



# Supporting Civil Society and Women's Rights Organisations in Fragile and Conflict Affected Contexts *Nigeria Report*

## 1. Introduction

As part of a consortium of organisations including Gender Action for Peace and Security (GAPS), Saferworld, Somali Women Development Centre, Women for Women International, Women's International Peace Centre, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) Nigeria and Womankind Worldwide have conducted a research exercise to look at the challenges and opportunities faced by women's rights organisations (WROs) and other civil society organisations (CSOs) working on issues relating to Women, Peace, and Security in [Somalia](#), [Nigeria](#) and [South Sudan](#). The research aimed to support the UK Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) Africa hub and the wider international community to better understand the landscape of WROs and CSOs in Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan operating at different levels; learn the challenges faced by - and opportunities for - these organisations (including in the current context of COVID-19); and have informed guidance on meaningful ways to strengthen the sector in alignment with the UK Government's and CSSF's Women, Peace and Security strategic outcomes.

In Nigeria, the research was led by Women for Women International (WFWI) and WILPF Nigeria. The research methodology involved desk literature review on profiling women's rights and civil society organisations across Nigeria and the donor funding mechanism. 25 key informant interviews (KIIs) were conducted with organisations working on issues of Women, Peace and Security from across 5 geopolitical zones of Nigeria.

Nigeria is currently facing significant levels of instability; the worst the country has experienced since the civil war of 1967-70. Poor governance, systematic and geographical inequalities, structural and structural violence, unequal representation among decision makers, and violent resolution of conflict due to poor conflict management mechanisms, and most recently the ENDSARS peaceful protest that was met with a violent state crackdown and brought the nation to an abrupt halt for days. These have all contributed to Nigeria's current ranking as the most violent country in Africa that is not 'at war' as of 2014.

Nigeria is a deeply patriarchal society in which women and girls struggle to access social, economic and political power that is equal to their male counterparts. Conflict and insecurity have left women and girls increasingly vulnerable to violence and exacerbated the harmful traditional and cultural practices that perpetuate gender inequality. This entrenched inequality, combined with a culture of silence around Violence Against Women and Girls, inadequate prevention and response mechanisms, and subsequent widespread impunity for perpetrators, means that Violence Against Women and Girls is endemic across Nigeria. Despite the disproportionate impact of conflict on women and girls, as well as the important role they play in the informal space in resolving conflicts at the household and community level, there is minimal female representation in formal conflict management and peacebuilding processes.

These challenges have given rise to the increase in WROs, CSOs and other groups and coalitions working to advance the Women, Peace and Security agenda across Nigeria. The activities of these organisations and groups have been significantly impactful but have also undoubtedly been hindered by challenges particularly when it comes to accessing and utilising sufficient funding.

## 2. Recommendations

### **Recommendation 1 – Increase availability of flexible, core and long-term funding for Women, Peace and Security, and direct this towards grassroots and local organisations.**

The amount of dedicated funding for women, peace and security should be increased – with flexible, core and long-term funding being directed to women’s rights organisations at an institutional level.

A specific percentage of funding should be allocated to grassroots and local organisations to amplify the voices of marginalised communities. These funding mechanisms should be designed, developed, evaluated and innovated in a participatory and inclusive way.

### **Recommendation 2 – Take an integrated, holistic and context-specific approach to funding**

Funding mechanisms should allow integrated approaches that are holistic and context-specific and provide women’s rights organisations with the funding breadth, depth and diversity they need.

This means that women’s rights organisations should be able to apply for funding for work that addresses multiple themes within Women Peace and Security rather than for only one programmatic intervention or theme.

### **Recommendation 3 – Fund relationship building, coalitions and networks for women’s rights organisations as well as specific organisations.**

The international community should support the building of both existing and new coalitions and networks to enable the sharing of skills and learning, peer accountability and review of standard operational practices that will help build less established organisations. These networks could be supported to provide specific capacity strengthening support to grassroots organisations to enable them to grow their institutional capacity, including in accessing and managing donor funding.

### **Recommendation 4 – Reach grassroots organisations through investing in specialist, well-anchored intermediaries, such as women’s funds.**

Where they cannot be accessed directly, grassroots, local organisations can be reached by investing in specialist, well-anchored funding intermediaries, such as women’s funds. These often have a track record of grant-making, connections with grassroots women’s groups, simplified application processes and systems to deal with financial risk. This investment in intermediaries should be guided by key principles that ensure that administrative and implementation burdens are not passed onto the local organisations. When being funded, grassroots organisations should be meaningfully included in the planning and design of any funding mechanisms from the outset.

