

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: PIDISDSA17473

Date Prepared/Updated: 16-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Nigeria	Project ID:	P157890
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P122124
Project Name:	Nigeria: AF - State Education Program Investment Project (P157890)		
Parent Project Name:	Nigeria - State Education Program Investment Project (P122124)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	25-Apr-2016	Estimated Board Date:	07-Jun-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Education	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Primary education (70%), Secondary education (30%)		
Theme(s):	Education for all (90%), Education for the knowledge economy (5%), Rural services and infrastructure (5%)		
Borrower(s):	FEDERAL MINISTRY OF FINANCE (IERD)		
Implementing Agency:	Federal Ministry of Education		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			100.00
Total Project Cost			100.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize to proceed with Negotiations, in principle		
Other Decision:	Appraisal mission took place from April 18-25, 2016.		

Is this a Repeater project?	No
------------------------------------	----

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

The year 2015 was momentous for Nigeria: the general elections held in March brought about the first peaceful, democratic transition of power from a ruling party to an opposition party, heightening expectations for meaningful political change. The new reformist administration that took office in May 2015 was elected with a mandate to undertake long-standing policy and institutional reforms in Nigeria, particularly for enhancing transparency and tackling corruption, addressing the country's huge infrastructure challenges, and ensuring a more inclusive society. At the same time, the new Government took office during one of the most challenging times in the country's history, with a conflict still raging in the North East region and the price of oil dropping sharply. Before the drop in prices, oil accounted for 70 percent of Nigeria's fiscal revenues, and 90 percent of foreign exchange receipts. The oil price shock also broke the consistent trend of significant growth in the Nigerian economy in recent years: GDP growth averaged 5.3 percent during 2011-2014, and was recorded at 6.3 percent in 2014, but this dropped to 2.9 percent in 2015.

The Nigerian population stands at close to 180 million, the largest in the Africa region, is growing at close to 3 percent annually, and has a median age of fourteen. Even prior to the economic slowdown, Nigerian economic statistics reveal a puzzling contrast between rapid economic growth and quite minimal welfare improvements for much of the population. Although data on the geographic distribution of growth in Nigeria are scarce, the economic expansion appears to have been highly geographically concentrated. At the national level, the poverty headcount declined only marginally from 35.2 to 33.1 percent between 2010/11 and 2012/13 and remained roughly 3.5 times higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Southern states tend to have a much lower poverty incidence, between 16 to 28.8 percent, compared to 31.1 to 50.2 percent in the north. Southern states were also more successful at reducing poverty between 2010/11 and 2012/13, with the South West zone leading with a reduction of 5.2 percentage points, while poverty rates in the North East actually increased from 47.1 to 50.2 percent. Higher poverty rates in the North East reflect a number of factors, including relatively poor social services and infrastructure weaknesses.

Compounding the historical deficit, since 2009, North Eastern Nigeria has been subject to violent conflict and insurgency. This had led to widespread displacement and a multi-faceted humanitarian crisis. It is estimated that more than 23,000 deaths occurred during May 2011 to November 2015 as a result of the conflict. People trapped in conflict-affected areas fear death and abduction, and according to media reports, 2,000-7,000 civilians are missing. Boys are forcibly recruited by insurgent groups and thousands of women and girls are subjected to sexual abuse and exploitation, while some have been used as suicide bombers. Schools have been targeted, restricting access to basic services, frightening away teachers from the areas where they are most needed, and many of them have been killed (more than 600). Maiduguri, the capital of Borno State, has received more than 1 million IDPs, overwhelming the delivery of basic services, and leading to further overcrowding in schools. Increased population density in many urban areas

due to displacement has led to greater competition for access to basic services. Short-term solutions, like using at least 50 schools to host IDPs in Borno, have meant that IDPs found themselves in inadequate quarters for longer than expected, and have negatively affected the host communities by leaving children without access to learning due to the closure of all schools in the state for one year.

