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Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Strengthening legislation and policies on DRR at all levels to reduce vulnerability and to enhance climate change adaptation.

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Ensure the establishment of institutions at local level and strengthen the capacity of the institutions at all levels for risk identification and reduction to build resilience in every community.

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

To enhance capacity and mechanism to monitor risk and response to disaster by supporting sub-national and local level through efficient disaster response and recovery strategy.
Priority for Action 1

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Core indicator 1

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National development plan</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector strategies and plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change policy and strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy papers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk? Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.
Nigeria has put in place relevant plans, procedure, guidelines, strategies, structures and laws such as the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) Policy, DRR Action Plan, National Contingency Plan, Erosion Control Law etc and institution established at all levels for managing disaster risks.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

1. Insufficient/Weak enforcement of laws and policies
2. Inadequate monitoring and evaluation
3. Insufficient compliance to town planning laws and regulations

**Core indicator 2**

* Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

**Level of Progress achieved? 4**

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risk reduction / prevention (%)</th>
<th>Relief and reconstruction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National budget</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralised / sub-national budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g. transport, agriculture, infrastructure)

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

One percent of the national budget is allocated to risk reduction, relief and reconstruction. Others are utilized by the Federal Ministries, Departments and Agencies such as Environment, Health and others that contribute to Disaster Risk Reduction and mitigation, as well as States and local governments.

The sectoral budget of the MDAs makes contribution to activities that relate to DRR, relief and reconstruction.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
- Insufficient fund for DRR
- Private Sector participation in DRR is minimal
- Difficulty in monitoring the amount allocated for DRR, relief and reconstruction.

Recommendations
- Increased funding for DRR
- Greater Private Sector investment/participation in DRR
- Mechanisms for monitoring investment at sub-national and local level.

Core indicator 3
Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 2
Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification
Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? No

| Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?) | No |
| Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government | No |
| Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR | |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

NEMA Act 50 of 1999 provides for establishment of Local Government Emergency Management Committees at Local Government level, but not many have done so. However, all Local Governments carry out activities that are DRR in nature such as building culverts for flood control and planting of trees, though there are no regular budgets for DRR purposes.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Low level of awareness, weak capacity and poor participation in DRR activities at local government levels.
Solution: Establishment of appropriate institution backed by law with regular budget. Sensitization, advocacy and increased community awareness.

Core indicator 4
A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.
Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>civil society members (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private sector (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify)</td>
<td>2 (traditional institutions &amp; youth organisations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

- In the Prime Minister's/President's Office: Yes
- In a central planning and/or coordinating unit: No
- In a civil protection department: No
- In an environmental planning ministry: No
- In the Ministry of Finance: No
- Other (Please specify): 

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).
Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There is a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Nigeria. It is composed of government Ministries, Departments, Agencies (MDAs), Civil Society Groups, and Development Partners. The Platform developed a National Action Plan for DRR, Recovery Plan, Joint Humanitarian Action Plan (JHAP), National Disaster Recovery Strategy and Framework (NDSRF) etc. The National Emergency Management Agency is the secretariat and coordinates the activities of the National Platform.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
• Coordination of members of the platform.
• Lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities among the various organizations.

Recommendations
• Enhanced synergy among members of the platform
• Greater understanding of roles and responsibilities among the various organizations.
Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

*National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-hazard risk assessment</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of schools and hospitals assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common format for risk assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment format customised by user</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is future/probable risk assessed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.

Health, Agriculture, education, water & sanitation, environment, infrastructure
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA), a state based assessment was carried out in seven pilot states, baseline studies conducted in six other states and the PDNA after the 2012 flood.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
• Inadequate funding to extend the VCA to the entire country.
• insufficient baseline information

Recommendation:
• Adequate funding for nationwide baseline information and VCA.

