Objective: Common position from CCCM/Shelter in regards to the establishment of sites and security infrastructures by humanitarian partners to guide interventions on the ground

In view of:

- **The Humanitarian Principles**: Stating the impartiality, independence and neutrality of humanitarian interventions and the need to have a consistent impartial approach.

- **The IASC Civil-Military Coordination Guiding and Operating Principles**: Emphasizing the operational independence of humanitarian action. The independence of humanitarian action and decision-making must be preserved both at the operational and policy levels at all time. ‘The military nature of assets require increased attention to be paid to the need to ensure that humanitarian action is not only neutral and impartial in intent but also perceived to be so by the parties directly concerned’

- **The International Humanitarian Law**: According to an uncontroversial principle of customary international humanitarian law (IHL), parties to an armed conflict must distinguish between the civilian population and combatants and between civilian objects and military objectives. In order to spare civilians and the civilian population from hostilities and their effects, it is essential to define who and what may be attacked. The first rule regarding attacks (by acts of violence) is that the intended target must be a military objective. Under Protocol I, a target is military if it makes an effective contribution to military action. Some commentators argue that this does not imply the need for a target’s direct connection with specific combat operations. A military manual substitutes "war-fighting or war-sustaining capability" for military action and includes targets that “indirectly but effectively support and sustain the enemy’s war-fighting capability”.

- **And site standards**: Recommending to have a perimeter of 300 meters distance from the last shelter built to watch towers and military infrastructures.

The CCCM/Shelter Sector SAG advises on the following position regarding safety and security infrastructures in IDP sites

- The Government of Nigeria is responsible for security and is the primary actor responsible for providing security measures such as fencing, which can take several forms (wire, walls and other measures).

- In line with the above-mentioned paragraphs, humanitarian partners should not been involved in the establishment of perimeters to sites used for humanitarian purposes. The purpose of establishing such boundaries is, in terms of the scope of humanitarian assistance, to provide safety to residents within those sites (for example, to prevent animals from entering or children from running out into areas that would pose them risk). The provision of fences, barriers, boundaries, walls or other perimeter infrastructure intended for a security purpose will not be undertaken by the humanitarian community.

---

• As flexibility is required, the installation of minimum fencing by humanitarian partners can be justified only under a safety argument for protection of children, animals or adding boundaries to the camp as safe areas for IDP population. However, the building of fences cannot be justified as a security argument, which is the government responsibility.

• Watch tower construction, including operation and maintenance of any infrastructure serving the purpose of military, defensive and security-related infrastructure should not be provided either directly or indirectly by humanitarian partners. Installation of military infrastructure remains the main responsibility of the government.

• Should watch towers and associated infrastructure be necessary and installed by the State and/or military authorities, a minimum of 300 meter distance is to be advocated for between the watch towers and the last shelter installed.