian refugees only, whereas CARE programmes focus on vulnerability. For example, small group discussions are organised between women of various nationalities and backgrounds, leading to increased understanding, new friendships and increased social cohesion. Furthermore, it is a holistic programmatic approach (See below).

**Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Country context:** for the past 70 years, Jordan has received wave after wave of refugees, from Palestinians, to Iraqis, Syrians, Yemenis and others.

**Programmatic Approach:** While formally placed within the protection sector, CARE's approach transcends sector-thinking by focusing on needs and vulnerabilities and most appropriate response modalities to address them. CARE's response model uses a combination of social work tools such as vulnerability assessment, information provision, referrals, and case management in combination with emergency cash assistance (complementary to UNHCR monthly cash assistance), livelihood support, e.g. vocational training, and psychosocial support services, psychosocial support activities and other services designed based on continuous analysis of evolving needs.

***Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:***

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

This approach has proven very appropriate to the context of Jordan, a middle-income country, where institutions and markets are, in principle, available to provide the goods and services required by affected populations. CARE's role as an INGO should be primarily to support affected populations with information and (financial) support to access services and goods they need. The design of the approach also highlights complementarity with inter-governmental and UN support to the Government of Jordan, which focuses on expansion of the capacities of public services, and with the efforts of INGOs to temporarily fill sector-specific service gaps.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

CARE's long standing presence in Jordan (since 1948), partnerships with various actors at different levels: government, civil society (worked with over 93 local CSOs and CBOs), international community and the private sector, as well as the experience and knowledge which CARE brings to the scene in Jordan. The long term presence also facilitates successful advocacy at various levels.

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

Ensuring that CARE remains capable to address risks and respond to emergencies if and when they occur. CARE has an updated emergency preparedness Planning (EPP), and it ensures the training and capacity building of CARE staff on emergency response.

**Were any lessons learned?**

Examples of lessons learnt and best practices:

1. Opportunities for cross-fertilisation between relief work and development programs.
  - Cash as an effective modality not only for relief, but also for protection, education, shelter and livelihood programming.
  - Merging livelihood support from the relief and the sustainable development programs, respectively.
  - Introducing elements of development programming to Azraq camp.
2. Focus on gender transformative, rather than gender-sensitive programming.
  - Comprehensive livelihood support for women's economic empowerment during protracted crisis: Community Savings and Loans Associations (CSLAs), vocational training, support to start-ups and home based businesses, grants/ material input, and marketing support.
  - Addressing Gender Based Violence through comprehensive approaches, helping communities understand and challenge the social norms that perpetuate inequalities between men and women, and engaging men and boys.
3. Advocacy for flexible, long(er)-term funding and a mixed funding portfolio.
  - Two/three-year humanitarian/development bridging funding from GAC, the US BPRM, ADA, and the German MOFA.
  - Integration of relief components in funding proposals for sustainable development and vice-versa.
4. Where strictly necessary, maintaining a separation of humanitarian response and development activities.
  - Clear programmatic focus assigned to CARE Jordan's three program teams.
  - Firewalling CARE's response in Jordan, and Syria, respectively.

## Case Study 4

### **Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors**

CARE Sudan (CARE International Switzerland (CIS))  
Partners (Participants): Members of the Community Based Resolution Mechanisms (CBRMs), Darfur Community Peace and Stability (DCPSF) /UNDP team, CARE team, implementing partners, Government officials (various ministries)

### **Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach**

**Country:** Sudan

**Programme:** Project "Promoting Peace in East Darfur".

### **Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study**

2016-2018

### **Donor/Funding Sources**

The project was funded by the Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund (DCPSF) that promotes peaceful co-existence among communities in three localities in East Darfur.

### **What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?**

Exchange of knowledge and inclusion of women's and youth groups, allow for more effective peacebuilding while at the same time advancing the development in the region as well as humanitarian recovery through, for example, Village Saving and Loan Associations (VSLAs) and youth in leadership roles to intervene immediately after a conflict and create a discussion forum with the rival group.

### **Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach**

Trainings provided to different sub-structures (women and youth groups) to increase their role and participation in their communities.  
Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs) have given opportunities for pastoralist and farming women to contribute to community stability. The VSLAs integrate social cohesion while addressing both short and long-term community needs.

### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The project created a space for the community to discuss their issues actively and solve them before they escalate.

Women are empowered to advocate for change, peace, and recovery, using their skills and influence to discourage calling for war.  
Engaging capable and committed community based structures was crucial to the success of the project.  
Substructures received training adapted to their line of work- e.g. a water committee learnt how to deal with conflicts over water

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

Delay of the project start, high staff turnover, lack of technical staff (implementing partners' organisations).  
Challenges shared by partners: difficulty to work in the community during rainy season and harvest time, lack of manuals promoting peace.



## Case Study 5

### Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

**Name of Organisation:** CARE Middle East - North Africa region (MENA)

**Partners:** research institutes, specialists in the field

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Region:** Middle East

**Programme:** Research "[Doing Nexus differently](#)" – done by the MENA Regional Applied Economic Empowerment Unit, with strong engagement of CARE OPT, Jordan, Egypt and inputs from other MENA offices.

**Programmatic Approach:** organisational – wide engagement process, different Nexus approaches: LRRD, Contiguum concept and (Double/Triple) Nexus Approach

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

Since 2016, a study was published in September 2018.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

Connecting and integrating humanitarian action with development goals, for example via Village Savings and Loan Associations (VLSAs), Resilient Market Systems approach and having Cross-Sectoral Teams.

### Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

Review of evidence from the ground shows that many CARE country teams are already connecting and integrating humanitarian action with development goals. A wide range of examples show opportunities such as Village Savings and Loan Associations (VLSAs) that integrate social cohesion while addressing both short and long-term community needs. Other examples show the creation of community-led hubs that promote socio-economic development while responding to urgent needs, the acceleration of social enterprises that address social issues, the integration of women's rights in refugee support programs, and the stimulation of markets through innovative cash and voucher services, to name a few.

### Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The principles for doing the nexus differently which CARE proposes based on its programming in MENA, which are:

- Localisation

- Local ownership and participation
- Evidence-based analysis
- Politically smart
- Gender and Women's voices
- Resilience: particular focus on Resilient Market Systems approach
- Adaptive Management
- Piloting Nexus Projects through Cross-Sectoral Teams
- Reinvesting in Program Quality – especially MEAL systems

### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

CARE accepts there are challenges surrounding a highly integrated approach (especially a top-down one coming from the global level). Because of this, the Hub calls for developing stronger awareness and a more explicit evidence base to avoid negative consequences of the instrumentalisation and politicisation of aid, as well as the possible reduction of impact.

## Case Study 6

### Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors

**Name of Organisation:** CARE Niger

**Engagement with other actors:** Government authorities, civil society actors (representing communities)

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Country:** Niger

**Four distinct programmes:**

- 1) Women and girls' empowerment and leadership;
- 2) Food security, nutrition and emergency;
- 3) Management of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and conflict prevention;
- 4) Youth, peace and development.

**Programmatic Approach:** integrate humanitarian and development action under a single framework. At the heart of the program approach is a long-term commitment to specific vulnerable groups. → Targeting strategy: CARE Niger targets the same households for both humanitarian and development interventions. This strategy is well-accepted and implemented in a highly participative manner with communities, local organisations and local authorities.

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

2009 - 2014 (programme shift)

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

CARE Niger supports the most vulnerable families with appropriate emergency / recovery / development initiatives at different points in time to contribute to sustainable change in a very strategic manner.

### Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Country context:** Niger has been facing a protracted food crisis for several years. At the heart of this crisis is a lack of resilience among families.

**Programmatic Approach:**

Example: The capacity and vulnerability of a household will be very different if it is experiencing or recovering from an acute food crisis, or even if it is in a period of relative food security. Therefore, the support the household receives should be very different as well.

Components of the targeting strategy:

- The development initiatives of CARE Niger's programs all conduct participative vulnerability assessments in the villages where they work in order to identify the most vulnerable households.
- The outcome of these vulnerability assessments is a "master" vulnerability list for each village.
- For the moment of the case study, this list was available only to CARE and its partners, but the goal is to make it available for everyone.

**Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

Other examples of reinforcing linkages:

- All CARE Niger's initiatives include a strong DRR component
- CARE Niger uses a mixed early warning system, combining its own system with one led by the communities.
- The Country Office is very intentional in linking its humanitarian and development efforts and has developed a clear emergency-to-development continuum to do so.
- CARE Niger negotiates the inclusion of contingency funds in its development initiatives.
- All these strategies combined are resulting in better development work that reduces the need for humanitarian work, better humanitarian work that contributes to development, and, overall, a greater contribution to social change.

**Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The participant targeting process of humanitarian interventions, which can sometimes be challenging and lengthy, is streamlined and extremely efficient. It ensures a fair participant selection process and engages with affected communities in a deliberate and meaningful way.

It helps CARE Niger and its partners to truly reach the most vulnerable households, who are typically disproportionately affected by disasters and for whom a modest shock could be a tipping point that reverses all gains made through previous development projects. In other words, the strategy ensures better targeting and protection of development gains.

This way, CARE Niger's overall impact is much more sustainable than if its humanitarian and development initiatives were targeting different sets of households. Depending on the circumstances, the match is not always perfect but CARE Niger and its partners are working consciously to support the most vulnerable with appropriate interventions, whenever they are on the emergency / recovery / development cycle.

# Case Study 7

## Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors

**Name of Organisation:** CARE Palestine

**Engagement with other actors:** NGOs, local government, farming communities, ministries such as Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Economy, private sector, including investors, processing and exporting companies, etc.)

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Region/Country:** West Bank and Gaza (occupied Palestinian territory)

**Programme/Project:** programme that meets the humanitarian needs of civilians and builds their capacity to sustain their livelihoods.

**Programmatic Approach:** Transitional approaches

## Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

2012 – on-going

## What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

- Using transitional approaches with the aim to lift people from poverty and dependence towards self-reliance, resilience, and development
- Integrate in emergency response measures for resilience/development where possible

## Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**Programme/Project:** CARE Palestine has been active in relief and development since 1948. CARE has field offices in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, implementing programs for the Palestinian communities in health, agriculture and livelihoods, economic empowerment / resilience and gender equality, civil society strengthening, and emergency relief. CARE Palestine works to ensure that the projects delivered benefit both men and women, particularly those who are poor, vulnerable, marginalised and isolated.

CARE Palestine made a major shift in 2012, from a delivery oriented agency towards a partnership approach that takes a localised, participatory and sustainable method towards the empowerment of our target groups. All of the analysis and all of the local actors supported this type of thinking for the sake of impact.

In addition, CARE prototyped/piloted many components of transitional approaches in the first two years and still continues to do so. For instance, CARE piloted and prototyped its social entrepreneurship work in crisis settings.

Focus: Transitional approaches (from continuum to contiguuum), empowering local actors to take/evolve their role as well as push for more resilient market systems.