Core indicator 2
Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed?
Yes

| Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated | Yes |
| Reports generated and used in planning by | Yes |
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The establishment of situation room in NEMA to monitor, record, update and generate report/disseminate for planning purposes.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
• Inadequate resources for disaster losses and hazard assessment.
• Inadequate capacity (human and technical) in the conduct of disaster losses and hazard assessment.

Recommendations
• Provide adequate resources for disaster losses and hazard assessment.
• Capacity building (human and technical) to conduct disaster losses and hazard assessment.

Core indicator 3
*Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**
Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Early warnings acted on effectively</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local level preparedness</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication systems and protocols used and applied</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There is an Early Warning system in place, with some agencies responsible for forecasting and prediction such as Nigerian Meteorological Agency (NIMET), Nigerian Hydrological Services Agency (NIHSA) etc. The forecast/prediction is digested through meeting with relevant stakeholders. The information is passed to relevant stakeholders e.g States, NEMA Zonal/Operation Offices for dissemination to communities for early action.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

**Challenges**
- Inadequate hazard early warning systems e.g high precision flood prediction system.
- Low investment in early warning systems infrastructure.
- Inadequate capacity for better prediction.
- Low coverage of weather stations.

**Recommendation**
- Adequate hazard early warning system
- Sufficient funding for capacity building, provision of adequate weather station etc.
Core indicator 4
*National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional or sub-regional risk assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional or sub-regional early warning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Nigeria is participating in Regional DRR programme coordinated by ECOWAS. Nigeria participated in flood Trans-boundary study expert meetings and development of DRR Action Plan for the west African countries.

DRR Frameworks and strategies for West Africa region had also been developed and approved.

Nigeria received trans-boundary information on Early Warning System from ACMAD and also a member of West African Disaster Management Agencies.
Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
- Limited support of international partners for trans-boundary implementation of DRR programmes.
- Poor coordination of trans-boundary hazard assessment and monitoring.
- Lack of standardized protocol for trans-boundary information sharing.

Recommendations
- Greater support and participation of International Partners.
- Better coordination of trans-boundary hazard assessment and monitoring.
- Provision of standardized protocol for trans-boundary information sharing.
Priority for Action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Core indicator 1

Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

| Information is proactively disseminated | Yes |
| Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV, ) | Yes |
| Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Emergency Management (NEMA) worked with the Federal Ministry of Information, National Orientation Agency (NOA), Media (Print & Electronic, Social Media) to effectively disseminate information. An MoU was signed with NOA to ensure effective dissemination of information.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities.
and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
• Translation of information/publication of DRR into Local Languages
• Synergy between various organizations involved.
• Inadequate capacity at local level for information sharing

Recommendation;
• There should also be close working relations between Agencies responsible for Disaster Management information in the country.
• Improve capacity for information sharing especially at local level.

Core indicator 2
School curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

| primary school curriculum | Yes |
| secondary school curriculum | Yes |
| university curriculum | Yes |
| professional DRR education programmes | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

NEMA is collaboration with Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) has mainstreamed DRR/CCA into basic and Post basic curriculum. NEMA
is also collaborating with six Nigerian Universities for PGD and MSc in DRM. DRR has also been incorporated into professional programme such as Police Armed Force, Civil Defence, Town Planning and Architects.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
- Funding.
- Development of teachers guide/manual and materials
- Train the trainers

Recommendation
- Funding to support the programme.
- Capacity development for teachers.

Core indicator 3
Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification
Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research programmes and projects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator
(not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Institute for Socio-Economic Research (NISER) carries out research programmes and projects in various areas which includes DRR, Economic cost and benefits of DRR, Child Labour, Oil Exploration, and the Manifestation of Street Children (Causes and consequences), the consequence of Oil Spillage and Gully Erosion in the southern part of the country etc.

