

Nigeria Joint CTP Feasibility Review

Acceptance and security & safety criteria

This review seeks to provide an overview of i) the Government of Nigeria's attitude towards cash being used as a modality of assistance, as well as to ii) outline particular protection concerns and potential corresponding mitigation measures relating to the use of cash transfer programmes in the north-east of Nigeria.

1. Government acceptance

Government use of cash

At the national level, the Nigerian Government has shown significant openness to the use of cash by humanitarian and development partners, as well as a willingness to use cash to implement its own programmes. These include the following initiatives: ¹

- A national social safety net project was introduced in 2016, aiming to provide access to targeted transfers to poor and vulnerable households.
- COPE, a conditional cash transfers (CCT) programme targeting poor female-headed households, HIV/AIDS patients and people with disabilities. The programme was implemented by the National Programme for Poverty Eradication (NAPEP), the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on the MDGs (OSSAP-MDGs) and state representatives, with support from the World Bank².

While there is acceptance and support of cash based programmes at the national level, the Nigeria policy system is highly decentralized. As such, although policy design is done at a Federal level, individual states have significant autonomy to execute these policies and to decide how related funding should be allocated.

Partner use of cash

The Nigerian Government has welcomed the use of CTP by other implementing organizations. Currently at least 12 partners are implementing cash programmes to meet humanitarian and development objectives. These have reached some 140,000 households since the beginning of 2017³, with plans for a significant scale up over coming months to help meet the continued escalation in humanitarian need. While these programmes focus primarily on addressing food security, other sectors are also considering to expand or introduce cash-based programmes.

2. Community acceptance

There is already significant familiarity with CTP among the Nigerian population, following the implementation of humanitarian and development based cash programmes by both national authorities and humanitarian/development organisations. According to post distribution monitoring

¹CaLP, Save the Children, ACF (2014), *Planning for government adoption of a social protection programme in an insecure environment: the Child Grant Development Programme in northern Nigeria*, pp.4-5.

² ODI (2012) *The potential for cash transfers in Nigeria*.

³ OCHA (2017), *Nigeria: Ongoing Cash Activities*.

reports and key informant interviews, affected communities have indicated a general preference for receiving humanitarian assistance through cash or vouchers⁴. Among some of the reasons mentioned were flexibility and control over the resources, choice and use of local vendors and markets⁵. Cash and vouchers are mainly being used to support people living in host communities (rural and urban areas), as those living in refugee camps often have movement restrictions and limited or no access to local markets⁶.

3. Protection concerns and impact of cash

The below table provides an overview of potential risks of using cash by different population groups, with information primarily drawn from the Global Protection Cluster’s efforts to bring together relevant stakeholders and identify good practices and lessons learned on protection, as it relates to CTP in Nigeria⁷. It should be noted that, as a result of the conflict, there is a particular prevalence of women- and child-headed households.

Community group	Potential Risks/Impact of cash	Mitigation measures
Women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of violence: Depending on location, men perceived differently the impact of women being the recipients of cash. While in Adamawa this did not create any problems, men in Borno felt their women were being inappropriately empowered. • Husbands taking the cash from their wives. • Higher rates of divorce. • Planning to have more children to receive more money. • Gender-based violence following cash distributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering cash to women should be context specific. Depending on the culture of the area, the appropriateness may vary. • Sensitization of men and other community members helping them to understand that cash is given to women, but is meant to cover the needs of the entire family, and not of the woman alone. • Women should be given the option to decide not to be the recipient of the cash, but their husband can receive it instead. • Sensitization campaigns aimed at clarifying that cash programmes are temporary solutions. • Setting up of linkages to existing protection referral mechanisms.
Children (as beneficiaries)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of cash not reaching some children at all, with money used for other purposes. • Gender based violence following cash distributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving the community to help children. • Using vouchers instead of cash to enable a level of monitoring and control over the items purchased.

⁴ NORCAP, FAO, OCHA (2016) ‘Humanitarian Cash Transfer Programming Symposium’.

⁵ Ibid

⁶ Ibid

⁷ Global Protection Cluster (2017) ‘Good Practices and Lessons Learned Workshop on Protection in Cash-based Interventions in North-eastern Nigeria’.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of social workers to support the implementation of CBIs and of other complementary activities. • In-depth assessments to ensure putting in place of adequate checks and balances.
Child-headed households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited ability to make optimal decisions in financial matters. • Any other risk linked to a vulnerable recipient: extortion, corruption, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving the community or social workers to help and orientate children on how to spend cash in an optimal way. • Frequent monitoring of their situation and their family. • Sensitization on potential risks they may face and available protection measures to mitigate such risks.
All (Women, men, children head of household, IDPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender-based violence. • Taxation for receiving cash due to perceptions of aid as a favour rather than a right, and due to insufficient and inconsistent information and sensitization of future beneficiaries regarding amounts to be received. • Corruption • Community tensions • Duplication between programmes, leading to inclusion and/or inclusion errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitization campaigns to potential beneficiaries on correct entitlements. • Clarifying myths regarding the need to pay tax to receive cash. • Harmonizing of transfer amounts among humanitarian partners. • Consideration of targeting criteria to also include vulnerable host communities.

Limitations of the analysis:

- The review is based solely on available secondary data and, as such, is not a comprehensive representation of possible protection concerns.
- In particular, the data reviewed refers to CTP implementation in the north-east of the country and may reflect protection risks specific for that area. It is hence not representative of the whole country, and does also not take into account particularities at an LGA level.

Secondary data reviewed:

CaLP, Save the Children, ACF (2014), *'Planning for government adoption of a social protection programme in an insecure environment: the Child Grant Development Programme in northern Nigeria'*. Available at: <http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calpcasestudynigeriaengweb.pdf>

Global Protection Cluster (2017) *'Good Practices and Lessons Learned Workshop on Protection in Cash-based Interventions in North-eastern Nigeria'*.

International Policy Centre for inclusive growth (2016) *'Rethinking the design and implementation of Nigeria's COPE Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes'*. Available at: http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/eng/OP330_Rethinking_the_design_and_implementation_of_Nigeria_s_COPE.pdf

NORCAP, FAO, OCHA (2016) *'Humanitarian Cash Transfer Programming Symposium'*. Available at: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/nga_abuja_final_report_humanitarian_ctp_symposium_042016.pdf

OCHA (2017) *'Nigeria: Humanitarian Dashboard (January-May 2017)'*. Available at: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/20062017_ocha_nga_humanitarian_dashboard_may_2017.pdf

OCHA (2017), *'Nigeria: Ongoing Cash Activities'*. Available at: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/31052017_nga_ocha_ongoing_cash_activities_march_2017_0.pdf

Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Rebecca Holmes et al. (2012) *'The potential for cash transfers in Nigeria'*. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7578.pdf>

World Bank (2014) *'The SURE-P Maternal and Child Health Project in Nigeria'*. Available at: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/284981453222884744/Policy-brief-Nigeria-SURE-P-MCH-IE.pdf>