### **Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

Examples:

- During the war in 2014, CARE mobilised mobile health teams, while also rehabilitating local health structures with robust emergency preparedness mechanisms.
- In addition, CARE applied resilient food market systems approaches to resume food supplies after major destruction and improve food availability in addition to food distributions by CARE or its partners.
- Besides, the team has been integrating gender transformative approaches in all of its work.

These shifts also turned around other aspects of CARE's work – for example developing socio-economic hubs that are now capable of serving community needs and responding to farmers' vulnerabilities during droughts or floods, poverty, and social tensions.

- In FY2017, CARE and its partners reached approximately 10% of the 4 million Palestinians (60% female, 50% youth). Under CARE Palestine's Economic Empowerment (EE) Program, CARE has impacted more than 165,000 people (51% female, 35% youth) in 2017.

### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

- Ongoing learning, reflection, innovation (piloting and prototyping), and of course the impact visible on the ground.
- Almost all local partners (CBOs, local authorities, local implementing NGOs, and even the private sector) engage in humanitarian responses, development, and even in grassroots peacebuilding.

**What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

There were different perceptions from donors and implementing partners in the initial stages (i.e. in 2012/2013). However, now, donors and implementing partners have followed to adapt similar transitional approaches.

**Were any lessons learned?**

Teams need to be able to understand, design, and implement both emergency and development.

## Case Study 8

### Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors

INTERSOS

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

Iraq: Provision of emergency primary health care services for crisis affected population in urgent need in Ninewa Governorate

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

Project started on 10 May 2018 and was completed on 9 January 2019.

### Donor/Funding Sources

The project was funded by ECHO within the framework of HIP 2018 for Iraq. Funding applied for at INTERSOS' own initiative.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

The project, which was implemented in coordination with the Department of Health, included strong elements of strengthening the healthcare system in the project areas through:

- technical capacity building of specialised staff;
- revitalisation of health facilities;
- provision of medical drugs and medical equipment.

Furthermore, the project worked with the local community to build their resilience through developing the community networks to monitor protection needs and to better address emerging vulnerabilities.

### Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

The project aimed to address the existing gap in primary health care service in the community of Tel Afar, in the Ninewa Governorate and it ensured the outreach to all members of the community there, which has historically been a separated community. **(access expansion)**

The project included the revitalisation of 2 primary healthcare centres (PHCCs), including the reestablishment of an emergency room and provision of furniture, medical and laboratory equipment.

The project identified and trained medical staff from the Department of Health (DoH) employees on primary health care topics included in the PHC package (including on Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses - IMCI, first aid, triage and other). **(work with National Health Authorities + capacity building)**.

Complementing the training and specific technical support to the health staff responsible for PHC services, INTERSOS also provided medical equipment

enabling the facilities to provide a long-term and sustainable service. **(health system strengthening).**

The project also **developed volunteer network/community-based protection mechanisms that reduce the vulnerability of the affected groups and individuals, while shaping and enhancing the rights-based analysis at a community and local authority levels to** ensure promotion of positive coping mechanisms, community participation, avoiding victimisation while stressing the role and options for the affected population groups. Essentially, the project built the volunteer network that served as an essential bridge between the community and the services available on the ground. In addition, the trained volunteers monitored the protection needs, and helped raising awareness on protection issues and services available. **(addressing the barriers to access services from a community perspective).**

This **community-based approach** is in line with the government's national acceleration plan, which focus on producing sustainable change at the community level. Outreach workers and local staff, trained/supported by INTERSOS, serve as catalysts for change in their community. **(work with National Health Authorities + community-based approach + improve of referral capacity).**

***Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:***

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The project is successful since it consists of **life-saving assistance, integration in national health system and health system strengthening as well as building community resilience, thus ensuring a more sustainable outputs once the project is completed.** While addressing and preventing health problems, the project focused on widening the specific knowledge of local health staff, delivering benefits beyond the duration of the action.

In fact, specific attention has been given to delivery of training and specific technical support to the health staff responsible for the provision of PHC services. The selected health facilities have been equipped with the tools required for long-term and sustainable service.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Favourable conducive environment: good collaboration with the Ministry of Health, access to project area, clear objectives and directions by health cluster. Availability of funding.

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

No specific challenges related to the project. However, inherent risk of worsening of the security situation, thus hampering access of the beneficiaries



to the health facilities has been an underlying challenge. Lack of skilled personnel was also part of the risk. There was a need for strict coordination with the DoH.

### **Were any lessons learned?**

Iraq is now in a post-conflict operating environment: humanitarian needs are still relevant and mostly related to displacement population unable and/or unwilling to return to their places of origin. This represent the most vulnerable segment of the population still in need of life-saving assistance.

Generally, however, the environment is ready for operationalisation of the nexus: humanitarian provision of essential public services is to be coordinated with mid-/long-term support strategies and governmental systems, aimed at supporting the timely resumption of government services, for a sustainable response and prospects for future exit strategy. Beyond humanitarian aid, safety, basic services and livelihood opportunities are urgently needed in Iraq. This is indispensable also to enable safe, voluntary, dignified and sustainable returns, and to ensure durable solutions to protracted displacement. Combination of humanitarian assistance and support to resumption of basic services is therefore the best applicable approach.

## Case Study 9

### Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

Action Against Hunger mission in Mali is the implementing organisation. It engages with communities and local authorities.

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

Action Against Hunger in Mali implements two separate projects funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) in the region of Timbuktu in a humanitarian-development dual approach:

- “Integrated project to strengthen the resilience of rural communities in Kita and Timbuktu circles in Mali” (development project – locally delegated to the Swedish embassy in Mali).
- “Integrated response to the humanitarian nutritional crises in Timbuktu and Taoudenit, North of Mali” (humanitarian project).

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

The two projects:

- The development project was implemented from December 2015 to September 2019.
- The humanitarian project was implemented from April 2018 to March 2019.

### Donor/Funding Sources

The two projects implemented by Action Against Hunger in Mali in this dual approach are funded by **SIDA**:

- The development project is contracted locally with the Swedish Embassy in Mali;
- The humanitarian project is part of the multi-year humanitarian agreement signed between SIDA and Action Against Hunger.

### Was the funding received because of the NGO’s own initiative or pushed by donors?

This initiative came from the donor at first. SIDA was interested in experimenting this way of working and the complementarity of emergency projects with development initiatives was mentioned in the call for emergency projects.

### How much time/effort did it take and what could have made it easier?

Setting up this approach indeed requires additional efforts, such as aligning objectives, making localised assessments of humanitarian and development needs and coordinating two different and separated projects while ensuring that they remain complementary. In the future, having only one project, with integrated development and emergency objectives and activities, would help ensuring that the project is easier to implement, more effective and impactful.

## **What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?**

The complementarity between the two projects implemented by Action Against Hunger in the Timbuktu region, as well as the combination of funding from the same donor, make Action Against Hunger's dual approach a good example of a humanitarian/development nexus programming.

With this dual approach, Action Against Hunger implements both a humanitarian nutrition crisis response and a multi-sectoral development project at the same time in the same region of Mali. The humanitarian project aims at responding to the nutritional crisis and treating its consequences, while the development project aims at addressing the root causes of malnutrition and strengthening the resilience of populations. This dual approach is thus very relevant because of the complementarity of the projects, both in terms of needs and objectives. In addition, the analysis of the situation in the area of Timbuktu was also common to the humanitarian and development projects, with the identification of similar issues (in particular the chronic nutrition insecurity) to be addressed by the two projects.

Another specificity of Action Against Hunger's dual approach in Mali is the combination of two types of funds from the same donor. SIDA provides Action Against Hunger in Mali both with urgency and development fund and supports Action Against Hunger in its dual approach.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

Action Against Hunger in Mali aims at implementing a dual approach, ensuring that the humanitarian and development strategies of the two projects are converging. Specifically, the humanitarian project's goal is to strengthen the prevention and treatment of children under five suffering from severe acute malnutrition; the development project's goal is to strengthen the resilience and the improving the livelihood vulnerable populations in Timbuktu and Kita. The humanitarian project is therefore focused on addressing undernutrition in the area, including through the delivery of treatment against severe acute malnutrition, while the development project adopts a multi-sectoral approach (nutrition, food security, etc.) to improve vulnerable populations' resilience.

A semi-quantitative analysis carried out between April and June 2018 assessed the relevance and the efficiency of the Action Against Hunger's dual approach in Timbuktu. This analysis concluded that this dual approach is very relevant to respond to the protracted and multidimensional nutritional crisis in Timbuktu. In terms of efficiency of this dual approach, project teams can support each other for implementing certain activities such as mass sensitisations and information sharing, and it created continuity between humanitarian and development activities. It also shows that people's needs in areas where the dual approach was implemented were better met than in areas where the dual approach was not yet put in place.

### **Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

Action Against Hunger's dual approach in Timbuktu combining two projects and two funding is very innovative and positive. Lessons learnt show that the following recommendations should be considered to ensure the implementation of the humanitarian/development nexus:

- Conduct a preliminary contextual analysis to assess the relevance of a nexus approach;
- Design a single project or programme rather than two distinct projects separating humanitarian and development activities;
- Plan an exit strategy from the humanitarian to the development component;
- Establish formal coordination mechanisms between the different teams in the case of two distinct projects;
- Establish formal consultation and coordination frameworks with all relevant stakeholders;
- Advocate and sensitise communities on the need for a transition from humanitarian to development activities.

#### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

#### **What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

Some elements of success in the implementation of the humanitarian/development nexus by Action Against Hunger in the Timbuktu region are:

- The combination of two types of funding from the same donors;
- The joint analysis and objectives between the humanitarian and development projects;
- The fact that the humanitarian project (designed after the development project) identifies and refers to the complementarity of the two projects as crucial for success;
- The continuity and mutual strengthening of humanitarian and development activities. Example: After the distribution of nutritional inputs in a health centre (humanitarian), these are used during cooking demonstrations at community level, enabling community support (development);
- Common approaches to both projects, which avoids contradictions. Ex: in both projects, there is no motivation (per diem) distributed to participants during sensitisation sessions;
- The support project teams could give to each other during implementation (example of mass sensitisations) and regarding information sharing and lessons learnt.

#### **What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Some enabling elements for Action Against Hunger's dual approach in Timbuktu are:

- **Single donor for the two projects:** SIDA is supportive of the nexus approach adopted by Action Against Hunger in Mali.

- The joint analysis and objectives between the humanitarian and development projects;
- The fact that the humanitarian project (designed after the development project) identifies and refers to the complementarity of the two projects as crucial for success;
- Common approaches to both projects, which avoids contradictions.
- In the future, an enabling element would also be for donors to take into account such pilot projects, so that they can in turn analyse any internal shortcomings and in turn adapt their ways of working to an effective implementation of the nexus, including being able to fund multiannual projects, guarantee flexibility, etc. In addition, the implementation of the New Way of Working and the nexus in the area should include all actors, to ensure alignment of NGOs and donors on the nexus implementation and avoid conflicting approaches (see below disabling elements).