The Centres of Disaster Risk Management and Development Studies also conduct researches in DRR.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges
• Limited funding for DRR research
Recommendation
• There is need for more research in the areas of DRR with improved funding

Core indicator 4
Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

| Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk. | Yes |
| Training of local government | Yes |
### National Progress Report - 2013-2015

#### Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance for risk reduction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Emergency Management Agency with other stakeholders such as Federal Ministry of Information, Ministry of Education etc have been widely engaged in public education, Training of staff and stakeholders (State and Local government, NGO’s, FBO’s, Volunteers and the communities) for effective DRR. There are publications by NEMA on DRR practice.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

**Challenges**

- Language barrier especially at community level
- The DRR publications are not translated into local language for effective dissemination of information

**Recommendation**

- The available DRR Publications needs to be updated and translated into the basic Local Languages in Nigeria.
- Local languages should be used for sensitization, awareness and education especially at community level.
Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected areas legislation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment for ecosystem services (PES)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation projects and programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Federal Ministry of Environment has legislation in place for the protection of Forest Reserves, also legislation for the conduct of Environmental Impact Assessment for major development projects.

The ongoing Great Green Wall project to conserve and afforestate the desert prone belt. Other projects include the REDD project (Reducing Emission from Deforestation
and Degradation), the wetland initiative in the southern part of the country.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

i. Funding and insufficient capacity for the projects
ii. Rapid population growth (high growth rate 2.7%) which puts pressure on the environment.

Core indicator 2

*Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop and property insurance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment guarantee schemes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional and unconditional cash transfers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The following are put in place:
- Agricultural Insurance cooperation;
- Subsidy reinsurance and
- Tandatory insurance for certain categories of assets,
- temporary employment guarantee scheme.

There are programmes in place for crop and property insurance, conditional and unconditional cash transfers, micro finance, micro insurance such as SURE – P, Niger Delta Amnesty Programme, Small and Medium Scale Enterprises Development Agency (SMEDAN), National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), National Directorate of Employment (NDE) and the United Nations System for Cash Transfer during emergencies etc.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

i. Inadequate funding
ii. Youth unemployment
iii. Emergence of new hazards such as Terrorism, climate change.

Core indicator 3
Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets</td>
<td>The building of dams, agricultural projects which will reduce unemployment to increase the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resilience of the community, and the downstream population will be positively impacted.

| Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) was introduced to receive some percentage of profits from Business Concerns as Education Tax. The fund is being used to retrofit and renovate schools at all levels.

Millennium Development Goals (MDG) is a programme meant to carry out projects at all levels so as to increase the resilience of the people. The conduct of EIA is a way of mainstreaming DRR into developmental projects.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

- Political interference on decision and project implementation
- Bureaucracy involved in the process of obtaining approvals for funds

Core indicator 4

Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification
Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

| Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas | Yes |
| Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas | Yes |
| Training of masons on safe construction technology | Yes |
| Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities | Yes |
| Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development | Yes |
| Regulated provision of land titling | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Large scale urban flood management projects in major urban centers are being carried out. The Ecological programmes are being done to reduce erosion in the South East region.

There is also the provision of low income houses in many of the urban centers in Nigeria. Provision of low income houses and serviced plots and relocation of vulnerable communities from flood prone areas.

There are regulations and building codes for the development of real estate. The land use act regulates land titling by government.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

- Inadequate investment in urban flooding projects
- Low investment in urban areas as compared to population growth
- The provision of land and housing is not keeping up with the rate of population growth and urbanization.
- Weak enforcement of building codes and land use regulations.
Core indicator 5

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? Yes

| % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR | 5% |
| DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened | Yes |
| Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning | Yes |
| Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Post Disaster Needs Assessment explicitly incorporate DRR for resilience recovery, however, there is limited funding for the implementation of the recovery projects and programme. The recovery plan incorporated the issue of gender.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.
i. DRR activities have not been fully incorporated at local authorities and communities,
ii. There is a limited capacity for response and recovery at state and local level.
iii. The post disaster programmes are not fully funded for DRR resilient recovery.