### **Recommendation 5 – Improve accessibility of funding by simplifying application, budgeting and compliance processes.**

The international community should improve its accessibility by simplifying funding proposal application, budget requirements and compliance processes. This should mean that calls for proposals are: in national languages; give a clear timeline for the process; are launched with sufficient time for applicants to apply; submit in different formats (such as email and online). That funding applications are: accepted in national languages; do not require line-by-line list of activities but focus on outcomes; can be submitted in various formats (for example, via email not just via an online portal). Budgets should not be activity based and therefore constricting but focus on outcomes. Compliance should be scaled back to necessary information including: confirmation of registration/certification; submission of essential organisational and HR documents; bank statements; annual audit; and that due diligence and compliance is harmonised across donors to ensure organisations submit the same documentation to each donor rather than different information to each donor.

**Recommendation 6 – Prioritise MEL frameworks as a key element of funding mechanisms, and emphasise the learning element of the process.**

The international community should prioritise the implementation of existing MEL frameworks that are already in use by WROs— particularly at the grassroots and local level. The learning element of this process should be emphasised to ensure organisations can use the learning from programmes for their internal work as well as for donors to use. Such processes should have a focus on outcome reporting that looks at what has been achieved as a result of the funding, rather than a focus on activities. Where these frameworks do not yet exist, then develop frameworks collaboratively with WROs and CSOs.

**Recommendation 7 – Develop a standardised reporting (financial and narrative) format and/or system.**

Donors and INGOs should develop a standardised financial and narrative reporting format and/or system that is accessible, transparent and user-friendly. Reporting periods should be lengthened to 6 to 12 months maximum. Narrative reports should be accepted in national languages and should focus on outcomes rather than activities. Financial reports should allow flexibility between budget lines. Receipts should be required for expenditure only above agreed amounts and should be accepted in copies to enable organisations to keep receipts for national audit processes.

**Recommendation 8 – Provide capacity strengthening opportunities.**

The international community should provide capacity strengthening opportunities by a) funding lower capacity organisations with a view to building a longer-term partnership and b) designing and delivering specific capacity strengthening interventions with a specific focus on developing organisational capacity to apply for funding, manage budgets and fulfil monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements as well as organisational development, investment in staff and policy and advocacy.

**Recommendation 9 – Use diplomacy to support an independent civil society**

The international community has a key role to play in using diplomacy to influence the Government of Nigeria to ensure sufficient security, access to information and freedom of expression for WROs, CSOs and Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) to carry out their vital work.

### 3. Recommendations and evidence

#### **Recommendation 1 – Increase availability of flexible, core and long-term funding for women, peace and security, and direct this towards grassroots and local organisations.**

The amount of dedicated funding for Women, Peace and Security should be increased – with flexible, core and long-term funding being directed to WROs at an institutional level.

A specific percentage of funding should be allocated to grassroots and local organisations to amplify the voices of marginalised communities. These funding mechanisms should be designed, developed, evaluated and innovated in a participatory and inclusive way.

**Recommendation for:** Donors, multi-lateral institutions and INGOs

Donors and multilateral institutions should increase the availability of funding for Women, Peace and Security and introduce a funding target for funding women’s rights organisations and civil society organisations.

Investing in the infrastructure of organisations and movements is the basics of sustainability, resilience and long-term change. Often, funding opportunities are short term and project focused. Instead, funding should be guided by the intention of developing longer-term partnerships that build organisational capacity through multi-year core support and recognise “increased capacity” as a tangible and positive funding outcome.

In order to direct sufficient funding towards grassroots and local organisations, separate funding streams or windows should be established – for example, one for larger, more mature and established partners and another for newer and/or smaller grassroots organisations, to ensure a fair competitive process.

Funding mechanisms should be designed, developed, evaluated and innovated in a way that involves WROs, CSOs and women’s groups as experts and leaders.

#### **Country Evidence**

To respond to the humanitarian and security crisis in Nigeria, there has been an increase in donor agencies funding organisations at different levels and also working directly with the Federal Ministry of Women Affairs. Some of the notable agencies are UN Women, UNDP, NORAD, SIDA, the diplomatic communities and some international NGOs.

