

www.ifrc.org  
Saving lives,  
changing minds.

# Emergency Plan of Action Preliminary Final Report

## Nigeria: Elections Preparedness

 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

<b>DREF operation n°:</b> MDRNG019	<b>Glide number:</b> NA
<b>Date of Issue:</b> 31 October 2015	<b>Date of disaster:</b> 15 February 2015
<b>Operation start date:</b> 23 December 2014	<b>Operation end date:</b> 23 June 2015
<b>Operation budget:</b> Original allocation: CHF 239,946 Additional allocation n° 1: CHF 55,211 Total allocation: CHF 295,157	<b>Total estimated Red Cross and Red Crescent response:</b> CHF 295,157
<b>Number of people affected:</b> 120,000	<b>Number of people assisted:</b> 109
<b>Host National Society:</b> Nigeria Red Cross Society	
<b>N° of National Societies involved in the operation:</b> International Committee of Red Cross, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	
<b>N° of other partner organizations involved in the operation:</b> National Emergency Management Agency, State Emergency Management Agency, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.	

## A. Situation analysis

### Description of the disaster

In Nigeria, the elections were held successfully despite the postponement of six weeks from 14 February - 28 March 2015 for Presidential; and 11 April 2015 for the Governorship Elections by the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC). The elections were the most contentious in the history of the country. Many international organizations including the United Nations (UN) had predicted violence, unexpectedly too all of these actors, the level of violence was not as envisaged. Generally, the elections were conducted in a peaceful manner as confirmed by international bodies that monitored the elections. According to the human rights commission reports, a number of people were reported killed and many others affected by alleged election related violence however it was difficult to clearly link the incidents to specific activities of the elections since Nigeria was still undergoing conflict in many parts of the country. The new government was inaugurated on 29 May 2015.

On 24 December 2014, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) released CHF 239,946 from the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) to ensure that the Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS) was prepared to meet the immediate needs of populations, which were predicted to be affected by election related violence, with activities planned for a period of three months. On 10 March 2015, an Operations Update was issued to extend the timeframe by two months (New end date: 23 May 2015), following the decision of the INEC to postpone the elections until 28 March 2015; and an additional allocation of CHF 55,211 (Total allocation: CHF 295,157) was also made available to extend the activities planned to five states (Benue, Gombe, Ebonyi, Ekiti and Niger).

The major donors and partners of the DREF include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the USA, as well as DG ECHO, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) the Medtronic, Zurich Foundations and other corporate and private donors. The IFRC, on behalf of the Nigerian Red Cross Society would like to extend many thanks to all partners for their generous contributions.

Please note that this Preliminary Report is issued in advance of the Final Report, which is expected to be issued by the end of November 2015.

[<click here for the contact details and here for the interim financial report >](#)

## Summary of response

### Overview of Host National Society

Following the DREF allocation, the NRCS was able to complete all of the activities planned within Emergency Plan of Action (EPoA), including the contingency planning workshop; Emergency First Aid Team (EFAT) Training of Trainers (ToT) cascading of this training at branch level as well as procurement/distribution of first aid items and protective equipment. Despite the election related violence being limited, the DREF operation has contributed to strengthening the capacity of the NRCS and the structures established will be used to respond to any other emergency if it occurred. The NRCS will build on the lessons learnt and experiences to perfect its future response mechanisms.

### Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

The IFRC, through its Nigeria country delegation, which has been based in Abuja, Nigeria since 2012, provided support to the NRCS with the implementation of the DREF operation. On 16 December 2015, an Operational Strategy Call was carried out with representatives from the IFRC Nigeria, IFRC West Coast regional representation (WCRR), Africa zone disaster management unit (DMU) and Geneva level disaster and crisis management unit (DCM) and it was agreed that a DREF allocation should be made. Following the launch of the DREF operation, the IFRC and NRCS signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to enable the implementation of the activities planned. A Regional Disaster Response Team (RDRT) member was expected to be deployed but this did not occur due to the non-availability of a suitable candidate; however surge support was deployed by the IFRC Africa zone DMU to provide support with the completion of the contingency planning workshop.