Core indicator 6

*Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By national and sub-national authorities and institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By international development actors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

All sectors are involved in the reconstruction and recovery processes. There is an existing law for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which is expected to assess the impacts of disaster risk that can be created by major development projects.

EIA is compulsory in all major infrastructural development. Environmental Impact Act (EIA) empowers the ministry of environment to monitor compliance.
Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

i. Inadequate regulations
ii. Inadequate Monitoring and Evaluation
iii. Inadequate enforcement.
iv. Citizens participation is low
v. Political interference in the EIA report.
vi. Inadequate autonomy
vii. Institutional capacity and coordination
Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

| DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies | Yes |
| The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support. | Yes |

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

| Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety | Yes |
| Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness | Yes |

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

| Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections | Yes |
| Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios | Yes |
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There exist policies and programmes that are put in place in preparations to contingency planning and response.
- National Disaster Response Plan
- National Contingency Plan (NCP)
- Search and Rescue (SAR) & Epidemic Evacuation Plan
- National Disaster Management Framework
- National Contingency Plan on Infrastructural Resuscitation
- Draft Guidelines for the Use of Military Personnel & Assets During Emergencies
- National Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Plan
- Nigerian National Influenza Pandemic Preparedness
- Armed Forces of Nigeria Pandemic Contingency Plan
- Military Assistance to Civil Authorities (MACA) Disaster Contingency Plan

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

i. Inadequate M & E for the implementation of the programmes
ii. Inadequate of synergy between stakeholders in the implementation plans.

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and communications centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and rescue teams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles of relief supplies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure medical facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

- Contingency Plans at the national level has been developed and NEMA is equally encouraging the State Emergency Management Agencies to develop contingency plans for different scenarios.

- NEMA acquired Air Ambulance and Search & Rescue helicopter for emergency response.

- There are relief stockpiles in warehouses.

- NEMA also has a functional Simulation Unit under the department of Training for drills and simulations to test contingency and preparedness at the national and state levels

- Establishment of Emergency Call Centre and Situation Room

- Stockpile in all the NEMA regional and state offices.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the
country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

- Contingency plans at National and Sub-regional levels are not adequate. Development of incident specific contingency plans is necessary.
- Infrequent review of contingency plans

Recommendation:

There is need for state and local government to develop similar plans for preparedness and effective response. Similarly, the documents should be periodically reviewed. There is need to update our plan at regular intervals.

Core indicator 3

*Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

| National contingency and calamity funds | Yes |
| The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds | Yes |
| Insurance and reinsurance facilities | Yes |
| Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms | No |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's
ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Federal Government allocates 1% of the National Budget for ecological problems and 20% of that goes to disaster management in the country.

Insurance facilities for major infrastructure and insurance are compulsory for some properties.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

i. Increased frequency and magnitude of disasters, has made the funds inadequate.
ii. Insurance penetration is low

Recommendations:

i. Other sources of funds and are needed to compliment the allocation from Ecological funds Office.
ii. The framework for sovereign risk transfer for natural disaster.

Core indicator 4
Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? Yes

| Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available | Yes |
| Post-disaster need assessment methodologies | Yes |
| Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender | Yes |
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Under the umbrella of Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR) and the World Bank, the country has benefitted in capacity building programmes such as the Damages and Losses assessment and Post-Disaster Needs Assessment trainings. The training provided an agreed method and procedure to be adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur.

Experts were identified at National and sub-national level and trained on PDNA using standardized DaLA methods.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

i. There is need for continues capacity building for PDNA at all level.
ii. Inadequate baseline data for Needs assessment.
Drivers of Progress

a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

i. More emphasis should be placed on risk identification, monitoring and assessment.

ii. Need for more investment in major multi-hazard assessment.

b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)
Though the Ministry of Women Affairs has been established, there is need for gender mainstreaming into government policies, programmes and activities in all MDAs. This will include creation of gender desk in all ministries, department and agencies.

