Each year, Sida conducts a humanitarian allocation exercise in which a large part of its humanitarian budget is allocated to emergencies worldwide. The allocation and subsequent disbursement of funds takes place in the beginning of the year to ensure predictability for humanitarian organisations and to allow for best possible operational planning. Sida’s humanitarian assistance is based on the four humanitarian principles, in particular **impartiality**, with its compelling urge to ensure that humanitarian action is carried out based on "**needs alone**", giving priority to the "**most urgent cases of distress**". Therefore, Sida’s allocation methodology is grounded in several objective indicators such as; the **scale** of humanitarian needs (number of people in need), the **severity** of humanitarian needs (including food insecurity/IPC levels), the number of people targeted for the humanitarian response, the **financial coverage** of the respective humanitarian appeal, **national capacities** to respond and underlying risks, as well as distinct indicators related to **forgotten crises**. Sida also strongly supports the humanitarian coordination structures.

For 2021, Nigeria is allocated an initial 135 MSEK. Close monitoring and analysis of the situation in Nigeria will continue throughout the year and inform possible decisions on additional funding.

## 1 Crisis overview

### 1.1 Humanitarian overview

The armed conflict in northeast Nigeria is entering its 11\textsuperscript{th} year, affecting the states of Borno, Yobe and Adamawa, and spilling over into neighbouring countries; Niger, Chad and Cameroon. Violence erupted in 2009, and in 2013 hostilities escalated into a non-international armed conflict that nessecitated the cooperation between the Nigerian armed forces and a Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) comprising of forces from Nigeria, Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Benin, on the one side, aimed at uprooting the Islamic State’s West Africa Province (ISWAP), Jama’at Ahl as-Sunnah lid-Da’wah wa’l-Jihad (JAS, commonly referred to as Boko Haram), and the JAS-aligned Bakura faction disruption. The two non-state armed groups (NSAGs) ISWAP and JAS are the result of Boko Haram’s split in 2016. The underlying causes of the conflict are what many refer to as a development crisis, dating back to the days of British colonial rule. The disparities between north and south established at that time have perpetuated up to today. The conflict intensified notably mid-2019, resulting in significant deterioration in the humanitarian situation for the populace in the affected areas. 2021 presents a gloomy prognosis as the destabilisation effect from conflict is expected to continue unabated. Factors
that have contributed significantly to the intensified conflict are the withdrawal of Chadian troops from Nigerian soil, as well as the so-called “supercamp strategy” adopted by the Nigerian military in Borno during the summer in 2019 following heavy losses over a long period of time. The strategy entailed concentrating military presence, troops and equipment over 20 strategic locations (garrison towns), leaving a security vacuum in large areas and on road axes in Borno. This opened up these unsecured areas for NSAGs to carry out attacks on both roads and towns with devastating consequences for civilians and humanitarian actors.

According to OECD statistics, Nigeria is by far the country most affected by violence in West Africa. According to OCHA, 35 000 people have been killed in the northeast since 2009. The armed conflict in the northeast risks being repeated in the northwest if violence in this part of the country is not addressed. In addition, farmer-herder clashes are continuously occurring across the country, while the Niger Delta suffers from intermittent maritime crime and conflict dynamics. The COVID-19 crisis and low oil prices (and oil-production reductions by OPEC) compound Nigeria’s economic and security challenges. In addition to the armed conflict, regular epidemics and climate hazards are contributing to the growing humanitarian needs in the northeast. Various regions of this large country is seasonally prone to floods, drought and public health emergencies. In September 2020, heavy floods affected the northwest in particular, destroying a quarter of the annual rice harvest. In the northeast, extensive infrastructure was damaged in IDP camps during the rain season.

The pandemic led to movement restrictions, closure of schools and government agencies, and has had an important impact on Nigeria’s economy and on people’s access to livelihoods. The full impact of COVID-19 is expected to emerge in the second half of 2021, but consequences are already materializing. For instance, the already critical food insecurity situation has deteriorated even further. Gender inequalities are reported to have been exacerbated and there are records of growing stigmatisation of vulnerable groups.