The International Committee of the Red Cross has an extensive presence across the country and provided complementary support to the DREF operation. The ICRC, IFRC and NRCS has established a Movement coordination mechanism with meetings held three times per week to discuss the evolving context and progress on implementation of the elections preparedness interventions. From February 2015, meetings had also been held successfully by ICRC, IFRC and NRCS technical staff. Efforts had been made to link the leadership of the three arms of the Movement to discuss strategic issues pertaining to cooperation, and plans are in process to develop/sign a Movement cooperation agreement.

### Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

The UN and other international organizations in the country were also prepared for the elections. The United Nations Office for Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) conducted an analysis of the situation and historical data and identified potential hotspots country-wide. This information was used during the contingency planning workshop to develop scenarios. The government of Nigeria through its National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) in conjunction with other stakeholders at federal and state levels prepared for any emergency that may occur before, during and after the elections. Many other organizations such as the International Medical Corps, Médecins San Frontières (MSF), Mercy Corps, Oxfam and Save the Children also prepared for the elections. Through the DREF allocation, coordination activities with other stakeholders (including the NEMA and UN agencies) were supported.

## Needs analysis and scenario planning

Please refer to “Table 1: Classification of states by potential risks (NRCS mapping)” below, which was used to guide the prioritization of the states as the situation kept on evolving. Through the timely information that the branches were submitting to the national headquarters (NHQ), the ranking of the states kept on changing.

**Table 1: Classification of states by potential risks (NRCS mapping)**

No.	Red (High Risk)	Orange (Medium)	Yellow (Low Risk)
1	Edo	Adamawa	Bayelsa
2	Kaduna	Bauchi	Zamfara
3	Plateau	Imo	Kwara
4	Nasarawa	Rivers	
5	Taraba	Niger	
6	Delta	Kogi	
7	Borno	Sokoto	
8	Oyo	Ekiti	
9	Lagos	Benue	
10	Ogun	Ebonyi	
11	Katsina	Gombe	

As part of assessment, the contingency plan identified a number of scenarios including the possibility of annulment of results, vote rigging or denial of the outcome of election by either the ruling party or the opposition. It was estimated that over 1.5 million people would have been affected by the elections with the majority of them likely to be those attending rallies during campaigns/after elections and also those participating in the voting process on the polling day. Due to the insurgency, it was likely that some people could have experienced improvised explosive devices (IEDs) or attacks during campaigns and the voting period. Furthermore, it was also assumed that after the elections, if there was dissatisfaction among people with the outcome of the elections, violence would have affected many people. It was also predicted that if the opposition lost the elections, the situation would have been worse.

### **Risk Analysis**

During the risk analysis the major concern was about staff and volunteers being affected by bomb blasts (IEDs) during voting periods. Some areas of the country were under the control of the insurgency though the military had made progress to recapture the occupied territories; however it was not clear at that time how the voting would be carried out in those locations especially since the security situation remained uncertain. The NRCS continued to work closely with the ICRC to ensure the safety, security and well-being of the volunteers in the conflict affected states. Through the DREF operation, and in collaboration with the ICRC, volunteers were provided with necessary training and protective equipment to manage their own risk.

## **B. Operational strategy and plan**

### **Overall Objective**

The immediate needs of populations affected by election related violence are met through the provision of emergency first aid and psychosocial support<sup>1</sup>.