Sectoral and institutional Context

President Buhari has made restoration of peace and stability to the North East a top priority for his Government and there have been significant territorial gains made by the military in its counter-insurgency operations in recent months. Concerned with the deep social, security, humanitarian, and developmental crises affecting the North East of Nigeria, the President has established the Presidential Co-ordination Committee on North East Interventions (PCNI) to co-ordinate and provide synergy, leadership, and direction for the various initiatives in the zone run by Government, development partners, charitable organizations, and civil society. The Government is also committing to significant expansion of the scale of its investment in the zone. The main objective of PCNI can therefore be described as providing leadership, co-ordination, and synergy for the rapid and safe return of IDPs and refugees to their homes in the North East, and coordinating a Marshall Plan for the development of the region. The specific objectives include:

- (a) To promote the civic culture that is supportive of peaceful co-existence;
- (b) To provide access to basic services and infrastructure;
- (c) To increase the production capacity and wealth creation in the zone;
- (d) To accelerate access to high quality education; and
- (e) To provide development and well-being to citizens of the North East.

For the education sector in particular, PCNI will co-ordinate a strategy for a complete overhaul of the educational system, dealing with issues of access to basic education, provision of educational facilities, improvement of the quality of teachers and the gendered learning environment, and provision of adult literacy training for IDPs and all citizens. This will include working in conjunction with State Ministries of Education to facilitate the integration of religious, i.e. Islamiyya and Qur'anic schools, with formal education schools. The Safe Schools Initiative (SSI) will also be integrated into the statutory education system. SSI is a public-private initiative that promotes schools as safe spaces by building community security groups, bolstering the physical protection of schools, training staff as school safety officers, helping schools develop school security plans and rapid response systems, as well as sponsoring the education of students from conflict-affected areas in safe schools in other parts of Nigeria.

In order to estimate the extent of damage inflicted on the North East by the insurgency, as well as the resulting recovery and reconstruction needs, the Government conducted a jointly with the World Bank, United Nations, and European Union a Recovery and Peace-building Assessment (RPBA). The RPBA aims to inform a collective vision and strategy on peace building and recovery, and covers 3 main areas: 1) peace building, stability, and social cohesion; 2) infrastructure and social services; and 3) economic recovery. The education sector falls under the third component, and the focus of the RPBA findings is on assessing infrastructural and equipment needs, on the one hand, as well as addressing the immediate needs of IDP children.

In terms of the damage to education sector infrastructure assets as of the end of 2015, a synthesis presents of the damage sustained and resulting needs for reconstruction and rehabilitation

provides the damage and needs in two broad sets. The first set entails core infrastructure and equipment, and includes 6-classroom block, office block, hand pump and motorized boreholes, latrines, classroom rehabilitation, pupil seats, teacher table and chair, as well as a perimeter fence surrounding the school. This set is considered to form the bare essentials for a functioning school. The second set in entails additional infrastructure and equipment identified as destroyed by some states and in need of replacement in order to secure a suitable learning environment for students. This additional infrastructure and equipment includes science lab, clinic, computer library and computers, library books, and hostels for students and/or teachers. Borno was by far the most damaged by the insurgency, followed by Adamawa and Yobe. The damage sustained by Taraba, Bauchi, and Gombe is of a different order of magnitude. Accordingly, addressing core infrastructure and equipment needs in Adamawa requires close to US\$60 million; in Bauchi over US\$10 million; in Borno over US\$140 million; in Gombe over US\$2 million; in Taraba close to US\$10 million; and in Yobe close to US\$50 million; for a total of over US\$270 million. Addressing the additional infrastructure and equipment needs deemed necessary by the states would require a further US\$80 million.

Regarding the IDPs, the December 2015 DTM reports that there are currently over 1.8 million IDPs displaced as a result of the recent insurgency. The majority of IDPs are in Borno (close to 67 percent), followed by Adamawa (6 percent), and Yobe (also 6 percent). Close to 56 percent of IDPs are children, and over 28 percent are 5 years old or younger. Over 92 percent of IDPs live in host communities, and most of the rest are in camps and there are 78 camps and camp-like sites. Fully 94 percent of registered IDPs are willing to return home. Given that, based on the DTM data, approximately 30 percent of IDPs are children of school-going age.