With the onset of COVID-19, the number of PIN rose from 7.9 million to 10.6 million, which was later adjusted to 8.5 million. The violence has led to large number of people fleeing their homes, and large number of people are in need of shelter and NFI assistance. At the time of writing, the number of IDPs in the northeast surpasses 2 million. Over 240,000 Nigerians have sought refuge in neighbouring countries and close to 550,000 are internally displaced in those countries due to the spreading of the conflict over the borders, and in Cameroon to a large extent also due to the Anglophone crisis in the Northwest and Southwest regions (270,870 in Cameroon, 169,000 in Chad, and 109,000 in Niger). Entering 2021, the number of people in need (PIN) of humanitarian aid is projected to be at a staggering 8.9 million people, with 1.2 million of these in hard-to-reach areas or areas inaccessible to humanitarian actors. This is an increase from the 7.9 million people at the beginning of 2020. The number of people that will be targeted for humanitarian aid is 6.2 million, compared to 5.7 million at the beginning of 2020.

The majority of the IDP camps are already considered congested, increasing the risk for epidemics, but challenges with land allocation limit possibilities to decongest the camps. In August 2020, the Borno State government urged the Borno State Task Force on the Return of Refugees and IDPs to accelerate the process to resettle IDPs. The stated purpose of returns was
to first decongest the camps, and eventually relocate all IDPs from Maiduguri to their Local Government Areas of origin by May 2021. On August 10, 2020, the Borno State Government begun the resettlement of IDPs without coordinating with humanitarian actors. The initiative sparked strong reactions from both humanitarian actors and donors as returns with primarily taking place to locations that were neither safe or secured, nor accessible to humanitarian actors. Humanitarian actors and the donor community advocated for the returns program to abide by the Kampala Convention principles and guidelines. Rather than returning displaced people to areas that are not deemed safe, the humanitarian community is advocating for the decongestion of the camps, and for returns to be carried out to places that are secure and where services are available. A decongestion mitigation strategy is under development by the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) and shelter sectors in order to expand IDP camps and build additional shelters to mitigate risks of, for example, disease outbreaks.

Food insecurity is worsening in the three BAY states, compounded by COVID-19. Even though the yield from farming has been relatively good this 2020 season, loss of salary and increased prices have seen a heavy toll on people’s capacity to access and buy food. According to the latest official food security assessment and projections, up to 5.1 million people risk being critically food insecure in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe during the next lean season period of June to August 2021. Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) in children aged 6-59 months increased from 6.7 % in 2017 to 11% in 2019, exceeding the WHO threshold of 10 %. The levels of acute malnutrition are expected to further increase in Borno in 2021, from Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC AMN Phase 2 (Alert) to Phase 3 (Serious). In November 2020, it was announced that US$80 million had been allocated from the CERF to urgently support cash programming to respond to rising food insecurity in six countries, including Nigeria that was allocated US$15 million (the others being Burkina Faso, DRC, South Sudan, Yemen and Afghanistan). In September 2020, the worrying food security situation prompted the UN USG, Mark Lowcock, to send a note to Security Council members warning about worsening food insecurity (White Paper), including the risk of famine, as a result of armed conflict in the four countries. The note was sent in accordance with UN SC Resolution 2417 requesting the Secretary General to report swiftly to the Council when there arises “the risk of conflict-induced famine and widespread food insecurity”.

Moreover, the impact of the protracted conflict has had devastating effects on health services. Immunisation coverage in Borno is estimated to only 46 %, under-five mortality is 86/1000 live births and maternal mortality outlook in Nigeria is currently at 917/100 000 live births.