### **Proposed strategy**

As agreed in the strategy, the following activities were prioritized within the DREF operation:

- Continuous assessments were conducted through participating in meetings with key stakeholders at Federal, state and branch levels. Branch level staff were trained on how to conduct community assessments and continuous monitoring and reporting of the situation. Channels of communication and reporting were established from the divisions, branch to the NHQ. This was more effective before the elections. The EFATs were trained on simple, easy-to-use templates of gathering and reporting data to the branch focal persons.
- Referral systems with the existing institutions were established particularly with local health facilities, NEMA and State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) offices at state level. As part of preparedness, discussions were held with the identified institutions on the modalities of collaboration.
- Coordination with other stakeholders was promoted before, during and after the elections. Internal coordination within the Movement was enhanced especially with the development of a Movement cooperation agreement. The

<sup>1</sup> The elections were generally peaceful with minimum number of people affected

agreement was not signed at the time of reporting. However, efforts have been made to ensure that all the clauses are verified by the stakeholders.

- A joint contingency planning workshop for election preparedness was carried out in January 2015, with the intention to draw up an approach and strategy on how to provide meaningful assistance to the people who would be affected by election violence. During the contingency planning workshop only key people from the 20 identified states participated in the training. In total 24 participants from the 12 branches, six people (three facilitators and three participants) from the NRCS HQ, and two people from external organizations participated in the two day workshop. ICRC and IFRC (country and Zone) including two external organizations provided technical support during the workshop.
- EFAT ToT workshop for 40 EFAT team leaders was conducted and the participants were equipped with skills on Safer Access Framework, emergency first aid, psychosocial support, facilitation and communications. The EFAT team leaders underwent three days ToT, after which they conducted a step-down training to EFAT members at state level. Each branch cascaded the training to 24 EFAT members (2 divisions per branch and 12 people per division, however some branches mobilized their own resources hence the number of EFATs increased) using the DREF and ICRC support as planned in the EPoA. However some branches trained more than this number using their own resources and the total number of EFATs trained was 636 nationwide, which is more than what was planned in the EPoA (Refer to “Table 2: EFATs Trainings”). Previous investments in the EFATs since 2013 from ICRC, IFRC and other donors were taken into consideration in order to maximize the support provided through the DREF allocation. Each EFAT was deployed for 14 days initially and 14 additional days due to the postponement of the elections.

**Table 2: EFATs Trainings**

No.	Branches	No. of EFATs trained
1	Adamawa	24
2	Borno	24
3	Delta	30
4	Edo	88
5	Kaduna	24
6	Kano	30
7	Katsina	30
8	Lagos	110
9	Nasarawa	30
10	Ogun	24
11	Oyo	24
12	Plateau	24
13	Rivers	30
14	Taraba	24
15	Ekiti	24
16	Benue	24
17	Ebonyi	24
18	Gombe	24
19	Niger	24
	<b>Total</b>	<b>636</b>

- In total, 20 states received assistance in order to improve their level of preparedness to respond to election related violence and in 19 states a total of 636 EFAT members were trained. The IFRC supported step-down training in 15 states while ICRC supported in 4 states. The remaining states received equipment and protective materials.
- First aid materials for 20 states were prepositioned in the two national warehouses (Lagos and Kano). The first aid materials were procured centrally by the NHQ and were distributed to the identified branches before the elections. In addition, traditional first aid services were provided by the branches during campaign rallies and also during the voting period.
- Procurement of protective equipment (gloves, nose masks, stretchers, safety goggles and safety helmets) and visibility items (ID cards, bibs, stickers and flags) for volunteers was carried out. The ICRC provided body bags.
- Dissemination of Red Cross fundamental principles through the distribution of information, education and communication (IEC) materials was carried out.
- Four monitoring and supervision visits were carried out by NHQ staff to monitor the activities at branch level.

## **Operational support services**

### **Human resources (HR)**

The NRCS DM Coordinator was responsible for the management of the DREF operation, and reported to the Secretary General. BSs were responsible for the implementation of the DREF operation at the branch level and they reported to the DM Coordinator. In total, four National Disaster Response Team (NDRT) members were mobilized and deployed to four states to support the cascading of the EFAT training. NDRT elements were provided with allowances to cover per diem, accommodation and transportation. At community level, the implementation of the DREF operation was the responsibility of the EFAT members who were supported with per diem and transportation. The NHQ staff involved in the DREF operation were provided with allowances to cover per diem, accommodation and transportation during their visits to the states. Though RDRT deployment was planned, no suitable candidate was identified by the Africa zone office hence there was no deployment; however NDRTs were deployed to some states to support the training of EFATs.