However, the amount of funding available for work relating to Women, Peace and Security priorities remains inadequate. Most participants in the key informant interviews in Nigeria lists this as one of their most fundamental challenges.

WROs in Nigeria also felt that, where limited funds are available, they are inaccessible to the smaller, grassroots organisations due to lack of information or capacity issues. Where possible, funding should be streamed to ensure a fairer, most competitive process. One participant noted: *“There is a need to categorise the access to funds between big, medium and small organisations.”*

Participants also outlined that funding mechanisms would be more accessible to smaller, local organisations if they were able to participate in and provide feedback on the design and delivery of funding mechanisms.

## **Recommendation 2 – Take an integrated, holistic and context-specific approach to funding.**

Funding mechanisms should allow integrated approaches that are holistic and context-specific and provide women's rights organisations with the funding breadth, depth and diversity they need.

This means that WROS should be able to apply for funding for work that addresses multiple themes within Women Peace and Security rather than for only one programmatic intervention or theme.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

WROs and movements require breadth, depth and diversity. Donors can best fund this through a mix of funding streams and mechanisms that enable partnerships with WROs, CSOs and groups of different sizes and capabilities, working at different levels and on different issues.

Funding mechanisms need to be designed in a way that recognises that WROs and CSOs do not work in siloes, and in reality, cut across themes, agendas and sectors. Currently, certain organisations cannot apply for the small amount of funding that is available since they do not fit into a narrow category of the 'type' of organisation or 'thematic issue' that they work on. Some donors also do not have calls for funding opportunities for amounts that are seen as relatively 'small', so smaller organisations are already excluded.

### **Country evidence**

Participants in Nigeria reported that funding for certain programme areas are more accessible than others, with one responding that *"Violence Against Women and Girls gets more attention these days"* while another noted that *"conflict prevention, peacebuilding and violence extremism"* are easier to fund. There can be a tendency for organisations to shift interventions to match donor priorities, but it is not feasible for organisations to focus on one area alone – most themes are cross cutting.

WROs should be able to apply for funding for work that address multiple themes relating to women, peace and security – and also addresses these priorities both directly and indirectly. For example, one participant noted that the latest poverty index (released in 2019) showed that poverty is at its highest in the Northern Nigeria. Implementing projects that reduce poverty could be particularly relevant for advancing Women, Peace and Security priorities.

### **Recommendation 3 – Fund relationship building, coalitions and networks for women’s rights organisations as well as specific organisations.**

The international community should support the building of both existing and new coalitions and networks to enable the sharing of skills and learning, peer accountability and review of standard operational practices that will help build less established organisations. These networks could be supported to provide specific capacity strengthening support to grassroots organisations to enable them to grow their institutional capacity, including in accessing and managing donor funding. Donors should map funds that are already available in the public domain, made available by others, to ensure they are making funding decisions that are complementary rather than duplicative.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

Working together, building coalitions and networking is a key opportunity for strengthening WROs and CSOs in Nigeria. It is also an excellent way of sharing funding opportunities with a wider pool of organisations and increasing accessibility to funding.

#### **Country evidence**

Poor networking and inadequate cooperation among organisations were identified by interview participants as a major challenge. It is the cause of duplication of efforts, conflicting strategies at the community level and a lack of learning from experience: *“The biggest opportunity is working together.”*

One participant outlined that it would be easier to access funding from the international community if there was more collaboration and a stronger relationships developed among grantees, partners and donors, and that there is currently lots of space for this among Nigeria civil society: *“there is room for collaboration and synergy.”*

Negative competition for resources also undermines the reputation of the sector and the effectiveness of CSO activities at the community level. As a result, there is a great deal of mistrust among WROs and CSOs, and a lack of transparency. As one participant put it: *“Having the capacity to write a good proposal does not always work...knowing men at the top may help better.”*

**Recommendation 4 – Reach grassroots organisations through investing in specialist, well-anchored intermediaries, such as women’s funds.**

Where they cannot be accessed directly, grassroots, local organisations can be reached by investing in specialist, well-anchored funding intermediaries, such as women’s funds. These often have a track record of grant-making, connections with grassroots women’s groups, simplified application processes and systems to deal with financial risk.