There is need for capacity building on gender issues at all levels.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

The training of community/grassroot volunteers, National Youth service Corps Vanguard, Executive Volunteer Corps needs to be scaled up for effective response.

Harmonized efforts for NGOs in order to capacitate them to enhance the activities at the local level.

Local institutions and communities needs to be properly trained for risk reduction and response.

There is need to build and strengthen institutions at local levels with the capacity for enforcement of DRR activities.

There is the need to identify and recruit more volunteers at the communities for proper response.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities
Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

There is need to ensure that National programmes considers the socio-economic risk of the vulnerable groups e.g in the area of social protection measures and safety net.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Need to develop mechanism to identify traditional knowledge in DRR in order to use NGOs and CBOs to integrate and harmonize into plans and programmes of DRR.

Contextual Drivers of Progress
Levels of Reliance
Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

- Strengthening DRR institutions at all levels.
- Peer review mechanism at national, sub-national and local level to integrate knowledge and experience into the plans.
- Improve synergy between DRR institutions at all levels.
Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable
development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special
emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability
reduction.

Overall Challenges

- Weak Legislative and institutional framework at sub-national and local level
- Weak capacity at all level to implements the plans
- Insufficient funding
- Weak regional and international cooperation

Future Outlook Statement

Ensure that DRR is mainstreamed into National Development Policies, Plans and
Programmes of governments at all levels.

Government should make budget provision and develop capacity for disaster
prevention, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at
all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to
building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

i. Weak institutions, mechanism and capacities in some of the states and the local
government.
ii. Inadequate resources for capacity development in DRR.
iii. Ineffective collaboration among stakeholders especially at the state and local
government levels.
iv. Inadequate political support to develop and strengthen institutions and capacities
especially at state and local government levels.
Future Outlook Statement

Encourage states and local governments to establish institutions, develop mechanism and build capacities for DRR. Collaboration among relevant stakeholders, adequate funding and political will is important.

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges

i. Resources allocated to disaster response are inadequate to mitigate disaster occurrences in the country i.e to respond to emergencies and recovery programmes as well as preparedness.
ii. Weak capacity at all levels.
iii. Non availability of Contingency Plan for various hazards.

Future Outlook Statement

Ensure dedicated fund for DRR activities at all levels for disaster preparedness, response and recovery.
Ensure that DRR is incorporated into policies, plans and programmes in disaster preparedness, response and recovery.
### Stakeholders

*Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Organization type</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the organization National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Aliyu Sambo, deputy director, disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Abbas Suleiman (Climate Change) (<a href="mailto:abbas_suleiman@yahoo.com">abbas_suleiman@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Women Affairs</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Mrs. Nkechi Onwukwe (<a href="mailto:kerisgold@yahoo.com">kerisgold@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria Meteorological Agency (NIMET)</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Joseph Alozie (<a href="mailto:jealozie@gmail.com">jealozie@gmail.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Friday Afiakurue (EIA) (<a href="mailto:fridayafiakurue@yahoo.com">fridayafiakurue@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria Hydrological Services Agency</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Rev. M.I Nwabufo (<a href="mailto:mnwabufo@yahoo.com">mnwabufo@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Stephen Ibem (<a href="mailto:steveibem@yahoo.com">steveibem@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Water Resources</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>C.I Okpaleke (<a href="mailto:christainokpaleke@yahoo.com">christainokpaleke@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>J.A Kehinde (<a href="mailto:akonjkdinde@yahoo.com">akonjkdinde@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Commission</td>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Mrs. Rahab Anyanwu (<a href="mailto:anyanwurahab@yahoo.com">anyanwurahab@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil society coalition for DRR</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>Badanga Lamidi (<a href="mailto:firengo@yahoo.com">firengo@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African youth movement</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>Uwen Robert (<a href="mailto:aymnig@yahoo.com">aymnig@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international foundation for the aged</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>Matilda Alao (<a href="mailto:foundationfortheaged@yahoo.com">foundationfortheaged@yahoo.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>