### **Logistics and supply chain**

Procurement of first aid kits, working tools and IEC materials were carried out locally by the NRCS logistics unit through a tender process. A comparative bid analysis was done and the best bidder was selected and awarded the bid to supply the items. The items were acceptable and in line with SPHERE standards. In addition, materials were donated to the NRCS by ICRC and these included body bags, first aid kits, rubber boots and stretchers. The items contributed to the equipping of the branches with working tools.

### **Communications**

The head of communications was assigned as a spokesperson for the NRCS by the Secretary General. The communications department developed stories on the trainings of EFAT training of trainers and step down training of members at the branch/divisional level. Both print and electronic media were invited to cover the training events. The DREF operation contributed to increase visibility of the NRCS and its activities. In addition, volunteers were provided with some airtime for their mobile phones.

### **Security**

During the DREF operation, security information was shared among the movement partners to ensure that the operation was implemented in a secure manner. The ICRC trained the branch and NHQ staff on the Safer Access Framework. The volunteers were also oriented on the Safer Access manual during their training as EFATs. Security regulations were developed and shared with all the branches. Precaution was taken to ensure that the volunteers were protected before, during and after the elections. There were no incidents that affected the volunteers and staff throughout the country.

### **Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)**

The NRCS appointed focal persons for each zone of the country to ensure effective monitoring of the operation, including follow up specific states to gather data on progress, changing environment and report to the technical committee at the NHQ. The focal persons recorded all incidents that were happening in the states and the information guided the technical team at NHQs to make decisions. As a result of the information that was gathered, some states were included in the training and also received materials for response to support the EFATs. Teams were set up to conduct monitoring visits to specific states that had identified gaps. During the DREF operation, the Branch Secretaries (BSs) monitored evolving situations and reported to the NHQ focal points. Some states recorded incidents of violence but the elections were generally peaceful. Approximately 50 per cent of the states received two monitoring and support visits by two people from the NHQ. Remaining states were not visited due to under budgeting on travels as well as unexpected expenditures (e.g. the financial charges) that were incurred in the section highlighted below. Some states were performing well and didn't need any visit. There were states that had serious challenges and were visited twice instead of one planned visit.