This investment in intermediaries should be guided by key principles that ensure that administrative and implementation burdens are not passed onto the local organisations. When being funded, grassroots organisations should be meaningfully included in the planning and design of any funding mechanisms from the outset.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

It is evident that donors and multilateral institutions can sometimes find it challenging to identify and fund the smaller, local organisations that have the relevant access, expertise and presence to implement effective Women, Peace and Security programmes – particularly at the community level. Where direct funding of grassroots organisations is not possible, one well-established way of reaching these organisations has been through investing in specialist funding intermediaries such as women’s funds or larger NGOs/INGOs. These intermediaries have a track record of grant making, processes and systems to manage large sums of money and the direct connections with grassroots organisations that the donors just do not have.

Any investment in larger organisations to act as intermediaries must be guided by sound partnership principles that enable WROs and smaller, local CSOs to engage meaningfully in the design and development of funding from the beginning of design so that any sub-grant arrangements are not driven by short-term approaches, but have a longer- term and more sustainable partnership in mind.

**Country evidence**

Participants - particularly the smaller, grassroots organisations - voiced concern that these larger organisations occupy so much space and receive such a high proportion of the available funding, that it can be hard for them to find room for themselves. Intermediaries can also unintentionally disempower the WROs and CSOs they are partnering with by taking a short term, project-based approach which excludes grassroots organisations from inputting into the design of funding mechanisms and becomes overburdensome.

One participant shared that, *“when you are not involved in [the design], you may not really understand the context and it becomes difficult for you to implement.”* Another claimed that *“it’s more difficult with the partners as it doesn’t give you the flexibility of what you encountered on the field. It is more difficult collaborating and uninteresting.”*

### **Recommendation 5 – Improve accessibility of funding by simplifying application, budgeting and compliance processes.**

The international community should improve its accessibility by simplifying funding proposal application, budget requirements and compliance processes. This should mean that calls for proposals are: in national languages; give a clear timeline for the process; are launched with sufficient time for applicants to apply; submit in different formats (such as email and online). That funding applications are: accepted in national languages; do not require line-by-line list of activities but focus on outcomes; can be submitted in various formats (for example, via email not just via an online portal). Budgets should not be activity based and therefore constricting, but focus on outcomes, or preferably on line items only (e.g. staff, equipment, office rent, communications, etc). Compliance should be scaled back to necessary information including: confirmation of registration/certification; submission of essential organisational and HR documents; bank statements; annual audit; and that due diligence and compliance is harmonised across donors to ensure organisations submit the same documentation to each donor rather than different information to each donor.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

More needs to be done to proactively raise awareness of funding opportunities among wider civil society, rather than simply uploading calls for proposals to websites. Networks and coalitions have a key role to play here, as highlighted in recommendation 4.

The international community should simplify funding application forms and proposal templates. These are often inappropriately structured for women's rights organisations and civil society organisations to provide the relevant information for the project they are proposing to implement.

Application forms and proposal templates should be simplified to fit WROs and CSOs capacities and make funding more accessible, for example making it possible to submit in various formats (via email, not just via an online portal). Budget requirements should also be less onerous.

The international community should also look to harmonise some of the due diligence and compliance requirements, at least across their own national funds, if not across multilateral and other nations' funding mechanisms. Donors should also consider graduating the due diligence processes according to size and capacity of organisation, so that national and local CSOs and WROs have lesser requirements than the INGOs that they are competing for funding with.

#### **Country evidence**

Overall, all participants consistently reported that it was not at all easy to access funds from the international community. Comments ranged from: *"So far, I have not really seen someone who gave a contrary opinion of how difficult it is"* to *"the main challenge is the bureaucratic bottlenecks in the system."*

Participants expressed difficulty in finding sufficient, appropriate, and continuous funding opportunities for their work. Many participants reported learning about funding opportunities through network partners, donors' sites and other online platforms – but that these were not always obvious, well-known or clear. One interviewee said: *"As an organisation, we depend mostly on referrals and calls for proposals advertised on donor websites to submit concept notes and proposals."* WROs and CSOs would like to see more proactive efforts from donors and partners to reach more potential grantees: *"There should be a more deliberate means of reaching out to organisations and not to subject them to untold hardship to access these funds."*

Even when the opportunities are identified, they are difficult to access. One reason cited was that the processes are too long and complicated, and that there are significant challenges around technical capacity and staff time for writing concept notes and proposals. Donors should take into account the challenges of consistent connectivity and internet access, be more flexible and inclusive with the language that proposals are advertised and accepted in, and ensure that the time-frame for developing and submitting a proposal is not unrealistically short. Participants claimed that calls for proposals are *"not easy to understand, especially the budget"* and that *"language can be a challenge for a lot of staff."*