1.2 Affected population

The population suffering from the most severe and acute humanitarian needs are those residing in areas affected by the conflict, and the locations hosting large numbers of IDPs and returnees. The majority of people in need are in Borno State. The impact vary between different groups, and there are obvious gendered dimensions. While the majority of civilians who are injured or killed are males, women and children constitute over 80% of the overall crisis affected population. The conflict has a particularly devastating impact on women and children leading to high numbers of female and child-headed households, elderly and chronically ill, persons with disabilities, and unaccompanied/separated children. The impact also varies between urban
and rural populations and their access to livelihoods. The protracted nature of the conflict, with repetitive shocks and many being displaced multiple times, is eroding people’s resilience and coping mechanisms and many therefore have to resort to negative coping mechanisms such as sale of livelihood assets, child labour, child, early and forced marriage, and transactional sex.

Grave violations of international humanitarian and human rights law are pervasive in northeast Nigeria, and protection of the affected population is a major concern. Protection risks include, but are not limited to, attacks on civilians and civilian locations, either directly targeted or caught up in military and NSAG operations, forced and underage recruitment, restrictions on freedom of movement, denial of access to resources and basic services, arbitrary detention and forced disappearances, as well as several forms of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). The presence of mines and explosives remnants of war also constitute an important threat. Health facilities, IDP camps and schools are frequently targeted. SGBV affect women and girls in particular, and involve both parties to the conflict and family members. Kidnapping or killing of civilians who venture out of the camps to fetch firewood or water, or who are travelling between different locations, occur frequently. The ICRC has nearly 23 000 people registered as missing in Nigeria, the highest number worldwide. More than 90 % are missing as a result of the conflict in the northeast, and more than half of the cases are children. Statistics point to SGBV increasing. Child, early and forced marriages and transactional sex is on the rise due to the lack of economic opportunities and ensuing negative coping mechanisms, and violence and abuse targeting women and girls are increasing. Men and adolescent boys are at risk of forced recruitment by armed actors, arbitrary arrest and detention, as well as being disadvantaged in terms of access to assistance because of suspicions that they might be members or supporters of NSAGs.

Given the magnitude of protection issues and the massive needs that arise from violence and abuse, it is absolutely critical that protection is at the centre of the humanitarian response. Priority must increasingly be given to reaching protection outcomes, i.e. reducing the risks facing the affected population.

1.3 National and local response

With the important need for implementing partners, the number of national/local NGOs engaged in the crisis has increased since the beginning of the crisis. The establishment of a Country Based Pool Fund (CBPF) in 2017 opened up the opportunity for these organisations to get direct funding. An important national humanitarian actor is the Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS). They have a vast network of volunteers and branch offices in all states and work in close collaboration with the ICRC. This allows for the ICRC to reach out to people in need who they would otherwise struggle to assist.

The government does officially have the lead in the humanitarian response, with UN agencies and NGOs being partners and co-leading the sectors. The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) coordinates the response operation between humanitarian partners and relevant ministries. At the state level, the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) coordinates the humanitarian response. Both NEMA and SEMA have limited capacity resulting in the humanitarian community taking a greater responsibility in providing humanitarian
protection and assistance. The Nigerian authorities’ performance overall is below expectations and detailed information regarding their contribution has not been forthcoming. In 2019, the Nigerian government created a new Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development (FMHDS). This was seen by both donors and humanitarian actors as a positive step away from a military-driven strategy largely found to be failing. The establishment of a High-Level Policy Forum (HLPF) by the FMHDS to ensure regular exchange and communication between the Nigerian authorities and the humanitarian community was also seen as a positive step in the right direction. The establishment of the FMHDS was expected to improve the coordination between the different institutions and levels of government, but so far it appears that it has not had the effect hoped for.