## C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

### Quality Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors

Quality Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors	
<b>Outcome 1: The DREF operation implementation is well planned, coordinated, monitored and evaluated with central actors in the field</b>	
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Continuous assessment, analysis and coordination to inform the design and implementation of the operation	
<b>Activities planned:</b>	
1.1.1	Participation in information and coordination meetings for continuous assessment of situations.
1.1.2	Establishment of referral systems
1.1.3	Conduct monitoring and supervision visits by HQ staff
1.1.4	Conduct monitoring visits by branches
1.1.5	Lessons learned / review
<b>Achievements</b>	
1.1.1	Following the contingency planning workshop, a task force was established comprising the NRCS technical team, IFRC and ICRC. The joint technical team met three days a week (Monday, Wednesday and Friday) to continuously assess the context, developments and discuss progress on the implementation of the elections preparedness activities. The BSs and DM officers attended coordination meetings where issues related to the elections were discussed. The NHQ staff participated in UN coordination meetings. The information gathered through the meetings assisted the NRCS and partners to revise plans and guide implementation. Decision making was aided through the information received as a result of attending the meetings.
1.1.2	Following the contingency planning workshop, the branches were advised to identify potential collaborative partners to start formalizing the engagement procedures for referral. Branch level reported that they had established strong links with referral mechanisms being established at branch levels with key health facilities, civil defense, police and local government structures to ensure that beneficiaries were attended to in the fastest and quickest manner whenever they were referred.
1.1.3	NHQ staff in collaboration with ICRC and IFRC conducted regular support supervision to the branches with challenges in implementation and also for follow up to do spot checks on the cascading of the EFAT training and preparedness levels, as well as inspecting the status of the HF radio facilities and repairing them. As noted, following the postponement of the elections there were additional costs for the monitoring activities by NHQ, and as such the budget was revised to accommodate the extension.
1.1.4	Following the training of EFAT members, monitoring visits were carried out by representatives at branch level. The EFAT members were deployed in their localities to conduct activities of sensitizing the communities on dangers of election violence and also to disseminate the Fundamental principles of the Red Cross using the developed leaflets. As noted, following the postponement of the elections and addition of five states, there were additional costs for the monitoring activities at branch level, and as such the budget was revised.
1.1.5	A review of the DREF operation was carried out by representatives the ICRC, IFRC Nigeria country delegation, and IFRC Africa zone; and comprised focus group discussions, key informant interviews and a lessons learned workshop.
<b>Lessons learned</b>	
Lessons learned included:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RCRC/Agency Coordination: Increased collaboration with stakeholders - NEMA and SEMA saw the NRCS as key partners during disaster management and epidemic outbreaks. The DREF operation increased the visibility of the Red Cross movement and created a cordial relationship among Movement partners.</li> <li>• Early warning and emergency response preparedness: Branches involved in the contingency planning noted that the internal coordination went well; and were well supported and with step down training at the end of election process. At community level, the role of community volunteers was seen as valuable in providing the real time information on any unrest or violence developing in the communities.</li> <li>• National Society capacity building: Training of staff and volunteers before the election date enabled the NHQ</li> </ul>	

and branches to prepare well for any election related violence. The NRCS was prepared to address any situation of violence though very few incidences of violence were recorded.

### Challenges

Operational challenges included:

- Early warning and emergency response preparedness: It was noted by two branches that the NHQ/ branch did not sufficiently disseminate the contingency plan at grassroots level. Participants indicated that the number of days for the cascading of EFAT training was inadequate. In future trainings a minimum of seven days should be given to cover the EFAT training curriculum. In addition, the psychosocial support (PSS) modules were covered within a short period of time, however, none of the volunteers had previous knowledge in this field. As such, the duration of PSS training for the volunteers should be extended in subsequent training.
- Human resources: It was noted that members felt that deployment of staff was rushed to meet the deadlines.
- Logistics and supply chain: It was identified by the volunteers that not enough ID cards were produced for the volunteers. Red Cross visibility materials i.e. bibs were inadequate as the number of volunteers involved in preparedness was more than the number planned for and the branches trained more volunteers using their own resources. In addition, some branches did not have enough vehicles for movement when needed to attend to incidences and efforts to get support from local partners were unsuccessful. Some volunteers used their personal vehicles or motorbikes during the response, a situation that was not ideal. Red Cross stickers were used on private vehicles for identification.
- Communications: It was noted that there were breaches by some staff and volunteers in the aspect of social media, where some members highlighted the need for proper briefing on communication and social media.
- Security: Some divisions and branches reported hindrance in movement by the government security forces especially where collaboration and coordination mechanisms were not in place.
- PMER: Late submission of both financial and narrative reports from the branches was a challenge. Reports were not timely and the quality was not up to standard. In future, training of branches in report writing will be required. Due to the rapidly changing context, it was difficult to keep the plans as originally developed; and management of the budget was difficult. Postponement of the election dates affected the implementation time and also the budget.
- Administration and Finance: Late disbursement of funds at all levels was identified as a challenge. This was partly due to the change of the NRCS governing board that required new signatories and approvals. Limited funding meant that it was not possible to cover all branches (NRCS has 37 branches including the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) though the DREF operation was not intended to cover all the branches. There were requests however from all the branches to be trained and also to have materials prepositioned in case of violence related to the elections)