Some disabling elements for Action Against Hunger's dual approach in Timbuktu are:

- **Lack of a formal coordination framework and lack of a common vision between the two projects:**
  - The complementarity between the two projects was elaborated from 2016 onwards, i.e after the design of the development project (2015), which hinders coordination between the two.
  - The coordination / consultation between the teams of the two projects is not formal.
- **Conflicting approaches between NGOs:** Common approaches to both projects (such as lack of per diem) are sometimes undermined by the strategies of other actors as some NGOs provide per diem to participants.
- **Security and cultural environment:** Communities do not all seem willing to adopt the empowerment approach promoted by the development project. They want to be involved, but often remain in a logic of assistance, which can be understood as these communities live in a climate of conflict and recurrent crises.

### What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?

Challenges in the implementation of the project were identified in the following areas:

- Teams management and communication, in the case of activities implemented jointly by two distinct projects;
- Risks of contradictions with other organisations operating outside the conceptual framework of the nexus approach in the intervention area;
- Risk of not attracting funds from 'classic' donors, i.e either "emergency", either "development";
- Risk of too much flexibility in the intervention, and of discretionary use of strategies sometimes contradictory, depending on the need of the moment: development strategies (aiming at empowering communities) and humanitarian strategies (simplified procedures with the imperative of saving lives);
- Risk of scaling up the nexus approach inadequately, without conducting a contextual analysis beforehand to better frame the project and its expected results.

## What could have been done better or what went wrong?

Some limitations in the implementation of Action Against Hunger's dual approach have been acknowledged:

- Complementary activities such as prevention and screening are not jointly implemented.
- Each project focuses on its own activities and action plan. There is a lack of a transition plan, gradual reduction of support or handover of activities after the completion of the humanitarian project by the development project to ensure sustainability.

## Were any lessons learned?

The lessons learned by Action Against Hunger from implementing the humanitarian-development dual approach in Timbuktu are:

### On the design:

- I. Develop a pilot initiative based on a joint assessment of humanitarian and development needs. This initiative should be articulated as a **single project or programme** rather than two different projects to avoid biases related to project management and coordination. This approach should encompass great flexibility and responsiveness to be able to adapt to the evolution of the context.
- II. Include a "crisis modifier" component, allowing to integrate a dose of "adaptability" to cope with the constraints and hazards related to crises, conflict sensitiveness, security incidents.
- III. Establish greater complementarity between humanitarian and development activities, with clear links between each humanitarian and development components. This will allow the main stakeholders to have a better understanding of the continuity between the two components of the approach and will facilitate the transition from one to the other.
- IV. Plan an exit strategy from the humanitarian to the development component.

### On the implementation:

- I. Raise awareness and train project teams on the dual approach model, its principles, benefits, and challenges.
- II. In the case two projects (or separately funded projects) are being implemented, establish a formal framework for coordination and sharing of lessons learned throughout the implementation – eg. Real time learning exercises.
- III. Jointly implement complementary activities (eg prevention activities and screening activities) in order to increase their effectiveness and impact.
- IV. Advocate and sensitise communities, partners, local authorities and technical services on the need for a transition from humanitarian to development, and develop a behaviour change strategy to enable real empowerment of communities which are critical for the development approach to succeed.

**On the coordination:**

- I. Set up formal consultation and coordination frameworks with all stakeholders in order to avoid counterproductive approaches in terms of assistance and empowerment.
- II. Advocate to the different implementing agencies as well as the donors to participate in this formal coordination framework at all levels.

**On monitoring, evaluation and research:**

- I. Conduct reflection and capitalisation workshops bringing together the two approaches, in order to identify potential synergies.
- II. Further reflection on the level of integration of humanitarian and development initiatives.
- III. Continue research on the effectiveness of the "dual" approach and its long-term impact on reducing the rate of malnutrition and on the resilience of populations in Timbuktu region.
- IV. Study the feasibility of merging the two projects.

# Case Study 10

## **Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors**

**NGOs:** ADRA Germany, ADRA UK, ADRA Myanmar

**Local Organisations:** Rural Indigenous Sustainable Education (RISE) Network, including the following local organisations: Karen Teachers Working Group (KTWG), Ta'ang Student and Youth Union (TSYU), Lahu Development Network (LDN), Shanan Education Networking Group (SENG), Rural Development Foundation of Shan State (RDFSS), Pa'oh Health Working Committee (PHWC), Karenni Education Department (KnED), Eastern Naga Development Organization (ENDO), Chin Education Network (CEN), Zomi Development Foundation (ZDF), Karen Women's Organization (KWO).

## **Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach**

Myanmar/Children of Peace and Peace funding/Conflict Areas Support for Education (CASE/ CASE+)/Education in Conflict and Post Conflict areas.

## **Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study**

May 2016 - May 2019

## **Donor/Funding Sources**

ECHO Children of Peace funding (EU Nobel prize for support to education in conflict areas) - May 2016 to April 2018 (CASE)

EU Delegation funding – July 2018 to May 2019 (CASE+)

This funding was received because of the partnerships with the local organisation networks, the relevance to the current education reform and peace process, and the strong vision of the local education organisations for education in conflict and post conflict areas of the country. The funding also addressed gaps between humanitarian and development funding and the issue of declining funding to Ethnic States and Regions in Myanmar as donors began to shift more funding to government areas and areas that are more accessible for aid and development. Initiating the program with support from ECHO was useful as the humanitarian programs intrinsically have more flexibility to adapt to the complex environment, and allowed for the piloting of approaches, particularly in reaching out of school children. Transitioning to EU development funding enabled the inclusion of longer-term developmental approaches and increased engagement with other education actors in the country.

## **What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?**

In Myanmar, targeting for the humanitarian sector / Education in Emergencies Sector as represented in the HNO and HRP in Myanmar has, up until 2018, focused on/ prioritised the 239,000+ IDPs, while the development funding largely targets the more accessible non-conflict affected townships which are



also easier to access and secure agreements with the government for implementation. The initial phase of the program under ECHO funding focused the broader target group of “conflict affected communities” under the Children of Peace envelope with a focus on Education in Ethnic States and Regions and this mandate was expanded through the EU supported CASE+ program to include support to ethnic minorities not directly affected by conflict. The CASE/ CASE+ program focuses on the humanitarian-development-peace nexus for education targeting conflict affected/ minority population groups. The program engages Indigenous Providers of Education throughout the country through the RISE network to support education service provision, promote cohesion, facilitate harmonisation to sustain education services, reach Out of School Children and promote meaningful dialogue on education reform issues with the Myanmar MOE working towards a coherent and inclusive national education system that ensures Indigenous children’s rights to a relevant quality education are upheld.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

The program works to harmonise standards of operation among the RISE Network of Indigenous Providers of Education. Through evidence-based approaches (OoSC studies, teacher assessments, EGRA/EGMA assessments, EMIS review), the program supplies basic teaching and learning materials, supports the continuous professional development of teachers to strengthen Indigenous teacher competencies, works to find durable solutions to the issue of teacher remuneration (together with EU, World Bank, DFID, Australia, DANIDA), expands education pathways for OOSC children and youth through the Teachers Establishing Education Services (TEES) approach, that was piloted under the ECHO program, promoting localization of teachers and community engagement in education, exploring and piloting expansion of NFE and Vocational training and promoting progressive alignment and complementarity with government education services.

### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

#### **What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

It is also a good example of localisation, where decision-making, power and the bulk of the resources are transferred to local organisations to pursue their vision for an inclusive society in Myanmar. Within the peace process context of Myanmar this is particularly important for local education providers to have the resources needed to sustain services as development is being used as a political tool to expand government control in conflict areas. This program balances support to government through other channels.

The education sector in Myanmar is highly diverse and heavily marred by the country’s complex and long history of conflict: while the Ministry of Education is the largest provider of education services, it does not reach all populations in Myanmar, and it is estimated that over a quarter of education services in Myanmar are provided by either Indigenous providers, the monastic system or

faith-based organisations. Indigenous providers of education include the education departments of Ethnic Armed Groups (EAGs), as well as Indigenous community-based organisations. They provide education services in non-government-controlled areas, as well as in many mixed administration and government-controlled areas where government education services have recently been established but often remain weak and under-resourced. Where government education services exist in conflict and post conflict affected areas, they remain inaccessible for many indigenous children when they lack linguistic and cultural relevance. Indigenous providers therefore fill critical gaps in education provision in Myanmar. However, many children are out of school in the geographical areas they reach.

In the Council of the European Union conclusions on Myanmar/Burma of February 2018, the EU and Member States reconfirmed their strong engagement to support the country's democratic transition, peace and national reconciliation, and inclusive socio-economic development, and reiterated their readiness to continue support to ongoing reforms, specifically in the education sector. In line with this, the EU intends to provide sector budget support to the government to implement its National Education Strategic Plan (2016-2021). In complement to this, to support Myanmar's objective of "leaving no child behind" and to ensure a conflict-sensitive and balanced EU approach to education provision in Myanmar, the EU intends to provide support to Indigenous providers of education to help them improve the quality of their education provision and expand their reach to most marginalised children and youth in conflict and post conflict affected areas, as well as to promote their engagement with the Ministry of Education (MoE) on key educational reforms.

### **What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

The RISE network is key to the local ownership and decision-making in the program.

This network enables technical coordination and harmonisation of approaches, and a platform for advocacy and dialogue with the government.

### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

Continuing restrictions and access to conflict affected populations. Ongoing security concerns and influence that conflict and the peace process can have on outcomes, means that development funding needs to retain some flexibility. This has not been a significant issue as the program has such a large coverage, so disruption is usually very localised and doesn't impact the overall program.

### **What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

Working with multiple stakeholders can have its own challenges, in trying to achieve balance and ownership of the program, also considering the tension between centralisation and decentralisation of work, centralisation enabling better quality control and harmonisation, decentralisation enabling greater empowerment and ownership of the local RISE network partners. Also finding

the balance between bottom up planning and implementation and maintaining coherence and strategic alignment. In the context of political flux, managing relationships and supporting longer term dialogue also is within the program control.

### **Were any lessons learned?**

Localisation does enable greater teacher retention and resilience in education programs in conflict areas.

Commitment of resources into these types of programs does generate interest from other stakeholders and puts pressure on both humanitarian and development programs to be more inclusive, identifying gaps in initiatives that are exclusive and don't take a nexus approach.

# Case Study 11

## Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

The **WeWorld-GVC Foundation** programmatic strategy for the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt), based primarily on the Integrated Protection Programming realised through the **Community Protection Approach (CPA)** has been rolled out in partnership with a multiplicity of partners, depending on the context of implementation.