With regards to the international humanitarian response, Nigeria has a UN Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), who is also the UN Resident Coordinator (RC), supported by a Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator (DHC) based in Maiduguri, Borno. The HC leads the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), the strategic and operational decision-making forum for the humanitarian response in northeast Nigeria. OCHA plays a key support role for the effective coordination of the response, including a critical role in Civil-Military Coordination (CMCoord), as well as assisting the HC in the management of the Nigerian Humanitarian Fund (NHF). There is, however, an overall dissatisfaction with OCHA, in particular with regards to its CMCoord and access work, and advocacy towards the Nigerian authorities on important issues. INGOs often relate that there is a lack of transparency, inclusiveness and coordination on advocacy, for example on access to inaccessible areas or on the recent issue of returns taking place in Borno. There is a large community of INGOs working in northeast Nigeria, and despite the challenging environment they manage to provide extensive support to a large number of beneficiaries. An INGO Forum has been established for coordination and information sharing purposes, commonly referred to as the NIF (Nigeria INGO Forum).

The humanitarian community in Nigeria is also looking into how a common platform for cash assistance could be developed to reduce duplication and improve quality of humanitarian assistance. Nigeria is one of two pilot countries for the Global Donor Cash Forum (GDCF), a forum including ECHO, Denmark, Germany, Norway, Switzerland, the UK, the US and Sweden. Sida will encourage partners in Nigeria to enhance their work to strengthen aid effectiveness through coordinated and harmonized cash programming in line with the UN Common Cash Statement, NGOs Collaborative Cash Delivery as well as the DCF common vision whenever relevant and feasible. Part of the Swedish dialogue with partners in country would be the issue of Deduplication, Data interoperability, Harmonized programming among cash actors, especially those running MPC programs, drawing from both the DCF common vision as well as the three pillars of The UN Common Cash Statement of UNICEF, OCHA, UNHCR and WFP (2).

Nigeria has a multi-year Humanitarian Response Strategy (2019 – 2021) with the following Strategic Objectives:

- Save lives by providing timely and integrated multi-sector assistance and protection interventions to the most vulnerable.
• Enhance timely, unhindered and equitable access to multi-sector assistance and protection interventions through principled humanitarian action.

• Strengthen the resilience of affected populations, promote early recovery and voluntary and safe durable solutions to displacement and support social cohesion.

The financial requirement of the 2021 HRP is estimated at US$1.1 billion initial, which is a significant increase compared to the US$ 800 million required in 2020, going up to over US$1 billion following increased needs due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At the end of 2020, funding levels reached 60%. With the protracted nature of the crises, there is a downward trend in funding for Nigeria with 2020 funding being the lowest since 2014.

The most important donors for the humanitarian response in northeast Nigeria are (in order of contribution amount) US, Germany, Spain, ECHO, Sweden, Norway and Canada. In addition to humanitarian support, most donors also engage in development and stabilisation efforts targeting northeast Nigeria. The Borno State government in particular is determined to pursue a longterm development agenda and just recently launched a 25-year “Development Plan” that includes a 10-year transformation strategy setting out key priorities and action plans for the short, medium and long term. Humanitarian actors are worried that already limited space for principled humanitarian action will be further hampered by a push from the Borno State authorities to align with their development agenda.

1.4 Challenges and risks for the humanitarian response

Access to people in need is a critical challenge in northeast Nigeria with humanitarian actors relying heavily on UNHAS helicopters to visit locations outside of Maiduguri. With humanitarian operations only taking place in areas controlled by the Nigerian military, it is hard to argue that humanitarian action is principled. An estimated 85% of Borno is under the control, or strong influence, of NSAGs and completely inaccessible to humanitarian actors. Up to 1.2 million people are believed to live in those areas, which is more than the hard-to-reach people in, for example, Syria. Threats and violence against humanitarian actors from NSAGs on the one hand, and restrictions on humanitarian operations and bureaucratic controls by the Nigerian military on the other, are preventing organisations to reach out to people in need in areas not controlled by the Nigerian military. Counter-terrorism legislation further complicates operations, with humanitarian actors unable to establish adequate links with NSAGs to negotiate access. Difficulties have increased during the course of 2020 due to the negative trend in the overall security situation. The withdrawal of the Nigerian military troops from road axes and a number of attacks on humanitarian aid workers have made travelling by road even more difficult than before. Increasingly hostile ISWAP rhetoric and activity towards humanitarians is a major concern, with the number of incidents affecting NGOs having continued to increase in 2020. The incidents include two attacks on the humanitarian hubs, in Ngala in January 2020, and in Monguno in June 2020. Fifteen aid workers have been killed since 2019, twelve were killed last year and three in an incident that took place in July 2020.

