

# INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET CONCEPT STAGE

**Report No.:** ISDSC2933

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 17-Jul-2013

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 18-Jul-2013

## I. BASIC INFORMATION

### A. Basic Project Data

<b>Country:</b>	Nigeria	<b>Project ID:</b>	P143842
<b>Project Name:</b>	Nigeria Global Partnership for Education Fund Grant (P143842)		
<b>Task Team Leader:</b>	Olatunde Adetoyese Adekol		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	29-Jul-2013	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	03-Feb-2014
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	AFTEW	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Specific Investment Loan
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Primary education (100%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Education for all (100%)		
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	100.00	<b>Total Bank Financing:</b>	0.00
<b>Total Cofinancing:</b>		<b>Financing Gap:</b>	0.00
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			0.00
Education for All Supervising Entity			100.00
Total			100.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

### B. Project Objectives

The PDO is to improve access to quality basic education in selected States with particular attention to girls' participation. The GPE grant would finance selected aspects of the State's sector programs that contribute to the achievement of this development objective and are aligned with ongoing and planned investments by the Local Education Group (LEG). The GPE grant builds on ongoing government expenditures and commitments, IDP activities and experience and provides a targeted program of support reflecting the critical areas needed to improve education service delivery as well

as a means for coordinating interventions among government and development partners. It also reflects GPE strategic priorities.

### C. Project Description

1. The proposed project is a US\$100 million Specific Investment Loan (Grant) to the Federal Government of Nigeria, which in turn will disburse funds to the five selected Project states through subsidiary financing agreements to support the education programs of participating states. The grant will support implementation of the GPE project over the period from Feb 2014 to Feb 2017. The project consists of three major components: (a) Component 1- financing selected priorities within State programs to promote school effectiveness and improvement of quality of education through school grants and inservice teacher training; (b) Component2- financing for the States towards improving access to basic education, particularly for girls through scholarships, conditional cash transfers, support for female teacher upgrading; and (c) Component 3 a federal and State technical assistance component which would finance essential advisory, technical, and capacity-building support for State and Federal agencies, particularly focusing on monitoring and evaluation, assessment and education service coordination.

Component 1- Promoting School effectiveness and Quality of Education through School Grants (US \$ 45 million).

2. The aim of this component is to improve the management and service delivery of pre-primary and basic education at the school level. The GPE would support a decentralized mechanism for funding of non-salary expenditures to finance activities related to improving learning and teaching in the classroom. School grants and SBMC training would provide discretionary funding and decision making about school level investments. As the key input to improving quality of teaching, teachers will be supported through In-Service Training (INSET) in core subject areas.

3. School Grants: School Grants have been piloted in all five of the proposed States through government and some IDP activities. Therefore, the GPE will need to explore how to complement any ongoing school grant programs, expand, or enhance these programs. Experience indicates that reliable and consistent funding to augment schools' operating costs and non-salary expenditures have improved the quality of the learning environment. School Grants could be provided annually to all public basic education schools (in selected States) based on a per capita formula aligned with national norms. School Based Management Committees have received significant training through ESSPIN and GEP with school grants also piloted in some of the states (Jigawa, Katsina, Sokoto). The GPE would learn from these different programs to calibrate the yearly allocations, targeting, and expected expenditures guided by a quality menu to increase learning in the classrooms, particularly at primary level. It was agreed that Islamiyya schools also could be included in those States where government is already supporting these schools. A functioning and trained School Based Management Committee (SBMC) would be required in order to transfer resources. Training for SBMCs has been ongoing for several years with support from ESSPIN. But not all schools might be ready at the commencement of the project and to receive grant funding. This would ensure some phasing of school grants as new SBMCs are strengthened. The grants would match ongoing allocations from existing budget lines through State budgets and UBEC investment funds to ensure that parallel critical investments in infrastructure and textbooks are forthcoming. This matching grant system would encourage greater coordination among the multiple sources of financing, create new "rules of the game" for more efficient allocation of federal resources, and encourage greater impact of the investments by ensuring complementary funding. In addition, the link between school grants and federal and state resources would strengthen the sustainability of decentralized financing. This platform allows for States and

schools to tailor their interventions to the challenges of their particular States. For example, some States may opt to focus on top ups for Early Childhood Care and Education/pre-primary school, others may need more interventions for girl's participation.

4. School Grants could focus on quality improvements at the school level, with a possible menu of learning materials (in local languages and English), classroom libraries, remedial education, school based In-Service Training (INSET), minor rehabilitation, foundation skill support (reading and math), etc. The grants may also support teacher participation in Strengthening of Math and Science Education (SMASE) training (developed with support from JICA), community sensitization, school enrollment drives, etc. A school grant manual would offer a menu of evidence-based activities, linkages to donor-supported programs and guidance on more effective implementation of school grants through easy to use templates, SBMC reporting, etc.

5. Teacher Quality: The GPE would complement on-going efforts by ESSPIN, DFID, USAID and JICA to improve the quality of teaching in the five states. DFID will be rolling out a program in June 2013 to improve the skills of 66,000 teachers through in-service training in math, English and science and technology. In addition, colleges will be supported to improve pre-service training. JICA is supporting a cascading training program to train teachers in math and science education using activity based learning and ultimately school based continuous cluster training with support from NTI. The program has been piloted in Kaduna, but could be scaled to the other four GPE states. ESSPIN has developed quality lesson plans in primary 1-3 to teach reading and writing in Kano, Kaduna and Jigawa. Under the GPE, these materials could be translated from English to Hausa to encourage greater use by northern teachers in teaching reading and writing in early primary grades. Continuing the training to School Support Officers would be critical for ensuring greater support for classroom teachers in the use of these new materials. The GPE also would support the upcoming USAID Reading-For-All project by expanding the reading skills training in GPE schools. The GPE may also explore the possibility of linking school grant top ups to improve selected service delivery indicators such as teacher attendance reported and validated by NGO monitoring.