## Early warning & emergency response preparedness

<b>Early warning and emergency Preparedness and Response</b>	
<b>Outcome 1: Improved capacity of the Nigerian Red Cross Society to respond to election related violence</b>	
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Red Cross volunteers are trained, equipped and ready to provide emergency first aid and psychosocial support to populations in states most at risk of election related violence	
<b>Activities planned:</b>	
1.1.1	Conduct a contingency planning workshop
1.1.2	Conduct a refresher training of trainers for EFAT team leaders (Target: 30 EFAT team leaders)
1.1.3	Conduct addition two -day refresher trainings for EFAT members to increase the number of divisions with trained EFAT members (Target: 408 EFAT members)
1.1.4	Deployment of EFATs members
1.1.5	Procure first aid kits
1.1.6	Procure volunteer protective equipment (gloves , nose masks, stretchers, safety goggles, safety helmets and ID cards)
1.1.7	Procure volunteer visibility items (Bibs, stickers and flags)
1.1.8	Acquire body bags from ICRC
1.1.9	Production and distribution of 10,000 IEC materials on the RC fundament principles
<b>Achievements</b>	

- 1.1.1 From 27-29 January 2015, the contingency planning workshop was carried out in Abuja with participants from ICRC, IFRC and NRCS staff and volunteer. The contingency planning workshop was facilitated by the IFRC/ICRC. The Africa zone DM delegate led the facilitation team assisted by the WCRR DM officer. The ICRC provided additional financial support for the workshop. The remaining funds were allocated for additional monitoring activities, training of ToT EFAT team leaders and EFATs. A draft document was finalized and shared with the branches. In total 24 participants from the 12 branches (11 high risk and 1 from the medium risk which had converted to high risk in Table 1) and six people (three facilitators and three participants), as well as two people from external organizations were involved in the contingency planning workshop.
- 1.1.2 In total, 40 EFAT team leaders received refresher training (133% of the intended target of 30); and was possible due to additional financial support that was received from the ICRC. The EFAT team leaders' refresher training was held in Nasarawa and Oyo states. The EFAT team leaders were trained on security guidelines, code of conduct, Safer Access Framework, basic relief duties, SPHERE standards, basic first aid, health in emergencies and psycho-social support (PSS).
- 1.1.3 Following the contingency planning workshop, 19 branches were supported to carry out the cascading of the EFAT step-down trainings instead of the original 12 branches that were planned. Due to ICRC funding contribution, the NRCS added 4 more branches and later with the revision of the DREF additional 5 branches were trained to bring the total number of branches with trained EFATs to 19 branches (106% of the intended target of 17 branches); and as mentioned this was possible due to additional financial support that was received from the ICRC and branches own resources. In total the DREF allocation supported 19 states, and the ICRC funding supported four states. Please refer to "Proposed strategy" section for further information on states that were targeted. As per the original EPoA, it was planned that 12 EFAT members per branch targeting one division would receive the EFAT stepdown training. However, it was agreed that two divisions per branch should be trained with the same resources given the support received from IFRC. Based on that, in total, 24 EFAT members were trained per branch; and 636 EFAT members across the 19 states were trained above the target of 408 as indicated in table 2. In addition to the support received from the ICRC, some branches also secured their own resources, which enabled them to train more EFATs. In total, 636 EFATs were trained across 19 branches, which equates to 156 per cent of the intended target (408). The EFAT team members were trained on security guidelines, code of conduct, Safer Access Framework, basic relief duties, SPHERE standards, basic first aid, health in emergencies and PSS.
- 1.1.4 Each EFAT was deployed for 14 days initially and 14 additional days due to the postponement of the elections. The EFAT members conducted sensitization meetings in the local communities educating people on the need for tolerance, non-violence using the Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross. Before the elections they responded to incidences of violence as a result of campaign activities and during the elections they attended to those who were affected by violence. The volunteers were positioned near polling booths to monitor the situation. In previous elections it was noted that elections violence took place near polling stations especially during the counting exercise. The disaster management (DM) officers and BSs in the targeted states acted as links to both the NRCS headquarters and EFATs. They ensured that the activities of the EFATs were well structured, monitored and coordinated.
- 1.1.5 155 first aid kits were procured and distributed to across the 20 branches. The DREF allocation supported the procurement of 105 First Aid kits, which equates to 159 per cent of the intended target (85), and the ICRC supported the procurement of 50 First Aid Kits.
- 1.1.6 Procurement of the protective equipment was completed, including 4,028 hard gloves, 4,028 nose masks, 130 stretchers, 1,224 safety goggles, 408 safety helmets and 408 ID cards. A total of 45 pairs of boots were provided by ICRC. .
- 1.1.7 Procurement of visibility items for volunteers was completed, including 1,224 bibs (3 bibs per person), 500 flags and 1,000 stickers.
- 1.1.8 The ICRC provided 65 body bags.