Increased engagement with government and military actors to discuss the critical importance of principled humanitarian action in northeast Nigeria remains an imperative. Work to update the Access Strategy that was issued in 2018 has been ongoing. However, given OCHA’s limited capacity when it comes to CMCoord and negotiation on access, as well as the impact of counter-
terrorism legislation, there is limited hope for the issue of access to areas not controlled by the Nigerian military being addressed adequately.

Financing for humanitarian operations is another challenge, with humanitarian actors’ operations being underfunded. In addition to this challenge, humanitarian actors also face difficulties when it comes to recruiting experienced staff due to the insecure and difficult working and living conditions. Last but not least, with Nigeria ranking 146/198 in Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index (2019), risks of corruption remain high.

2 Sida’s humanitarian allocation

2.1 The role of Sida’s humanitarian support

Since the major scale up of the humanitarian response in northeast Nigeria in the second half of 2016, Sida has maintained an important level of support to strategic partners present on the ground. Sida’s support has been instrumental in establishing the CBPF (NHF) in 2017 as well as in the construction of the humanitarian hubs through support to the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency, MSB. The humanitarian hubs include a base camp in Maiduguri and seven strategic field hubs in hard to reach areas in Borno and have been instrumental in increasing humanitarian actors’ presence in hard-to-reach areas. Support to InterAction from 2019 for their project focusing on extending comprehensive and continuous support to field-based NGOs in northeast Nigeria, amongst other countries, to foster increased practical know-how in order to address critical protection concerns using results-based and outcome-oriented approaches to protection, has led to more coordinated efforts in addressing protection concerns and an increased focus on reducing protection risks.

In 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, Sida’s support was, 240 million SEK, 130 million SEK, 152,5 million SEK and 181,17 MSEK respectively. The 2020 funding was channelled through the CBPF/NHF, UNICEF, ICRC, OCHA, WFP, FAO, IOM, ACF, NRC and IRC.

Since the important scale-up of humanitarian protection and assistance in northeast Nigeria towards the end of 2016, access constraints have been hampering actors’ capacity to reach out to people in need. Despite efforts to increase access, the issue appears to have become even more difficult over time. Increased efforts to understand the dynamics at stake and support initiatives that can lead to an improvement will therefore be amongst the priorities for Sida’s follow up and dialogue with partners in 2021.

2.2 Allocation Priorities 2021

Given the further deterioration of food insecurity in northeast Nigeria, potentially leading to famine for some, food security and nutrition will be an important focus for Sida in 2021. Another area that will continue to be prioritized is enhancing the protection of affected populations, with a focus on reducing the risks that affected people are exposed to. As in previous years, Sida’s Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) will be prioritized for interventions to areas that becomes accessible to humanitarian actors, and to locations with a rapid and extensive influx of newly displaced populations. Cash as a modality will be given priority
whenever possible to stimulate local markets and to give people the possibility to make their own choices.

### 2.3 Partners

Based on humanitarian needs, prevalent protection risks and priorities, and humanitarian actors’ field presence, operational capacity and expertise, Sida will provide support to UNICEF, WFP, FAO, the CBPF (NHF), NRC, IRC and AAH. Support to IOM will not be continued in 2021, since Sida’s humanitarian unit is phasing out support to this organization. The partners that remain in Sida’s Nigeria portfolio are seen to have an added value in the overall humanitarian response, and to provide strategic support to people in need in the areas of protection, health and food security and nutrition in particular.