Component 2: Improving Girls Access to Quality Education (estimated cost: US\$35 million)

6. The aim of this component is to support the inclusion of all children especially for girls and out of school children in basic education in the selected beneficiary States. The primary means to encouraging an increase in enrolment and retention in basic education would be through interventions focused on incentives for girls participation. Scholarships and CCTs are potential programs, both being implemented in several of the States. A social assessment is being conducted to elaborate on the factors affecting girls access to education services that will contribute to further design of potential GPE interventions. Currently, the Girl's Education Program (GEP) supported by DFID and UNICEF is in its third phase providing demand and supply incentives to encourage greater enrolment and retention of girls in school. The program aims to increase girl's enrolment through advocacy, community mobilization and provision of educational materials and minor infrastructure for selected schools. In addition the GEP supports teacher scholarships for trainee female teachers from rural areas where gender imbalances are significant. Most recently the GEP has included cash transfers for needy families to send girls to school as well as school grants to improve the quality of education. The program also aims to encourage integration of Quranic schools with the national core curriculum (Katsina and Sokoto). A Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) program in Kano initiated under the World Bank supported SESP has also contributed to increased girls enrolment. Scholarship programs in Jigawa, Kaduna, Sokoto provide uniforms, materials and transportation for girls to attend school. This component would therefore focus on supporting and expanding some of these

transfer programs and/or scholarship programs to increase girl enrolment and retention. In addition, activities would be supported to increase the number of female teachers in these areas by expanding the teacher upgrading of uncertified female teachers. Support for girls clubs, enrolment drives, and closer monitoring and data disaggregation would also be supported. While CCTs are currently ongoing in several of the States, the extensive analysis and due diligence to expand and sustain these programs may be beyond the scope of the three-year GPE intervention especially with significant funding already secured from other IDPs and the World Bank YESSO project. Therefore, the project is likely to support CCTs only in exceptional cases where the commitment and readiness of the State demonstrate high probability of impact over the GPE period.

Component 3: Management, M&E and Assessment (estimated cost: US\$20 million):

7. The objective of this component is to provide capacity building and technical assistance as well as operational resources for managing, monitoring and supervising the GPE activities at all institutional levels. Support would enhance key institutional capacities and provide targeted training, particularly at the decentralized levels. The GPE would finance the standard project management activities such as audits, annual reviews, impact evaluation, surveys and quarterly reporting. In addition, this component aims to support State level civil society to support supervision and monitoring. An independent monitoring agency could be supported at the Federal level to validate performance and provide specialized reviews, assessments, surveys as needed. With possible security challenges for supervision, this component could also support new technologies to review and report on school level data through mobile GPS mapping and verification. This component could also finance strengthening of learning assessment systems that continue to receive technical assistance from DFID and USAID. Additional activities could include research and studies on key reform areas as well as data collection and analysis

#### **D. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)**

The project will focus on the states of - Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Sokoto and Jigawa.

#### **E. Borrowers Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies**

Nigeria has demonstrated its commitment to mitigating adverse social and environmental impacts in the implementation of a range of World Bank projects including category A projects. There are adequate legal and institutional frameworks in the country to ensure compliance with World Bank safeguards policies triggered in the country to ensure compliance with Ministry of environment (FMEnv) is responsible for setting policy guidelines on environmental issues and ensuring compliance with national environmental standards. It has different departments with field offices in every region of the country. At state level, the Federal Ministry of Education will be responsible and accountable for all safeguard issues.

An existing ESMF is used by the implementing agencies to govern safeguards for other education projects in Nigeria. It has been agreed that this ESMF will be revised and updated to incorporate proposed interventions under the Nigeria GPE grant.

#### **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team**

Alexandra C. Bezeredi (AFTSG)

Joseph Ese Akpokodje (AFTN1)

## II. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	While there is no construction involved in the project, there is the need to prepare an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) which will provide details on the processes and procedures for environmental safeguards and proper review procedures for any minor works or rehabilitation. This document will be disclosed in the event that minor school repairs/maintenance will need to be done through the proposed school grants under the project.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The Project does not involve or have impacts on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project does not involve forests or forestry.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project does not involve pest management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	The Project will not affect physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous people in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The Project does not involve land acquisition leading to involuntary resettlement and/or restrictions of access of resources and livelihoods.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project does not involve dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	N/A
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	N/A

## III. SAFEGUARD PREPARATION PLAN

**A. Tentative target date for preparing the PAD Stage ISDS:** 23-Sep-2013

**B. Time frame for launching and completing the safeguard-related studies that may be needed.**  
The specific studies and their timing<sup>1</sup> should be specified in the PAD-stage ISDS:

The ESMF will be prepared and disclosed prior to project appraisal.

## IV. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Olatunde Adetoyese Adekol
<b>Approved By:</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Reminder: The Bank's Disclosure Policy requires that safeguard-related documents be disclosed before appraisal (i) at the InfoShop and (ii) in country, at publicly accessible locations and in a form and language that are accessible to potentially affected persons.

Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Name:	Date:
Sector Manager:	Name: Peter Nicolas Materu (SM)	Date: 18-Jul-2013