The **West Bank Protection Consortium**, working comprehensively to address the coercive environment of Palestinian Communities living in Area C, has first employed the CPA on a major scale of intervention contributing to the fine-tuning of the methodology and to its success. The Consortium is composed of 4 We World-GVC partners: NRC, AAH, PUI and ACTED.

In the Northern Governorate of Tubas, WeWorld-GVC is realising this programmatic approach through the LRRD initiative "**Tubas Rural Business Opportunities and social innovation – TURBO**", in partnership with the Tubas Governorate and the Palestinian Business Women Forum. Other partners that participated in the projects' activities and offered their support are: *Legacoop Emilia Romagna*, *Cooperativa di Comunità Melpignano*, *Cooperativa LattEmilia* and *Provincia Autonoma di Bolzano*.

Complementary programs carried out by WeWorld-GVC in the oPt focus on specific sectors of intervention, such as a WASH intervention in partnership with UNICEF to subsidise water trucking for Palestinians in Area C, while enhancing the sustainability of water service delivery and scaling up governance schemes for the equitability of tariffs and the predictability of demand.

WeWorld-GVC has then implemented an initiative in the framework of **UNDP's Community Resilience Development Programme (CRDP)** in Area C of oPt, targeting 3 communities in the last phase of an LRRD integrated approach to assist the transition from relief, allowing such communities to carry out developmental activities.

Finally, since 2015, operational coordination with OCHA and specific Clusters was made effective through different HPF funded projects.

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

The WeWorld-GVC Programmatic Strategy for the oPt points towards the design of humanitarian and development sector specific projects in complementarity to contribute to the creation of a protective environment for local communities. The strategy is based on a multi-sector localised approach of assessment, monitoring, analysis and planning rolled out through the CPA. WeWorld-GVC projects are designed in the framework of a unique set of analysis and planning mechanisms, with multiple donors and partners, shared with national existing coordination mechanism (OCHA, Palestinian Authority led Area C Coordination Office and Governorates).

## **Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study**

The process of implementation of the CPA and the LRRD Programmatic Strategy in the West Bank started in 2014 and it is still ongoing.

## **Donor/Funding Sources:**

The implementation of the CPA, grounding the programmatic strategy of WeWorld-GVC, is based on DG ECHO funds, humanitarian calls for proposals of the Italian Agency for International Cooperation (AICS), OCHA and several EU Member States' humanitarian funding streams. The complementary humanitarian and development initiatives within the LRRD strategy were funded through different funds, coming from UNDP, UNICEF, development calls of proposal of AICS, decentralised Italian cooperation funds in addition to the abovementioned donors.

## **Initiative**

Resources for the implementation of the CPA have been granted through a process of concertation pushed by donors and partners within the framework of the Protection Consortium funded by ECHO and EU Member States. The complementary funding has been the results of donors' initiatives, moved by the interest for a joint measurable framework of work in coordination with other donors.

Aid in Area C is mostly funded through humanitarian streams, given the coercive environment generated by the Israeli permit regime. The nature of the context constrains donors' agenda to revolve around humanitarian interventions that are organised in "silos" of strictly sectorial and short-term responses. This element does not pave the way for the implementation of a Nexus approach. It requires a heavy process of programmatic dialogue and policy from WeWorld-GVC and all active organisations in Area C to increase the flexibility of programs and the complementarity of interventions.

## **Effort**

WeWorld-GVC spent a notable amount of efforts in promoting complementarity among donors and partners. The dialogue with and among donors took a considerable amount of time and efforts to be rendered smoother and the fine-tuning of mechanisms of coordination came along together with projects' results, furthering confidence in the program.

The strong focus that WeWorld-GVC keeps on developing partnerships with local authorities and ensuring communities' ownership, provided a virtuous framework in line with donors' strategies that facilitated the joint commitments of different actors.

An initial commitment among donors to use their own funding mechanisms in a unique programmatic strategy per community would have eased the process. However, efforts in this direction were multiple and pushed by individual agendas.

## What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

To date, it resulted in several projects implemented in complementarity and monitored through a unique multi-sector analysis and planning approach. The ECHO funded *West Bank Protection Consortium* constituted by 5 INGOs thanks to further support of financial mechanisms of 8 EU Member States; AICS humanitarian and development projects, among which an ongoing 3 year LRRD initiative (TURBO); the Response and Transitional Development Plan for Tubas developed by WeWorld-GVC in the framework of a UNDP Resilience program; UNICEF 4 year Water availability, access and management project; and several OCHA HPF interventions in different sectors.

In addition, the relevance of the case study emerges from the coherence between core components of its programmatic strategy and key aspects agreed by recent elaborations concerning the operationalisation of the HDN. WeWorld-GVC best practices can thus offer meaningful exemplification of how to do the Nexus in practice. Below some examples.

The **Tubas Rural development and Business Opportunities** (TURBO) is a LRRD initiative funded by the Italian Agency for International Cooperation to support 19 rural Palestinian communities within the Area C of the Governorate of Tubas. The initiative offsets humanitarian actions, under ECHO and other EU MS funds. The initiative foresees activities focused on developing opportunities for the rural communities around the Governorate, specifically concerning social management of service provision, women economic empowerment and the advancement of good governance.

TURBO is a project covering a 3 year LRRD intervention based on WeWorld-GVC contiguuum approach, meant to deliver in complementarity short-term humanitarian assistance together with developmental activities having medium and long-term scope. The project adopts WeWorld-GVC's Community Protection Approach (CPA) as an entry point to provide targeted communities with a Protection Vulnerability Index (PVI) and a Protection Response Plan (PRP).

The PVI offers a vast amount of multi-sector data gathered through context specific and participatory methods and is the corner stone of the evidence-based approach of the CPA. It informs the drafting of action plans while also serving as a monitoring tool, hosting the baselines values for communities' vulnerabilities, protection risks and measurements of their Dignity and Safety. The data is collected on a yearly basis and provides trends on the situation of communities, capturing the effects of external factors, as well as of the different support programmes provided to communities.

The Index is available to OCHA, Palestinian Authority and major donors and actors for coordination efforts, as it can be consulted to extract localised information, to visualise data for evidence-based advocacy and to inform complementary action by other stakeholders. The Protection Analysis carried out in this phase of the CPA is informed on a yearly basis by adaptive approaches in line with an Exit Strategy on the basis of the capacity of the

community to undergo a transition from the provision of material assistance. After 4 years of implementation, several communities are in the phase of transition to authorities' and developmental oriented support.

On the other hand, the PRPs translate the findings of the combined quantitative and qualitative participatory analysis into a set of activities that address comprehensively both the immediate needs of communities and the root causes of their vulnerabilities. The plans elaborate a comprehensive strategy of prevention, mitigation and response in 14 sectors through actions that capitalise existing local capacities, with the aim to limit the reliance on substitutive actions and avoid dependency from aid.

The PRPs are revised yearly to adjust to the changes in the needs and vulnerabilities of the community occurred during project implementations and taking into consideration the initiatives taken by local authorities and other stakeholders. In fact, PRPs represent the roadmap for the organised engagement of different actors through complementary and coordinated programmes, reflecting not only the activities of a single organisation, but outlining a set of actions to address the coercive environment in a specific community.

In practice, building on the PRPs, an empowered community is able to individuate potential implementing actors on the basis of their comparative advantage and advocate for the realisation of development initiatives. PRPs are intended to deliver on the HDN propositions on both a financial and operational level, representing a comprehensive programmatic framework that can be referenced to by local institutions, INGOs and donors as a unified planning modality in partnership with communities. They do not require for big changes in the models of funding mechanisms, but rely directly on the different funding mechanisms attracted by a multiplicity of implementing actors.

For instance, UNDP informed its 3 years strategy in the Governorate on the basis of activities individuated in the PRPs, to work then in complementarity with TURBO. Similarly, UNICEF WASH activities, and specifically the water management system for drinkable water implemented in partnership with WeWorld-GVC, aligns to the same operational framework.

Furthermore, the Plans developed through the CPA are currently being embedded by local authorities in the prioritisation of actions and strategic planning, both at the Governorate level, as in Tubas, and at the level of ACCO for Area C long-term programming.

The programmatic strategy conveyed through the CPA goes beyond the simple implementation of a range of activities with diverse scope along the humanitarian-development spectrum. By committing to the delivery of collective outcomes, WeWorld-GVC enables community-driven coordination among institutional and humanitarian stakeholders to achieve complementarity, capitalising on the impact that a multi-sector and LRRD approach can have on generating sustainable solutions and tackling the root-causes of communities' vulnerabilities.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

GVC has designed an integrated strategy to define in the occupied Palestinian territories an approach to Link Relief, Rehabilitation and Development in Area C. The intention of this strategic approach was to fill the gaps stemming from the different humanitarian and development interventions. Since then, GVC has been adopting an LRRD programmatic approach to all its interventions using the context-based analysis of communities provided by the CPA and the analysis of supplementary sectorial need assessments. The project TURBO is a further step to capitalise the methodological approach, introducing the concept of transitional development for local communities. It is being executed in coordination with the North West Bank Governorate of Tubas and the Palestinian Authority's Area C Coordination Office and aligning with the institutional development plan of the Governorate of Tubas. The CPA represented the entry point of the analytical approach considering that the communities are within an occupied territory; notwithstanding the violations of IHL and IHRL are main pushing factor for the hindered resilience, de-development, deprivation and lack of development opportunities, GVC introduced developmental analysis at the assessment stage. The CPA is therefore used as the basis on which developmental and humanitarian projects are realised, to make sure that the initiatives deliver Protection and holds Safety and Dignity of communities as paramount values, while tackling the root causes of their vulnerabilities.

On this ground, the TURBO project for example delivers a number of practical LRRD activities: (i) the institutionalisation of an Early Warning System for IHL and IHRL violations through the creation of a Protection Department in the Governorate of Tubas (ii) the scaling up of governance schemes for humanitarian assets in order to ensure the sustainability of various programs in the Governorate (iii) the construction of productive infrastructure to serve groups of communities and foster their connectivity (iv) the launching of innovative cooperatives' models to provide services to community members.

### **Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

WeWorld-GVC has developed in the framework of a UNDP Community Resilience Development Program, a comprehensive **Response and Transitional Development Plan [RTDP]** for 19 communities of the Governorate of Tubas. The RTDP offers a wide spectrum of short term to long-term responsive, remedial and environment building actions designing a model of holistic response focused on providing aid while shifting from predominantly emergency actions to more long-term development policies. It features a strategic Resilience analysis and action plan, detailed mappings of communities' vulnerabilities and a multi-sectorial transitional development response for each community. The RTDP provides a basis for strategic ways forward, guiding the complementarity of actions delivered by different NGOs, INGOs and institutional actors under the framework of the UNDP program.

