

NAVIGATING UNCERTAIN WATERS:

**LEGAL RISKS FOR NIGERIAN ENTITIES UNDER
USAID'S EVOLVING STRUCTURE**



INTRODUCTION

Recent developments in U.S. foreign aid policies, particularly under the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), have significant implications for Nigerian entities. Structural reforms driven by the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) have triggered changes that threaten the stability of USAID-funded projects in Nigeria. These changes come at a time when global funding priorities are shifting, leaving many development projects in limbo.

For Nigerian businesses, NGOs, and government agencies reliant on USAID funding, these changes present critical legal risks. This article explores these issues in detail and suggests ways Nigerian entities can protect their interests.

Recent USAID Developments and Their Impact on Nigerian Entities

The USAID restructuring and budget cuts have been accompanied by a significant shift in U.S. foreign aid priorities. These include:

1. **Increased Focus on Domestic Priorities:** Recent U.S. administration policies emphasize reducing foreign aid commitments in favor of domestic development programs.
2. **Restructuring of Regional Programs:** USAID has consolidated several regional programs, leading to delays in project approvals and changes in funding disbursement timelines.
3. **Introduction of New Compliance Standards:** Stricter reporting on project outcomes and financial accountability is now required, increasing the administrative burden on recipient organizations.

Real-World Example

In 2024, a Nigerian agricultural cooperative faced a sudden suspension of USAID funding for a rural development project due to a shift in U.S. priorities toward climate change initiatives. This suspension led to the cooperative's inability to fulfill its obligations to local farmers, resulting in lawsuits from subcontractors and supply chain partners.

Legal Risks for Nigerian Entities

The evolving USAID landscape poses several legal risks, particularly for entities with ongoing contractual obligations.

1. **Breach of Contract Claims:** If USAID withdraws or reduces funding, affected entities may face contract disputes. Force majeure and material adverse change clauses may offer limited protection, but organizations should carefully review their agreements to determine the scope of their legal options.
2. **Liability for Incomplete Projects:** Entities may face lawsuits if project disruptions prevent them from fulfilling obligations to subcontractors or employees.
3. **Regulatory and Compliance Risks:** Non-compliance with dual regulatory frameworks (U.S. and Nigerian) could result in significant penalties.

Legal Avenues for Redress and Protection

Despite the challenges, several legal remedies and protective measures are available to Nigerian entities:

1. **International Legal Remedies:** Diplomatic channels and international frameworks, such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, may offer relief.
2. **Litigation in Nigerian Courts:** While limited by sovereign immunity, affected entities may still explore local judicial redress for breaches of local obligations.
3. **Arbitration and Mediation:** Arbitration provides a neutral forum for resolving disputes, bypassing sovereign immunity barriers.

Future Prospects for Nigerian-USAID Partnerships

Despite the current uncertainties, future prospects for Nigerian entities partnering with USAID remain cautiously optimistic. Emerging areas such as climate resilience, digital transformation, and renewable energy are likely to attract renewed USAID focus. Nigerian entities should position themselves to take advantage of these evolving priorities by adapting their project strategies and expanding their expertise in these sectors.

Insights from Recent Arbitration Cases

Recent arbitration cases involving cross-border contracts provide valuable lessons for Nigerian entities. In a 2023 case before the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), a West African NGO successfully secured compensation for a unilateral contract termination by an international funder. The arbitration tribunal emphasized the importance of precise contract language and robust dispute resolution clauses.

Another notable case involved a healthcare organization disputing sudden funding withdrawal. The tribunal ruled that the funder had breached key terms by failing to provide adequate notice.

Conclusion

The restructuring of USAID under DOGE presents significant legal challenges for Nigerian entities. From contract disputes to regulatory compliance risks, the stakes are high. While litigation is an option, arbitration, mediation, and diplomatic engagement offer more practical solutions.

As the funding landscape continues to evolve, Nigerian organizations must stay informed, seek expert legal advice, and take proactive measures to protect their interests and sustain critical development programs.

Authors



Dayo Adu

Managing Partner
dayo.adu@famsvillelaw.com




Mercy Airiohuodion

Senior Associate
mercy.airiohuodion@famsvillelaw.com



 info@famsvillelaw.com

 www.famsvillelaw.com

 +234 (0) 90 68909 300