Organisations also reported an inability to meet due diligence and compliance requirements due to a lack of capacity, inexperienced staff, size of organisation and a limited track record when it comes to previous funding experience. One



participant noted that: *“There are bigger organisations who have been doing it for long. And, so they get to access those funds much more easily because they meet with the requirements compared to the smaller organisations.”*

Some participants of the key informant interviews suggested that calls for proposals should be made easier for WROs and CSOs, and that guidance should be offered on proposal writing. Where proposals and applications are unsuccessful, timely feedback would help to increase chances of success in the future. One interviewee noted that, *“there are some donors that guide you through the whole process, giving definitions of some terms you are expected to respond to.”* This should be a more frequent occurrence.

**Recommendation 6 – Prioritise MEL frameworks as a key element of funding mechanisms, and emphasise the learning element of the process.**

The international community should prioritise the implementation of existing MEL frameworks that are already in use by women’s rights organisations – particularly at the grassroots and local level. The learning element of this process should be emphasised to ensure organisations can use the learning from programmes for their internal work as well as for donors to use. Such processes should have a focus on outcome reporting that looks at what has been achieved as a result of the funding, rather than a focus on activities. Where these frameworks do not yet exist, then develop frameworks collaboratively with WROs and CSOs.

**Recommendation for:** Donors, multi-lateral institutions and INGOs.

Donors, as a key element of funding organisations, should provide institutional support to local partners in terms of training and support to put in place the appropriate tools, systems and processes to develop an effective organisational MEL function. This includes allocating sufficient funding to programmatic and finance staff so that local organisations can attract the best and most experienced long-term staff to be able to deliver on their commitments to donors. Donors should also try and provide more consistent MEL frameworks so that they do not become overburdensome for WROs and CSOs but can be seen as a beneficial investment of time and resource.

**Country evidence**

Frameworks vary depending on project, partner and donor. *“Each project has either a result framework or performance measurement framework depending on the donor.”* One participant referred to some positive monitoring and evaluation processes that have been followed previously, such as *“undertaking monitoring and evaluation planning meetings and involving all stakeholders”*, *“conducting bimonthly monitoring of project inputs, outputs and outcomes to ensure compliance”* and *“using monitoring and evaluation to re-strategise for improvement.”*

One participant reported that, given they do not have the long-term staff to fulfil MEL obligations, they *“normally will employ an expert”* to do that for them.

There was a general consensus that MEL was more worthwhile when there was a long-term member of staff managing the processes.

### **Recommendation 7 – Develop a standardised reporting (financial and narrative) format and/or system.**

Donors and INGOs should develop a standardised financial and narrative reporting format across donors and/or system that is accessible, transparent and user-friendly. Reporting periods should be lengthened to 6 to 12 months maximum. Narrative reports should be accepted in national languages and should focus on outcomes rather than activities. Financial reports should allow flexibility between budget lines. Receipts should be required for expenditure only above agreed amounts and should be accepted in copies to enable organisations to keep receipts for national audit processes.

**Recommendation for:** Donors, multi-lateral institutions and INGOs

Donors and partners should make financial and narrative reporting easier by developing standardised formats and systems – this should focus on enabling implementing partners to focus on reporting on their impact rather than overly focusing on processes. To make financial and narrative reporting easier, donors and partners should provide training and guidance. They should also develop and revise reporting templates, requirements and frameworks in partnership with women’s groups.

#### **Country evidence**

It is recommended that donors and partners simplify reporting requirements and procedures and develop easier reporting documents and templates. Interviews in Nigeria highlighted that *“in most cases, [reporting processes] are very challenging and vague at times.”* Reporting requirements vary between partner, donors and project. Some processes are simple and straightforward, while others require more detail. Efforts should be made to harmonise these:

*“Some of the different ways of reporting to partners are; direct using of reporting templates for both narrative and financial and sent via an email; registering and logging into a donor portal to upload reports; filling in reporting templates. This differs in frequency - some partners/donors prefer monthly activity reports while others prefer quarterly or 6 monthly for both narrative and financial.”*

Participants recommended that donors and INGO partners should provide training on reporting requirements during the project inception workshop. Otherwise, there is a risk that WROs and CSOs do not really understand the information that is being required by the partner or donor, which can later become an issue.