In terms of effectiveness and efficiency, the proposed PRPs, embedded into the existing Palestinian institutional planning documents, aim at proposing an already framed and structured set of interventions to be undertaken in the related area. This is likely considerably decreasing the overlap of different



initiatives/projects, promoting a more effective impact of actions on the ground as well as increasing process efficiency and reducing transactions costs.

In the context of the CPA, WeWorld-GVC created an **Online Platform** on which all of the information gathered through the process of analysis are uploaded, featuring visualisations of the level of vulnerabilities, protection risks and Dignity and Safety Indexes, as well as digitalised risks and resources maps and geographical data, all of which can be broken down community per community, sector per sector to the last indicator. The Platform has been designed specifically to support the implementation of complementary action by different actors, to inform programming and provide a holistic data-strong monitoring tool.

WeWorld-GVC has also committed to the elaboration of a set of **Nexus Guiding Principles** for the operationalisation of the Nexus framework in its action. The document draws on the lesson learned collected through WeWorld-GVC's experience with CPA and it translates the main propositions of the Nexus in practical guidelines directing the inclusion of a Nexus rationale in planning of projects and interventions in the field.

Finally, to further elaborate on its good practices, WeWorld-GVC plans to draft a comprehensive **Nexus Toolkit**, to guide the action of local and international actors as well as informing the policy of international donors when intervening in protracted crisis. The toolkit will mean to offer a contribution to the operationalisation and mainstreaming of the Nexus through guiding principles, best practices and SOPs starting from the former elaboration WeWorld-GVC made on its programmatic approach to LRRD in West Bank Area C published in 2017. The toolkit will be elaborated in partnership with the AICS of Jerusalem.

During 2018, the whole CPA methodology has been reviewed and refined on the basis of additional pilots implemented in Lebanon, Libya and Gaza and thanks to the lessons learned and external studies undertaken in the oPt. This was possible thanks to a specific Task Force composed of 12 staff, which has been working in collaboration with different Universities and experts. Currently the refined CPA is at the basis of an ECHO Consortium in Lebanon, and under programmatic design in different countries of Central America, Latin America and Africa.

#### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The case study presents consistent advancements in the components of Coordination, Complementarity and Flexibility, delivering a programmatic response that heavily draws on the propositions of the Nexus.

The delivery of a multi-sector Context Analysis allowed to embrace a truly multi-stakeholder approach. In fact, the outcomes of the CPA, once shared with an

array of institutional and aid actors, succeeded in informing the planning of local authorities and humanitarian and development organisations, boosting the complementarity achievable with other stakeholders' programs and projects.

Furthermore, it brought development-oriented actions into the humanitarian stream of activities. By embedding a focus on tackling long-term vulnerabilities of target communities, the typology of humanitarian activities could partially move from purely substitutive actions (e.g. providing drinking water) to activities enabling more sustainable solutions (e.g. water schemes). This favoured the overcoming of the limits of a silos-organised response and broke the sector orientation in targeting community needs, overcoming the constraints due to the available sector-specific funding mechanisms that generally only allows for yearly collection of data and cyclical implementation of humanitarian activities.

Different Member States and UN donors are now provided with a unique and comprehensive instrument for multi-sector monitoring that keeps track of the evolution of the situation in communities, allowing for the adaptation of ongoing programs. The complementarity of projects displays positive results as advancements in different sectors of implementation reinforce each other. For example, in the communities of Tubas, ECHO is funding the creation of mechanisms of monitoring, early warning and legal support against violations of IHL and IHRL, while thanks to the Italian Government development fund, WeWorld-GVC supported the creation of a Protection department at the Governorate level to monitor violations in coordination with OHCHR and OCHA. The two projects complement and reinforce each other as communities have now an institutional counterpart to which to refer their efforts in addressing their protection problems.

The efforts for increased Coordination went together with a strong stance for localisation. In fact, thanks to the participatory and Community Empowering process of the CPA, WeWorld-GVC managed to change the nature of community engagement, which is now two-way and operational, i.e. communities propose complementary actions and solutions to address their protection risks that are included in strategic planning and are supported by WeWorld-GVC. This, while siding with local authorities and supporting their role as duty bearers by facilitating closer engagement with target communities, notwithstanding the context of widespread IHL violations that vastly limits their capacities of action.

Overall, the program helped provide more relief and support, notwithstanding the yearly shrinking country budget, as specific activities could be assimilated in the planning and implementation of ministries or local authorities. While other activities could benefit from the increasing capacities of communities to undertake specific tasks, avoiding the provision of substitutive activities on the part of aid organisations.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

### **Enabling Factors**

- Implementing the CPA in a Consortium, the WBPC, with NRC, AAH, PUI and ACTED, supported by ECHO and several EU Member States. Working in close partnership generated a more effective buy-in in the context, expanding the collection of lessons learned and accelerating the delivery of better results.
- The design of joint and shareable outcomes. The whole system of analysis, planning and monitoring has been designed from its inception to be a long-term and holistic one, being it multi-sector and not linked to any specific project.
- The good positioning WeWorld-GVC started thanks to its longstanding efforts in Palestine in key sectors of intervention and the participation in the related coordination mechanisms, reinforced by the good relations enjoyed with key players, such as OCHA, UNDP and UNICEF.

### **Disabling Factors**

- The disabling factors concerning this case study vastly depend on the context of delivery of aid in the Area C of the oPt. Specifically, the hardships of providing long-term solutions and developmental work in areas under the administrative control imposed by the occupying power represent an omnipresent and high level risk factor.
- Even though the methodology offers alternative solutions to achieve complementarity, the general lack of multi-year funding programmes devoted to specific sectors hampers the achievement of longer timeframes of intervention and flexibility.

### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

#### **Risks**

- The strong focus that the methodology imposes on structural protection analysis and on the community-oriented planning elevated the risk of oversight with respect to urgent individual cases.
- The protection of humanitarian workers is a constant risk that increases considerably when commitments are devoted towards developmental work, as it heightens the risks of reckoning with the occupying power in a hostile way.
- The efforts in building the capacity of local authorities to take more action in support of communities certainly have positive reflections in terms of ownership, localisation and the principle "reinforce and not substitute", especially when employing a rights-based approach. Nonetheless, in the context of Palestine this process increases the risk of reducing the pressure over the occupying power to end IHL violations.

#### **Challenges**

Through the implementation of the CPA and the implementation of activities, WeWorld-GVC identified a number of opportunities for the further development of the methodology that pose active challenges to the organisation. These challenges concern:

- The lack of practical way to capitalise on the impact that the CPA has on community empowerment.

- The opportunity to integrate specific analysis addressing economic development potential to further operationalise an approach aiming at long-term well-being.
- Inherent difficulties have been reported concerning the evaluation of impact and results achieved through advocacy activities. WeWorld-GVC is considering the development of appropriate tools with this aim.
- The planning of transitioning strategies to devolve ownership, control of planning and monitoring functions to the communities has been difficult to develop and fully integrate within the methodology.
- Generating joint dialogue between humanitarian and developmental donors and actors is often limited by their political positions and individual program strategies.

### What could have been done better or what went wrong?

In the initial years of implementation of the CPA, energy was spent on the methodological aspects of the approach to analysis which guides the strategy. This may have diverted the attention from identifying efficient and fruitful ways to use the analyses, such as fostering better dialogue and cooperation. In this sense, the dialogue with partners could have been geared on finding better ways to address jointly the response. Instead, the debate has often been slowed down and hampered by elements of competition.

The channels of dialogue between internal departments in WeWorld-GVC following humanitarian and developmental projects should have been structured appropriately since the beginning. In reality, appropriate solutions concerning the organisational structure came on the way, as a result of grounding operational planning on joint multi-sector analysis.

### Were any lessons learned?

Thanks to the experience matured through the fulfilment of its programmatic approach in the oPt, WeWorld-GVC could collect a number of lesson learned highlighting the principles of action that are best to include in the planning and implementation of interventions in order to achieve further coherence with the Nexus framework. Some examples are:

- The **Joint Context Analysis** should be a joint outcome first of all thanks to the partnership with the community itself. The identification of communities' vulnerabilities, threats, capacities and coping strategies starts from an understanding of the context that is built together with the members of the community, individuating specific opportunities for their participation that allow the gathering of both quantitative and qualitative data through their narrated perspectives concerning the vulnerabilities and protection issues they experience, ensuring the ownership and localisation of the analysis.
- In order to realise in an effective and efficient way the call for **Collective Outcomes** raised by OCHA's New Way of Working, operational plans must be tailored on the single community and

holistically include activities to tackle multi-sector humanitarian needs, protection risks and developmental instances, to stress the importance of a holistic and complementary approach to the uprooting of people's vulnerabilities. The plans should be evidence-based, have expected impact that are measurable with data and feature systems of benchmarks and progress tracking. Furthermore, the way the plans are designed should pave the way for a fruitful process of sharing that can be functional to foster coordination with humanitarian and developmental actors and achieve multi-stakeholder complementarity.

- Striving for an intervention that is predictable for the target community is an important principle to embed in programming. Clear and coherent plans should be designed in concertation with the local community and feature a comprehensive **Exit Strategy**, scheduling the phasing out from material assistance, the transfer of key skills and knowledge to ensure the sustainability of programs and the transition of the responsibilities of support to duty bearers. In this way, the process of empowerment and strengthening of capacities is rendered a constant priority and falling into aid dependency is more easily avoided.

# Case Study 12

## Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors

Plan International (PI), West Africa and Central Africa Hub, Lake Chad Programme Unit, Country Offices in Cameroon, Niger and Nigeria.

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

**The Regional Lake Chad Programme (LCP)** is a joint initiative from Plan International's Country Offices (COs) in Cameroon, Niger and Nigeria, as well as Plan International's West and Central Africa Hub. It was established to address the crisis in the Lake Chad Basin through an integrated and regional programme approach.

Taking into account the protracted nature of the crisis, Plan International developed a regional Lake Chad Programme Strategy (2018 - 2023) that outlines the organisation's bold ambition to transform the life of girls and their families in the Lake Chad Region. It moves beyond a humanitarian vision towards a full spectrum programme, working at the nexus of humanitarian and development efforts to promote children's rights and gender equality. This approach recognises the importance of meeting immediate humanitarian needs while tackling the developmental deficit of the region which is both a contributor to and an outcome of the crisis. In addition, it is crucial to promote social cohesion, girls' rights and gender equality which are central issues in the region and at the heart of this strategy. Moreover, building the resilience of girls and their communities is vital to ensure they are able to cope with and adapt to the significant shocks and stresses they face currently and may face in future.

## Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

**Ongoing** – a new Lake Chad Programme Strategy is being implemented from 2018 – 2022. It builds on extensive experience that started first in Cameroon and Niger in 2014, and the development of the first joint programme vision in May 2016.

## Donor/Funding Sources

To date, more than 24 international donors (ECHO, DEVCO, GFFO, Sida, Irish Aid, DfID, etc) have contributed to financing the LCP approach and are increasingly willing to improve<sup>2</sup> the flexibility of their funding instruments to support the implementation of the LCP.