1.1.9 10,000 IEC materials (leaflets) were designed, printed and distributed in both English and Hausa (100% achieved). The IEC leaflets contained dissemination information on Fundamental Principles, and the dissemination of the messages increased awareness and knowledge of the Red Cross among the beneficiaries.

#### **Lessons learned**

Please refer to “Quality Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors” section.

#### **Challenges**

Please refer to “Quality Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors” section.

## **Budget**

- “Medical & First Aid” was underspent by CHF 12,584 (16.5%) due to the in-kind support received from ICRC.
- “Transport & Vehicles” was overspent by CHF 2,095 due to the postponement of the elections that extended the timeframe of the operation which resulted in more travels made and an increase in transportation costs. The flight costs in particular increased the expenses as they were not budgeted for initially. As such, the variance resulted from lack of budget allocation to fuel and flight costs at the onset of the DREF operation.
- “Travel” was overspent by CHF 5,007 due to travel that was required for the implementation of the activities planned but were not budgeted at the onset of the DREF operation.
- “Financial charges” was overspent by CHF 16,372 due to extensive currency losses and revaluations unforeseen during budgeting period. During the implementation of the DREF operation, the local currency devalued by 10 per cent and that affected the budget (uncertainty among investors of the outcome of elections).

## Contact information

### For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Nigeria Red Cross Society:** In Nigeria: Bello Hamman Diram, Secretary-General, Nigerian Red Cross Society; phone:+234 805 777 9993; e-mail: [bdiram@yahoo.com](mailto:bdiram@yahoo.com); [bdiram@nrscng.org](mailto:bdiram@nrscng.org)
- **IFRC West Coast Regional Representation:** Daniel Sayi, Regional Representative, West Coast Regional Representation, Abidjan, Cote D'Ivoire; phone:+225 667 75261; email: [daniel.sayi@ifrc.org](mailto:daniel.sayi@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Lucia Lasso, Disaster Management delegate for Africa; Nairobi; phone: +254 (0)731 067 469; email: [lucia.lasso@ifrc.org](mailto:lucia.lasso@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Geneva: Christine South,** Operations Quality Assurance Senior Officer; phone: +41.22.730.45 29; email: [christine.south@ifrc.org](mailto:christine.south@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Zone Logistics Unit (ZLU):** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of zone logistics unit; Tel: +254 733 888 022/ Fax +254 20 271 2777; email: [rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org](mailto:rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org)

### For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Fidelis Kangethe, Partnerships and Resource Development Coordinator; Addis Ababa; Tel; 251 930 03 4013; email: [fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org](mailto:fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org)

### For Performance and Accountability (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting):

- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Robert Ondrusek, PMER/QA Delegate for Africa; Nairobi; phone: +254 731 067277; email: [robert.ondrusek@ifrc.org](mailto:robert.ondrusek@ifrc.org)

---

## How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (Sphere) in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable. The IFRC's vision is to inspire, encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities by National Societies, with a view to preventing and alleviating human suffering, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

[www.ifrc.org](http://www.ifrc.org)  
Saving lives, changing minds.



The IFRC's work is guided by Strategy 2020 which puts forward three strategic aims:

1. Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disaster and crises.
2. Enable healthy and safe living.
3. Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.

