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**Introduction**

External funding from foreign donors provides for over 80% of services provided to PLWHA in Nigeria. Faced with the realities of dwindling HIV donor funding and the need for increased country ownership of our National HIV programs, the Government of Nigerian in July 2013 launched the Presidential Comprehensive Response Plan (PRCP) for HIV/AIDS in Nigeria. This program is homegrown and built on attaining targets of the National HIV Strategic plan 2010-2015, in achieving the MDG 6. This abstract reviews the extent of implementation of this plan as at December 2013.

**Description**

In promoting country ownership the program advocates for financial pooling of resources in a basket fund to be coordinated by NACA. In this model the Federal Government of Nigeria is to provide funds directly, and to the various states, which are to be matched in a 50:50 ratio by the state Governments. This is to promote joint ownership at state and federal level. The total cost of the PRCP covering 13 programmatic areas is $1.7 billion between 2013-2015.

**Lessons Learned**

A review of the 2014 National Budget shows the total expenditure on health (1.6 billion) including HIV is less than 5% of the total Budget. An additional $51 million has been earmarked by a special SURE -P program for this plan, however this is less than 15% of the federal government's contribution to the basket fund ($441 dollars). By the end of 2013, this funding pool is yet to established with contributions from either the state or Federal government.

**Conclusions/Next steps**

The PRCP remains an excellent innovation, however despite great enthusiasm following its launch the program is yet to materialize. Although the Government as set funds for the plan through the SURE -P program, it remains less than 15% of its quota. A clear M&E plan of the PRCP must be developed in line with the NSP, to ensure targets especially with regards to resource mobilization are reached. Increased advocacy is required by HIV advocacy/pressure groups to ensure this program is implemented with ownership by state and federal Governments.
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