## What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

---

<sup>2</sup> For instance, the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) agreed to pilot the financing of a three-year and multi-country program-based intervention in the LCB, thus increasing the predictability of funding, as well as the flexibility to adapt to the changing needs on the ground over the course of the intervention. Furthermore, the intervention logic refers directly to the LCP framework and how the humanitarian targets under the respective joint nexus outcomes contribute to achieving the joint SPOs and ultimately contribute to the overall programme goal.

The starting point for the development of the full spectrum strategy was a joint context analysis between humanitarian and development teams in the LCB, which allowed to identify (next to the humanitarian needs) those root causes and structural drivers of the crisis, which are relevant to PI's mandate and which can be addressed through PI's work. This analysis resulted in the formulation of collective outcomes, incorporating the functional areas of humanitarian, development and social cohesion actions<sup>3</sup>, based on PI's understanding that a lasting change for the affected people living in the LCB can only be achieved through simultaneous engagement and shared responsibility of the three functional areas.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

PI's implementation adapted an area-based approach, based on the understanding that communities have humanitarian, development and social needs simultaneously. However most of the time one of them is predominant and therefore requires that the respective functional area takes the lead in terms of programming.

The LCP's full spectrum programme structure provides PI and its partners and donors with a framework of collaboration, which allows each of them to work according to their own core mandate without losing their identity. Instead of mixing humanitarian and development projects with their different objectives, guiding principles, the coordinated programme approach with collective outcomes for each programmatic sector allows to continue the implementation of straight-forward and immediate lifesaving projects, while at the same time engaging with longer-term sustainable development projects, to enhance reconstruction and prevent to neglect underlying root causes from further fuelling the crisis.

### **Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

Strategy document: Online on ReliefWeb and humanitarianresponse.info [\[link\]](#)

### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

#### **What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

As many donors, governments etc. are still struggling to understand and operationalise the nexus, PI developed a Strategy with respective framework which allows donors, etc to contribute to a regional nexus programme at scale, without losing their "identity". As PI has access to several donors (both on the humanitarian and development as well on the stabilisation/peace side), it is in a position to integrate each specific project into the overall programme, thus implementing a nexus programme at scale. Each component fills in the gaps and needs that one cannot be covered due to its mandate - hence avoiding

---

<sup>3</sup> As there are many ongoing debates on the triple nexus and especially the definition of "peace", in this specific programme, the third component of the nexus "peacebuilding" is herein considered under social cohesion actions at community level to enhance peace and stability.

any blurring of lines, while ensuring a sustainable impact through an integrated response that addresses root causes of the crisis.

### **What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Dedicated Programme Unit: The establishment and work of the Lake Chad Programme Unit of PI has proven to be an essential element in terms of a) designing, monitoring, and coordinating the full programme spectrum approach for and within PI, and b) to engage with other stakeholders in the LCB crisis (donors, clusters, NGO Fora, LCB conferences, media/press) and inform them about the unique programme model. The value of a separate and coordinating programme team to lead on the collective planning and programme development cannot be overrated.

### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

- The concept behind the triple nexus still remains unclear to many professionals in the humanitarian and development sector (e.g. the confusion and mix-up with the LRRD approach) - thus hindering its application. The manifold interpretations used by different actors are one specific obstacle blocking colleagues to focus on the key concept/idea behind the nexus approach. Another one is the perception of a humanitarian-driven agenda, which is based on the fact that the nexus is often referred to as an approach for protracted "crisis" and moreover has been put on the agenda of the international community through the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. As a result, it is often observed that the development colleagues do not participate pro-actively or even take programmatic ownership.
- The triple nexus remains as well much questioned on the last component "peacebuilding", fearing it could blur the lines and affect the neutrality, impartiality and perception of humanitarian actors. Many doubts are thus raised by donors and NGOs on the definition of peace, and refrain to operationally engage in this approach. While some consider "peace" as activities at state level only, others may consider "peace" as activities implemented at community level (such as social cohesion actions for instance). However, one may consider that there is a link between state-level and community-level peacebuilding activities, and is very much context depended.
- A full spectrum/nexus approach requires a high flexibility in terms of programming, being able to adapt intervention approaches and slowing down programme implementation if needed, as well as strong risk management capacity and a functioning M&E and feedback mechanisms, and conflict sensitivity as building blocks.
- The divide between the humanitarian and the development domains is still very strong and often slowing down the process of unified programming through the nexus approach. It is often engrained in the organisational structures of key actors, where staff sometimes display a certain suspicion around the motives and approaches of the respective other functional area, or simply label the triple nexus as just another buzz-



term which will pass by and thus undermining its importance and potential positive impact for the affected people.

- Although funding instruments at large scale, like the European Trust Funds, which, in general, support and complement the nexus idea, are appreciated by the humanitarian and development actors, they are extremely competitive, very complex (considering the pre-conditions for applicants) and thus often difficult to access for NGOs. At the same time, donors who are funding these large grants, reduce resources for their more regular NGO funding instruments designed for NGOs - especially in the development sector, hence making it more difficult for NGOs to realise the nexus idea beyond project level.
- Last, but not least, not many professionals, especially those in leadership/management positions, possess work experience in both programme areas, resulting in limited understanding of the distinct programme cultures (in planning, guiding principles, project duration etc.) and, therefore, further hindering the implementation of the triple nexus within organisations and agencies, as well as within donor institutions.

### **What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

As the strategy has recently been launched and its implementation ongoing, an integrated approach to Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning (MERL) has been developed to ensure the effectiveness of the programme and more easily identify points for improvement or any issues that could arise during the implementation. A system is designed to serve as database to record data collected on any output indicator and the related beneficiaries. A learning agenda outlining the scope, objectives, expected outcomes and the processes of learning will be monitored and reported on. The active participation of the community members, especially children and adolescent girls, to the MER is promoted in conjunction with effective feedback and complaints mechanisms.

### **Were any lessons learned?**

It is paramount to engage with donors during the development of such a programme strategy. Many donors told PI, that they like the idea but that they weren't able to fund it, if they cannot find their identity within the strategy, e.g. having collective outcomes wouldn't allow them to fund the programme as their funding is either related to humanitarian work or development. In order to resolve this issue, PI included so called specific targets for each of the functional areas (humanitarian, development and social cohesion) which contribute to the achievement of the collective outcome.

Within Plan International they discussed the peace pillar of the triple nexus and what it means for the organisation. Considering its community-based and gender transformative approaches, the peace pillar consists – within PI operations, in the promotion of social cohesion at community level, while transforming social norms, attitudes and behaviours by analysing and challenging structural and systemic gender inequality and girls' rights issues that are factors reinforcing instability and drivers of the crisis. Those two

interlinked approaches enable a sustainable impact and avoid doing more harm than good by indirectly further fuelling the crisis.

## Case Study 13

### Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

A - **Save the Children Italy/International – Malawi Country Office**, in consortium with Oxfam and Goal and in partnership with Governmental stakeholders

B - Unit Purpose, in consortium with **Save the Children Italy/International – Malawi Country Office** and Concern Worldwide and in partnership with Governmental stakeholders

### Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach (

A (**ECHO**) - Malawi - **PREPARE**: "Social PRotection and E-PAYment for inclusive cash REsponse"

B (**DEVCO**) - Malawi - **FUTURE** (Food and NUTrition for Resilience)

### Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

A- **Ongoing** (August 2018-January 2020)

B- **Ongoing** (November 2017-November 2020)

### Donor/Funding Sources

A - 300.000 EUR budget funded by the EU – DG ECHO under **HIP 2018 for Southern Africa and Indian Ocean**, building on previous larger grants awarded as humanitarian response to El Nino. Shrinking funding for the region entailed a massive budget reduction compared to what initially proposed in the application, thus requiring extra effort to reshape the proposal according to ECHO feedback.

B – 1.169.000 EUR budget funded by the EU – DG DEVCO under the **Development Cooperation Instrument funding (Pro-Resilience Action programme)**, through direct granting to a pre-identified consortium.

### What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

Upon ECHO request, and in line with Save the Children growing focus on the continuum between Humanitarian and Development work, the ECHO intervention was synergised with the already ongoing FUTURE project, funded by DG DEVCO.

**FUTURE delivers a comprehensive package of interventions designed to break the cycle of food and nutrition insecurity in Malawi**, creating direct synergies with the Government's National Social Support Programme (NSSP) and linkages with resilience-building initiatives, approaches and players. The project targets 13,396 **Social Cash Transfer Programme (SCTP) beneficiaries** in Mulanje,

5,909 in Nsanje and 16,156 in Zomba to be more resilient to food and climate change shocks (monthly SCT using **manual payment**).

**ECHO Prepare** provides a **vertical top up** during the lean season to 2,000 Social Cash Transfer beneficiaries in Zomba districts (**same communities as FUTURE**) by using an innovative **e-payment** system.

**The ECHO action is thus implemented within the FUTURE framework**, providing added value in terms of technological solutions for enhanced delivery of social protection and resilience and reinforcing national level learning on Shock Responsive Social Protection.

**Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

### **A – ECHO**

The project aims at strengthening Preparedness of vulnerable households in Malawi to multi hazards for response and early action and in particular:

- Address cash preparedness for early response to address rapid vertical and Horizontal scale up
- Multipurpose Cash transfers and Nutrition Sensitive interventions to meet human needs

Two-pronged approach:

- Testing an e-payment system to provide evidence of effective mechanisms for Shock Responsive Social Protection by supporting households (Pregnant and lactating women and children under 5) through top – ups equivalent to Minimum Expenditure Budget.
- Advocate for cash preparedness for humanitarian response working with multiple stakeholders at national level (including private sector) to ensure that systemic challenges to operational efficiency and scale up of cash transfer programs will be adequately addressed.

### **B – DEVCO**

The project seeks to address the existing food and nutrition security challenges while targeting the most vulnerable households in Malawi. This includes promoting actions that improve the capacity of households to prepare for, withstand and bounce back during and after shocks (e.g. nutrition strengthening initiatives, Agricultural inputs supply, Soil and water conservation, VSL schemes promotion, disaster risk and climate change education, social cash transfer top-ups for fully labour constrained households). Rural women and girls are deliberately supported in recognition of their additional, systemic vulnerabilities; and women and men are engaged in dialogue together around shifting gender norms around decision-making power and social status.

**Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

- Focus on strengthening the capacity of the existing social assistance programme to timely absorb the humanitarian caseload by expanding vertically and or horizontally
- Developing a risk informed intervention based on pre-disaster baseline market assessment and understanding the expected scale of need per hazard type, thus identifying suitable CTP delivery mechanism and service providers;
- Selecting and promoting engagement of suitable service providers and vendors;
- Providing households with resilience-focused solutions, in a context where recurrent climatic shocks combine with long term development needs;
- Strong component of coordination with local actors from the local authorities, private sector and civil society;
- Cash transfer as preferred strategy for households' resilience enhancement (alignment with the Grand Bargain commitment);
- Advocacy component included in project design and pushing for the adoption of minimum expenditure basket in calculating the cash transfer value to respond to the priority needs of recipients;
- Promoting learning and mainstreaming of CTP in national contingency and response plans.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

- The fact that the national social protection system is invested in shock responsiveness to expand in response to large-scale shocks to meet the emergency needs of the population as well as to build long-term resilience to repeated, predictable and long-term shocks, and to do so by addressing people's chronic vulnerability as opposed to setting up ad hoc humanitarian responses.
- The existence of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms such as the Cash Working Group
- The readiness of humanitarian actors to coordinate and deliver cash-based assistance

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

- Accurate data collection and management of humanitarian caseload
- System capability to expand and cover the humanitarian caseloads
- Making financial resources immediately available to release for response

# Case Study 14

## Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

Norwegian Refugee Council

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

NRC Somalia. A combination of crisis modifier and adaptive programming.

## Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

2017 2018

## Donor/Funding Sources

DFID, DEVCO and ECHO at NRC initiative.  
It took two weeks. Donor was very responsive

## What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

This is a true humanitarian-development nexus approach. The primary project was not designed as humanitarian but multiyear development. Despite the funds being received from the donors' development arms, we were able to make modifications and make additional top up requests to meet urgent pre-emergency crisis modification needs while adapting the program to respond to emerging urgent needs at the time. Funds were shifted away from infrastructure works to cash to meet urgent food needs.

## Short description of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

The Country Office's main objective is to support vulnerable displacement affected populations with emergency support including durable solutions. All programs are area based and integrated in nature, five core competencies<sup>4</sup>/sectors are implemented concurrently and to the same populations groups. Protection is mainstreamed in all areas.

## Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:

### What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?

- Flexibility and quick action in making modifications.
- Donors fast response to request to changes

---

<sup>4</sup> NRC has developed expertise in six sectors, which it refers to as core competencies: Camp management, Education, Information, counselling and legal assistance (ICLA), Livelihoods and food security, Shelter and settlements, Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) promotion. See: [NRC's programme policy](#).

- A good understanding by staff on when and how to propose changes. Staff's good understanding of the context was also very useful.
- Longstanding partnerships with all actors that enable unhindered quick action and realignments.
- Program design that gives room to flexibility.

**What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

One key enabling element was the good relationships / Partnerships at project location level.

**What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

The most prominent risk was that of not being able to achieve the original objective and/or key result of the project due to changes.

**What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

Nothing went wrong, however room for improvement of in-depth assessments exists

**Were any lessons learned?**

- Ability to accommodate both humanitarian and development work within the same population groups is dependent on good assessments and program design flexibility.
- Logistics and procurement systems should be sensitive to adaptations to enable timely adjustments.
- Adequate staff capacity of humanitarian-development work is essential for success.

# Case Study 15

## Name of Organisation/Partner/Engagement with other actors

The Durable Peace Programme is an EU-funded consortium operating in Kachin and Northern Shan in Myanmar.

The development and structure of the consortium was locally led with a collection of nine local and national organizations – called the Joint Strategy Team (JST) – who requested Oxfam to join them, rather than the other way around. Oxfam currently leads the consortium and works closely with a Steering Committee as well as JST member organizations.

Through the DPP's work to date, twenty-seven organizations, from small-scale community development associations to those with influence in the national peace process and development agenda, have been supported to work together across these thematic areas with the shared aim of building a more inclusive and durable peace.

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

### Durable Peace Programme in Myanmar

The first phase of the programme, initiated in 2015, aimed to support greater community participation and influence in the peace process. The second phase, currently being implemented, aims to support the resilience of conflict-affected communities and displaced people, including through support for income generation, addressing gender-based violence, building social cohesion and strengthening effective peacebuilding.

## Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

The case study covers the period between 2015–2018.

## Donor/Funding Sources

The 2015–2018 Durable Peace Programme (DPP) was funded by the EU for a total of €7m. The success of phase one has led to a further €12m, 3.5-year phase two, with the programme expanding into northern Shan state.

## What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?

### 1) Integrated context analysis addressing hum-dev-peace challenges in a holistic way

Ongoing displacement has led to tensions between displaced people and host communities, meaning that **local peacebuilding** activities are essential. **Humanitarian response also** remains central as the armed conflict continues, but the complex context and **protracted nature of the crisis means longer-term thinking is needed**. Furthermore, **the national-level issues related to poverty, inequality, shrinking civil society space and the role of the state in the conflict also shape the dynamics of risk and vulnerability for communities**.



## **2) Drawing expertise from different organisations/background**

The consortium itself is comprised of four national organisations and three international organisations – each contributing their own area of expertise. KMSS and KBC, two consortium members, run many of the IDP camps in Kachin, for instance, which enables close partnership with communities DPP is focused on supporting. Nyein Foundation is one of the leading organisations on peace-building in Myanmar and has knowledge and expertise both at the community level, as well as influencing the national peace process. Metta Development Foundation currently chairs the Joint Strategy Team (JST - an influential grouping of local organisations with a humanitarian mandate in Kachin) and is strong across the Nexus programmatic area. SWISSAID brings their expertise on livelihoods, and Trócaire has been very strong on gender. Oxfam coordinating consortium efforts, including facilitating consortium wide-learning, while also managing sub-grants to several local organisations.

Furthermore, through the work of the consortium, twenty-seven organizations, from small-scale community development associations to those with influence in the national peace process and development agenda, have been supported to work together across these thematic areas towards the shared goal of building a more inclusive and durable peace.

Relationships between all consortium members have become much stronger as a result of a thorough sustainability process, while a focus on learning from the mid-term review has also reinforced the programmatic feel of the project. Relationships, effectiveness and efficiency have solidified through: the support provided by Oxfam as coordinator, the in-depth and productive interaction provided through the six-weekly PMC meetings and the guidance from the quarterly Steering Committee meetings. This positive atmosphere is based on open and regular communication, trust and proactively seeking collaboration. Tangible results include excellent consortium-wide collaboration on DPP's endline processes, risk management and conflict analyses, increased work with authorities, diversification of livelihoods, the constructive sustainability process and timely joint advocacy efforts and products. The increased collaboration, as well as the ability to amend the contract in a responsive and timely way has resulted in improved quality and appropriateness of activities as well as innovative ideas with regards to how DPP can build on the learning and gains over the past three years, to develop more detailed and tailored plans for the years to come.

Positive relationships are also based on the extensive history of consortium members' previous collaboration. Oxfam, SwissAid and Trócaire all have long-standing relationships and partnerships with consortium members, including support for and collaboration with the JST.

## **3) Adapting how we deliver programme**

Working across disciplines and finding common ground in order to meet the needs of the most vulnerable people will require both expanding technical knowledge and an increased emphasis on softer skills. A nexus approach requires implementers to step out of their comfort zone and work across different disciplines. In the case of Myanmar, Oxfam has primarily played a

support and contract management function – supporting capacity development, catalysing joint advocacy, facilitating learning and offering technical support on strategy while strengthening cross-cutting issues like conflict sensitivity.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

In its first phase, the Durable Peace Programme (DPP) worked within camp and host communities, and aimed to support greater community participation and influence in peace processes; to better link relief, rehabilitation and development by supporting improved education and livelihoods outcomes; and to support local authorities and community structures to be more receptive to social cohesion and development needs.

In the second phase, the DPP will continue to support the resilience of conflict-affected communities and displaced people (including through their potential return or resettlement). It will support income generation, contribute to improved social cohesion and more effective peacebuilding, and take action to empower women and reduce the impacts of increasingly reported GBV.

### **Any further, more detailed information that is available:**

The main successes so far, include:

- **Greater knowledge and awareness of peace processes.** The DPP has been instrumental in raising awareness of and knowledge of the peace processes for conflict-affected women and men, through workshops, mass meetings and the monthly IDP newsletters; a printed newsletter handed out within IDP camps which received very positive feedback
- **Increased capacity and opportunity for dispute resolution.** Training and capacity building workshops on reconciliation and conflict resolution helped expose DPP's communities to peaceful means of dispute resolution
- **Strengthened social cohesion and conflict trauma healed.** The DPP trained trauma healers and caregivers; 95% of whom were actively providing services by the end of the Action. DPP beneficiaries cited that an appreciation of the culture of peace has facilitated a change in mindsets and enhanced their understanding of, and respect for, other ethnic groups.
- **Incomes generated and livelihood options increased.** 90% of the DPP's livelihood participants implemented new livelihood skills and 95% indicated that these livelihood opportunities were an improvement from before. However, the final evaluation notes that these extra incomes were not sufficient for people to note an actual increase in their economic situation due to the worsening overall context; there was a significant drop in incomes for IDPs in KCAs.
- **Increased government engagement through advocacy.** There are clear examples of how direct advocacy with authorities at different levels positively impacted the situation of IDPs. This was complemented by higher-level advocacy initiatives, such as the Joint Strategy Team's (JST) engagement with national authorities and The Action's research agenda. DPP baseline and endline reports were used across multiple

advocacy platforms to illustrate the situation of IDPs in Kachin, and two DPP research publications gained wide national and international readership and were referred to by various organisations advocating for IDP rights (Displaced and Dispossessed and Life on Hold). Life on Hold in particular amplified the voices of female IDPs to audiences beyond Kachin State, including national authorities.

#### **Further Information Related to the Case Study to feed into the broader report:**

#### **What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

The emphasis on national and local capacities has been key to achieving change across the three pillars of the nexus, and the increased voice and power of local people in interventions has helped to build more sustainable change.

The participation of a large number of local actors, working from a community-based perspective on peacebuilding with a clear, inclusive and common vision of what the peace pillar is, has been critical to addressing root causes of conflict and promoting positive peace.

The main element of success has been the quality of the local partners, who are very strong and committed to achieving peace and sustainable development in Kachin (and now also northern Shan state). Not only are they strong organisationally, but also programmatically across the Nexus. It certainly helps that all the consortium members have long experience working in humanitarian contexts, either nationally or internationally. This enables the organisations to also work on developmental components with a full understanding of the context. Coordination between the consortium members has also been key. Although improvements can be made in cross-consortium learning and information sharing, the Steering Committee (once a quarter) and the Project Management Committee (one every six weeks) met very often – creating personal bonds between top management staff, as well as programme level staff. Throughout the programme there was relatively little turnover which also aided trust between the organisations.

#### **What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

Given the interests of different internal and external stakeholders, there is a tension in balancing contextual realities with what will effectively deliver change on the ground. This is even more important given the political dimensions of vulnerability so often associated with fragile contexts. **Local leadership** is vital for managing this tension and ensuring appropriate programming. Likewise, ambition needs to be balanced with pragmatism, being realistic about what we can achieve and influence.

#### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

- A nexus approach should not detract from humanitarian principles, nor serve other security agendas. In a context like Myanmar with shrinking civil society space, priority must be given to challenging policies and reaching the most vulnerable people.
- Certain approaches, understandings, good practices and issues, such as gender and conflict sensitivity, need to be understood more evenly across all actors in the consortia and needs to be consistently mainstreamed. Working together and ensuring common understating and minimum standards has required time and investment, that wasn't previously planned for.
- Robust debate and principled decision making is needed on how engaging with national peace processes that are intensely political is aligned with humanitarian principles and development practices, to ensure interventions do not contribute to political objectives. To mitigate this risk, the DPP committed to centre decision making around displaced people's preferences.

### What could have been done better or what went wrong?

Cross-consortium activities and consortium-wide advocacy could be strengthened. DPP needs to get better at disseminating good practices and lessons learned from partners amongst the Consortium organisations to enhance the effective implementation of projects i.e. hold Consortium wide workshops to share strategies and exchange views on project implementation challenges and opportunities. This could result in effective cross-fertilisation between projects, and ensure that youth and gender concerns are mainstreamed efficiently.

### Were any lessons learned?

The following recommendations were made by the final evaluators. Although they did not focus specifically on the Nexus, the lessons learned span across the humanitarian – development – peace sectors.

- **Undertake feasibility studies, accompanied by a labour market needs analysis**, to ensure that livelihood interventions are relevant and sustainable. Target livelihood interventions according to demography, e.g. ageing population, youth, and women with small children. Provide a comprehensive value chain analysis to understand how and where to create value-added products with access to markets.
- **Undertake Gender inclusion audits** to measure how women are involved, in what ways and at what levels, and how gender as a policy concern is integrated into programming or activities.
- It is recommended that a **new advocacy strategy which clearly links grassroots activities with the overall strategy** is developed for the second phase of DPP. Advocacy should be mainstreamed into the programme so that the needs identified by conflict-affected women and youth themselves directly feed into the wider Consortium advocacy plans. Additionally, activities should focus on linking grassroots groups to amplify their voice and role within the work of DPP.



# Case Study 16

## Name of Organisation/Partner /Engagement with other actors

**Mercy Corps** works with a range of local partners and governmental partners in northeast Nigeria. These include the Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement and other state authorities, Ministry of Women's Affairs (MAIDA) as well as the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, CIVIC and Okapi Consulting, Christian Association of Nigeria, Jama'atu Nasril Islam, Partnership to Engage, Reform and Learn, HERWA Community Development Initiative, Police, Military and Department of State Services, and the Civilian Joint Task Force (NE-CMS). With support from the GHR Foundation, Mercy Corps also chairs the Peace and Security Network, a membership network of national and international NGOs, donors, and embassies to coordinate peacebuilding efforts in Nigeria.

## Name of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

In **Nigeria**, Mercy Corps works at the nexus of humanitarian action, peacebuilding and development across a number of different projects. These include:

- MAIDA ('Recovery')
- Supporting Harmonious Association, Religious Participation and Engagement for Northern Nigeria (TARE)
- North East Conflict Management and Stabilisation (NE-CMS)
- Using the Airwaves for Stability in the Lake Chad Basin (UAS – LCB)
- Hadin Kai (Unity)
- These programs also intersect with and build upon Mercy Corps' overall portfolio of humanitarian action.

## Year(s) Being Covered by the Case Study

Mercy Corps' humanitarian programming in NE Nigeria began in 2014, with peacebuilding-focused programs phased in as early as 2016. All of these programs are ongoing.

## Donor/Funding Sources

Mercy Corps' first peace and security-focused program in the region, the NE-CMS program, began in 2016 after a series of discussions between Mercy Corps and DfID. Mercy Corps had previously conducted research, funded by the Ford Foundation, examining why male and female youth join or how they are forcibly recruited into Boko Haram. Based on these research findings, Mercy Corps proposed a stability focused program to DfID to complement the ongoing humanitarian efforts. This co-creation process took several months to establish the pilot, and then several (nine) months later once the pilot was completed, to secure follow-on funding. Because of the fluid humanitarian environment and DfID funding protocols, there was a gap between NE-CMS I and NE-CMS II, which caused major disruption in the program goals. Having plans with DfID, but also with other funders, to ensure that the pilot would be

followed immediately with subsequent programming would have helped make the initiative more effective at its beginning. Further, Mercy Corps since adapted incoming humanitarian program designs to ensure that peacebuilding efforts were included in broader humanitarian initiatives.

### **What makes this case study an example of a nexus approach?**

Mercy Corps' efforts in northeast Nigeria encompass the three pillars of the organisation's *Advancing Peace in Complex Crises* framework. These pillars include (1) conflict sensitive humanitarian action, (2) violence reduction, and (3) development and peacebuilding. Based on lessons from the first two years of response, Mercy Corps' humanitarian programming in the region has prioritised conflict sensitivity and has endeavoured to lay the groundwork for the layering in of peace-promoting activities. For example, MAIDA's interventions in social protection and livelihoods support were built upon previous ECHO-funded activities around protection, unconditional cash grants and water/sanitation infrastructure. Programs implemented under pillars 2 and 3 are complementary, addressing different facets of conflict. For example, while the TARE program works with leaders of both Muslim and Christian faiths to promote and implement initiatives that counter extremist doctrine and messaging, the UAS-LCB program supports a local radio station to provide credible, accurate information to communities, countering the role of misinformation in radicalisation. In addition, the NE-CMS and MAIDA programs work to address underlying causes of extremism and promote community security, drawing upon development approaches. For example, the MAIDA program works to promote livelihoods and employment opportunities for youth, and the NE-CMS strives to strengthen government and civil society capacities to address key grievances.

### **Short description** of Country/Programme/Project/Programmatic Approach

- MAIDA ('Recovery') program, funded by the EC. MAIDA directly support the recovery of at least 70,000 women, men, girls and boys who are returnees, IDPs and members of host communities affected by the Boko Haram insurgency in southern and central Borno State. The objective of MAIDA is to increase the social cohesion and resilience to economic, social and climate related shocks in Borno State in an environmentally-conscious way.
- "Supporting Harmonious Association, Religious Participation and Engagement for Northern Nigeria" (TARE) in Borno state, funded by GHR. TARE supports local religious leaders to participate in creating Community Action Plans for the prevention of violent extremism with youth and community leaders, negotiate formal agreements on implementation of these plans with the state government and local government areas, and develop initiatives to prevent youth participation in extremist organisations and violence. TARE works with leaders of both faiths to promote and implement initiatives that counter extremist doctrine and messaging.

- “North East Conflict Management and Stabilisation Programme (NE-CMS),” funded by DFID. Mercy Corps works as part of a consortium to strengthen protection of civilians, support social cohesion, address the root causes of violent extremism and contribute to conflict management in Northeast Nigeria by: a) strengthening government and civil-society efforts to address key grievances; b) increasing economic and social engagement opportunities for youth; c) promoting reconciliation and transitional justice at a community level; d) supporting civilian protection and improving civil-military relations; and e) laying the groundwork for successful reintegration of former members of violent groups, their victims and IDPs; and f) promoting positive alternative narratives through radio.
- “Using the Airwaves for Stability in the Lake Chad Basin (UAS – LCB) Program,” funded by the US State Department. This program supports a local radio station in the Lake Chad Basin, which includes coordination with stakeholders to produce and air news, current affairs and special content programming to increase understanding of, and support for, the de-radicalisation, rehabilitation and reintegration of Boko Haram combatants.

**What were the elements of success that you feel make this case study a good example of the nexus (humanitarian/development or humanitarian/development/peace)?**

Mercy Corps’ work in NE Nigeria demonstrates the potential positive dividends of working in a complementary and holistic manner across humanitarian, peacebuilding and development programming. Violent conflicts are often complex in nature, and therefore require a multi-faceted approach. By working in a complementary manner across the 3 sectors, it is more likely that an organisation’s actions will ‘add up’ to greater peace outcomes.

**Does your project/programme utilise a community based approach?**

Mercy Corps emphasises community engagement in its programming, in order to promote resilience of communities to conflict and other shocks and stresses. The MAIDA program, for example, works through Community Resilience Groups. It also liaises closely with community leaders, linking them to MAIDA’s community-based structures and program beneficiaries to leave behind the human resources infrastructure in conflict-affected communities that will be better able to cope with the evolving humanitarian situation and address the challenges of the context.

**Does your project/programme involve engagement with authorities and/or line ministries?**

Mercy Corps’ programs seek to harmonise with national and state-level initiatives and to engage local authorities where relevant. For example, the MAIDA program liaises with the Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement to provide support to implement jointly-identified projects. This helps meet the immediate needs of the communities, and adds to rebuilding



trust in the ability of the local government to provide basic services, while also ensuring sustainability of the project and building community members' skills to influence government decisions and hold their government officials accountable. In another example, the NE-CMS works with the Military, Police, and Civilian Joint Task Force in consultations for measures promoting civilian protection and livelihood options for CJTF members who wish to exit the group.

### **What were some of the enabling (or disabling) elements related to this case study?**

An enabling element was Mercy Corps' established reputation in conflict management work elsewhere in Nigeria, prior to the humanitarian and peacebuilding response in the NE. This credibility enabled Mercy Corps to respond to the NE crisis in a way that would be trusted by donors and local communities, which further enabled Mercy Corps to propose innovative blended humanitarian and peacebuilding programming. Further, Mercy Corps' global capacity in all three sectors meant that a team of experts could help shape the portfolio strategy. Disabling elements included an initial lack of donor appetite to fund non-humanitarian efforts at a time when the Boko Haram crisis and resulting displacement was at a peak in the international media. Mercy Corps used trusted relationships with donors to persuade them to allocate some funding for violence prevention, though this didn't work in all instances. One disabling element was that Mercy Corps tried to incorporate a heavy social cohesion component into a proposal with one humanitarian/early recovery donor which was rejected for going too far outside life-saving assistance.

### **What were some of the risks or challenges faced during the case study?**

The typical humanitarian neutrality/impartiality questions presented risks and challenges, as well as tensions between humanitarian and development actors (mostly about coordination and scarce resources). Security concerns were also a factor as Mercy Corps staff needed to keep a low profile to work in both spaces.

### **What could have been done better or what went wrong?**

The organisation could perhaps have planned better for funding gaps, and could have built the nexus into programs earlier on, incorporating conflict sensitivity from the beginning.

### **Were any lessons learned?**

It is good to bring in different technical experts to design fully integrated programmes, which Mercy Corps has been doing for the last couple of years.



VOICE is the network of more than 80 European NGOs promoting principled and people-centred humanitarian aid. Collectively, VOICE aims to improve the quality and effectiveness of the European Union and its Member States' humanitarian aid. The network promotes the added value of NGOs as key humanitarian actors.