**Disaster Response Financial Report**

MDRNG019 - Nigeria - Election Preparedness

Timeframe: 23 Dec 14 to 23 Jun 15

Appeal Launch Date: 23 Dec 14

DREF Interim Report

**Selected Parameters**

Reporting Timeframe	2014/12-2015/10	Programme	MDRNG019
Budget Timeframe	2014/12-2015/6	Budget	BUDGET9
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

**I. Funding**

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
<b>A. Budget</b>		295,157				295,157	
<b>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>Income</b>							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		295,157				295,157	
<b>C4. Other Income</b>		295,157				295,157	
<b>C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)</b>		295,157				295,157	
<b>D. Total Funding = B +C</b>		295,157				295,157	

\* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

**II. Movement of Funds**

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
<b>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>C. Income</b>		295,157				295,157	
<b>E. Expenditure</b>		-291,778				-291,778	
<b>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</b>		3,379				3,379	

## Disaster Response Financial Report

### MDRNG019 - Nigeria - Election Preparedness

Timeframe: 23 Dec 14 to 23 Jun 15

Appeal Launch Date: 23 Dec 14

DREF Interim Report

#### Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2014/12-2015/10	Programme	MDRNG019
Budget Timeframe	2014/12-2015/6	Budget	BUDGET9
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
<b>BUDGET (C)</b>			<b>295,157</b>			<b>295,157</b>		
<b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>								
Medical & First Aid	76,125		63,541			63,541	12,584	
<b>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</b>	<b>76,125</b>		<b>63,541</b>			<b>63,541</b>	<b>12,584</b>	
<b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>								
Transport & Vehicles Costs			2,095			2,095	-2,095	
<b>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>			<b>2,095</b>			<b>2,095</b>	<b>-2,095</b>	
<b>Personnel</b>								
International Staff	12,496						12,496	
National Society Staff	15,501		15,498			15,498	3	
Volunteers	76,044		76,036			76,036	8	
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>104,041</b>		<b>91,533</b>			<b>91,533</b>	<b>12,508</b>	
<b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>								
Workshops & Training	71,110		71,096			71,096	14	
<b>Total Workshops &amp; Training</b>	<b>71,110</b>		<b>71,096</b>			<b>71,096</b>	<b>14</b>	
<b>General Expenditure</b>								
Travel			5,007			5,007	-5,007	
Information & Public Relations	20,692		20,683			20,683	9	
Office Costs	2,942		1,326			1,326	1,616	
Communications	1,233		1,233			1,233	0	
Financial Charges	1,000		17,372			17,372	-16,372	
<b>Total General Expenditure</b>	<b>25,867</b>		<b>45,621</b>			<b>45,621</b>	<b>-19,754</b>	
<b>Indirect Costs</b>								
Programme & Services Support Recove	18,014		17,892			17,892	123	
<b>Total Indirect Costs</b>	<b>18,014</b>		<b>17,892</b>			<b>17,892</b>	<b>123</b>	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</b>	<b>295,157</b>		<b>291,778</b>			<b>291,778</b>	<b>3,379</b>	
<b>VARIANCE (C - D)</b>			<b>3,379</b>			<b>3,379</b>		

**Disaster Response Financial Report**

MDRNG019 - Nigeria - Election Preparedness

Timeframe: 23 Dec 14 to 23 Jun 15

Appeal Launch Date: 23 Dec 14

DREF Interim Report

**Selected Parameters**

Reporting Timeframe	2014/12-2015/10	Programme	MDRNG019
Budget Timeframe	2014/12-2015/6	Budget	BUDGET9
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

**IV. Breakdown by subsector**

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
<b>BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</b>							
Disaster response	295,157		295,157	295,157	291,778	3,379	
Subtotal BL2	295,157		295,157	295,157	291,778	3,379	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>295,157</b>		<b>295,157</b>	<b>295,157</b>	<b>291,778</b>	<b>3,379</b>	