Sida monitors each partner’s adherence to gender marker codes, conflict sensitivity, resilience, and accountability as well as their capacity to integrate and contribute to protection outcomes for people affected by the crisis irrespective of their sector-specific expertise. Project proposals for 2021 are reviewed to ensure that supported projects are coordinated within the broader humanitarian response to the crisis.

**UNICEF** is sector lead in nutrition, education, WASH and the child protection sub-sector in Nigeria, and delivers an integrated package of interventions to affected populations in northeast Nigeria. They have a good operational capacity and extensive field presence, and Sida support to the HAC will continue in 2021.

**WFP** is the lead agency for relief food and emergency logistics and telecommunications. Since 2019, they have stepped up their work on protection made possible by the addition of a protection advisor to the country team. As in previous years, Sida support will continue to focus on humanitarian logistics in 2021 (UNHAS).

**FAO** is at the forefront of providing much needed emergency agricultural livelihood assistance to an increasing number of people in need. Protection is integrated in FAO’s interventions with the purpose to mitigate exposure to risk in particular for women-led households. In 2021, FAO will focus on providing critical support to IDPs, returnees and vulnerable host communities to resume and rebuild their agricultural livelihoods.

**ICRC** responds to the humanitarian crisis in the northeast and has added value which lies both in its capacity to reach people in hard-to-reach areas with both assistance and protection, and in promoting respect for IHL and other normative frameworks. In 2021, an important priority for the ICRC will be to continue trying to reach people who are currently in areas inaccessible to humanitarian actors. Nigeria is the organisation’s 5th largest operation globally.

**NRC** has been confirmed, by monitoring field visits, to be a strong humanitarian actor with good operational capacity and a particular focus on hard-to-reach areas. In 2021, NRC’s programme objective is to contribute to protection and search for durable solutions for vulnerable, conflict-affected populations in northeast Nigeria. Programming will include food security and livelihoods, shelter, CCCM, WASH (including COVID-19 mitigation response), ICLA and education.
IRC is an important provider of health and nutrition services, who mainstreams and integrates protection into its programmes. In 2021, Sida support will continue to focus on the provision of services in the hard-to-reach outskirts of MMC and Jere LGAs in Borno state, in particular to communities hosting large numbers of IDPs, with a high concentration of Moderate and Severe Acute Malnutrition cases, high number of vulnerable women and girls, and SGBV survivors. The intervention will also focus on strengthening local health systems and capacities. The IRC is the protection cluster co-lead in Borno, and a member of the protection collective that has been set up with support from InterAction (also funded by Sida).

Action against Hunger (AAH) has managed to maintain its operations and continue to deliver high-quality and much needed assistance in the areas of nutrition, health and WASH, despite difficulties during the course of 2020 such as abduction and assassination of staff. Sida will continue its support to AAH in 2021, focusing on emergency WASH and NFI assistance in Borno and Yobe states (RRM) to the most affected population (newly displaced, new arrivals and those whose shelters were destroyed by floods). The lifesaving response delivered within the frame of the RRM will seek to have synergies with other AAH long-term projects in the two states, thereby striving for a transition from crisis to early recovery.

CBPF (Nigeria Humanitarian Fund) is an important instrument for addressing critical response gaps and for enabling national NGOs to receive direct funding (about half of the NHF partners are national NGOs). Substantial funding from Sida in 2017 was critical for the establishment of the fund, and since then support to the NHF remains a priority. Since its launch, the NHF has been struggling with timely allocations. Work is ongoing to address this issue, with hopes for more speedy allocations in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended partner for Sida support</th>
<th>Sector/focus of work and response modalities</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBPF (NHF)</td>
<td>Multisector</td>
<td>22 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Health, Nutrition, WASH, Child Protection</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP (UNHAS)</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food Security and Livelihoods</td>
<td>9 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>Protection, Economic Security, Water and Habitat, and Health</td>
<td>30 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Food security, Livelihoods, Shelter, CCCM, WASH, ICLA, education and protection</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>Health, Nutrition, Protection,</td>
<td>13 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
<td>WASH, Shelter and NFI</td>
<td>11 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>135 000 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Strategic humanitarian funding and longer-term assistance