### **Recommendation 8 – Provide capacity strengthening opportunities.**

The international community should provide capacity strengthening opportunities by a) funding low capacity organisations with a view to building a longer-term partnership and b) designing and delivering specific capacity strengthening interventions with a specific focus on developing organisational capacity to apply for funding, manage budgets and fulfil monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements. See recommendation 3 on support to national networks and coalitions – these networks and coalitions could be funded to provide tailored capacity strengthening to fund recipients.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

The international community should provide capacity strengthening opportunities for WROs and CSOs. This could be done by funding lower capacity organisations to develop their systems and processes with a view to building a longer-term partnership. Donor governments and multilateral institutions should ensure that specific funding and resources are made available to grassroots and local organisations in order to enable them to build their capacity – and better amplify the voices of marginalised communities.

Donors should also fund, design and deliver specific capacity strengthening interventions and programmes for WROs and CSOs, that focus specifically on applying for funding and developing proposals, writing reports, managing budgets, developing financial systems, meeting due diligence requirements. These interventions should be flexible and adaptable to meet the specific needs of the organisation.

### **Country evidence**

The lack of capacity of many civil society organisations and women’s rights organisations means that they are not able to compete for the available funding opportunities or feel confident in implementing work once it is funded, often because the funding provided does not compete with larger, better funded organisations in attracting and retaining experienced and skills staff.

When asked about the challenges faced by organisations’ in applying for funding opportunities, participants cited inadequate capacity and staff time as key issues. Interview participants cautioned that “*organisations are not all the same*” and that the “*issues and demands are dynamic*”, so a variety of trainings and support are required. In particular, KII participants discussed requiring capacity strengthening support for proposal writing, resource mobilisation, policy and advocacy, partnership development, budget management, and due diligence.

### **Recommendation 9 – Use diplomacy to support an independent civil society**

The international community has a key role to play in using diplomacy to influence the Government of Nigeria to ensure sufficient security, access to information and freedom of expression for WROs, CSOs and HRDs to carry out their vital work. In terms of funding, this to ensure that funding receipts can include protection mechanisms in their applications. In terms of diplomacy, they should use their diplomatic leverage to advocate for a strong, independent civil society.

**Recommendation for:** Donors and multi-lateral institutions

The Government of Nigeria needs to coordinate and cooperate with civil society to create a more conducive working environment. Corruption, insecurity and patriarchal norms present fundamental barriers to WROs and CSOs carrying out their vital work. The international community - including the new UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office - has a key role to play in this by using diplomacy to influence the environment for civil society in Nigeria and promoting mutual engagement between WROs and CSOs and the Government of Nigeria, for example by making supporting civic space a condition of international cooperation.

### **Country evidence**

There was general feedback among the interview participants that the environment for WROs and CSOs in Nigeria is particularly challenging. This prevents real barriers for them to conduct their important work. Sources of funding are shrinking, the capacity of WROs and CSOs to access funding is limited and this is alongside governmental interference in their work and restricted freedom of expression.

A number of interviewees noted that the patriarchal society in Nigeria - that has little regard for women-led organisations and a lack of political will to treat issues of gender equality and inclusion seriously – means that the landscape for women’s rights organisations is challenging. In addition to this, the challenge of violence was raised as a barrier to being able to implement projects and programmes of work, even when funding has been obtained: *“the security situation is a big concern...even if there are cars and money to go to advocate in the villages, the security situation won’t allow us to do so.”*

## 4. Partners

**Women for Women International:** Since 1993, Women for Women International has worked with more than 500,000 marginalised women survivors of war in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kosovo, Iraq, Nigeria, Rwanda and South Sudan. Our core work is centred on a holistic, rights-based year-long programme to address the needs of marginalised women in conflict-affected countries.

**Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) Nigeria:** WILPF is the oldest women's international peace organisation in the world, with over 42 sections covering all continents, an international secretariat based in Geneva and a New York office at the UN plaza focused on strengthening the work of the United Nations. WILPF Nigeria provides a platform to address challenges through peaceful and nonviolent means and for women to engage actively, to build the capacity of women at grassroots and national level and be part of a network of diverse women who are passionately seeking for peace through non-violent means all around the world.

**Gender Action for Peace and Security (GAPS):** GAPS is the UK's Women, Peace and Security civil society network. GAPS is a membership organisation of NGOs and experts in the field of development, human rights, humanitarian response and peacebuilding. GAPS was founded to progress the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. The role of GAPS is to promote and hold the UK Government to account on its international commitments to women and girls in conflict areas worldwide.