Nigeria faces more extreme poverty today than any other country in the world. According to the Sustainable Development Report 2019, 12 of the 17 SDGs face major challenges being met in Nigeria, including SDG 1 (No Poverty), 2 (Zero Hunger), 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), and 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation). In addition, Nigeria is one of the countries in the world most vulnerable to climate change and with a very low level of adaptation and readiness. The north of the country will see increasing instances of drought and desertification, and the rest of the country will see increasing flooding. This will have a devastating impact on agriculture production, which is already insufficient to feed the country. Yet, Nigeria is not a failed state, it is the 27th largest economy in the world in terms of GDP. The government is, however, primarily focusing on the capital, Abuja, its financial centre, Lagos, and other income-generating regions (oil, trade, etc.). The petroleum industry has created revenues that have enabled Nigeria to become a middle-income country and Africa’s largest economy, yet huge disparities exist between and within its geographic zones. 51% of the population in Nigeria as a whole, and a staggering 77% in the northeast, live below the poverty line and has no, or very limited, access to health care, education, safe drinking water or other basic goods and services. There is no Swedish bilateral development aid to Nigeria. Development support is provided within the frame of Sweden’s regional strategy for development cooperation with sub-Saharan Africa (2016-2021) focusing on environment and poverty-related objectives, democracy, human rights and gender equality, human security and freedom from violence. Funding is also provided within the frame of different thematic strategies such as the Sustainable Peace strategy that for Nigeria includes core funding to CIVIC, Conciliation Resources, International Alert and Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, as well as funding for the Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme on Peace and Development Advisors (within the new UNDP Peacebuilding Support), and UNDP Global Rule of Law Programme (within the UNDP Peacebuilding Support).

Bilateral and multilateral development funding to northeast Nigeria is overall substantial, including funding from the World Bank, UNDP and other UN agencies. Within the framework of Team Europe (TE) initiatives in Nigeria (2021-2027), two potential areas have been proposed: Green Economy and Peace & Governance. It is anticipated that these areas will be proposed as broad priority areas for the future Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) for Nigeria (2021-2027). With regards to the northeast, initiatives within the area of Peace & Governance in particular will be in focus, including EU and EU Member States’ diplomatic, development and peacebuilding instruments, through both short-term engagement and longer-term development interventions. The EU is also focusing on how the link between humanitarian and development initiatives can be strengthened in a number of pilot countries, one of them being Nigeria.

Within the UN, and the framework of “The new way of working”, OCHA, UNDP and DPPA are focusing on “collective outcomes”. There is a joint Steering Group with a pilot project ongoing in seven countries, including Nigeria.
There are also national and regional development plans for the northeast and Lake Chad Basin region. An important longer term initiative, to which Sida provides support, is the UNDP’s Regional Stabilization Facility (RSF) for Lake Chad, a fund that aims at facilitating the implementation of the Regional Stabilization Strategy (RSS) of the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC). The RSS strives to strengthen security and rule of law, improve essential infrastructure and the functioning of basic services, and increase livelihood opportunities for communities affected by the armed conflict in Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria. The “Nigeria Window” of the RSF targets seven communities in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa. Dialogue and exchange between the geographical focal point at Sida’s humanitarian unit and Sida’s regional nexus advisor in charge of Sida’s support to the Regional Stabilisation Facility is important to identify opportunities for complementarities and synergies between Sida’s support to humanitarian interventions on the one hand and the RSF on the other. Particular attention is afforded to the risks that links between humanitarian, development and peace interventions poses for humanitarian actors’ access to affected populations and their security.

In November 2020, the Borno State launched a 25-year “Development Plan” that includes a 10-year transformation strategy setting out key priorities and action plans for the short, medium and long term.
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