The Government has begun responding to the education sector crisis in the North East. The relevant State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) as well as the Army Engineering Corps are focusing on infrastructure needs and have begun renovation of conflict-affected schools. Under SSI, 2,800 students have been relocated from the North East to safer schools in other parts of the country. Several international and civil society organizations, in particular UNICEF, are working in IDP camps to provide education to IDP children. This includes providing psychosocial and pedagogical training to teachers, as well as school bags to students and temporary structures for learning (e.g. tents and mobile classrooms). USAID is active with IDPs outside camps: its Education Crisis Response aims to address the main learning needs of internally displaced out-of-school children and youth in the northeastern states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, and Yobe by establishing non-formal learning centers, improving instructional practices, and developing teaching and learning materials for literacy, math, life skills, and socioemotional learning competencies. It also selects and trains local non-governmental organizations to support community-based commitment, participation, and support for displaced learners and their families, and to provide psychosocial support to internally displaced children and youth.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The Project development objective is to support (a) need-based teacher deployment; (b) school-level management and accountability; and (c) measurement of student learning in selected States. This will contribute to, and complement, the programs and priorities of participating States in addressing education access, quality and efficiency issues, through their own funding, financing from UBEC and other government agencies, as well as other development partners.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

Component 1 Results Based Support to Education Sector Reform Program

Component 2 Technical Assistance,

Component 2.1(a): Technical Assistance Improving Education Quality in Anambra, Bauchi, and Ekiti States.

Component 2.1(b): Technical Assistance to the North East States

Component 2.2 Technical Assistance - Federal Level

Component 3: Improving Access to Quality Education and Learning Environment in North East States

Component 3.1 ➤(Teacher Incentive Grants

Component 3.2 ➤(School Grants

Key Results

The Results Framework has been revised, with minor changes to existing indicators. A summary of new indicators are as follows:

- (Teachers trained in psychosocial pedagogy dealing with displacement and trauma.
- (Teachers deployed in the project areas.
- (School-based management committees (SBMCs) activated or re-activated.
- (SBMCs that received school grants to finance school improvement plans (SIPs).
- (Trained members of SBMCs, parents, and community on psychosocial interventions.

D. Project Description

The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the proposed AF was adjusted marginally to show explicitly that the AF project is focusing on improving the educational systems of North East States. Design of components, project cost, implementation schedule, and results indicators were changed. The main changes in the components reflect the scale-up of project activities, introduction of new interventions, and fine-tuning of existing activities.

The proposed Additional Financing is intended to complement the Government program, as supported by the Federal and State governments, with support from Development partners. It will finance activities to support Government's emergency program for the North East, by improving access and quality education through the scaling-up of original project activities. Based on the implementation experience from the original project, this AF would support the following: (a) scaling- up of the interventions that have successfully contributed to the improvement of service delivery, primarily relating to: (i) extending project coverage to address teacher needs in conflict- and displacement-affected areas in North East States; and (ii) strengthening of school level management and accountability toward improvement of education quality through school grants funding; and (b) enhancing technical assistance to address the needs of the North East

Component Name

Result-Based Support to Education Sector Program: Supporting Participating states education sector reform program to improve the quality of education.

Comments (optional)

This component is the result-based component of the original SEPIP Project. The AF has no

inputs into this component.

Component Name

Technical Assistance: Financing essential advisory, technical, and capacity-building support for Participating States' edu. sector program, as well as for federal-level coordination, monitoring

Comments (optional)

The objective of this component is to provide technical assistance channeled through two levels: (a) State Level (supporting participating states) towards the achievement of the performance targets, and institutional capacity strengthening; and (b) Federal Level, supporting the Federal Ministry of Education and UBEC in overall project coordination and in providing an enabling environment in line with national policies, and in ensuring sustainability or scaling-up of successful interventions.

Component Name

Improving Access and Equity to Quality Education in Northeast States.

Comments (optional)

This new component will focus on emergency response to the North East. The aim of this component is to support the participating State Governments' service delivery program in basic education in LGAs affected by the insurgency. Given the trauma experienced by the communities in the North East in general and the targeting to some degree of teachers in particular, it stands to reason that teachers will be reluctant to return to work, and that both they and their students will be in need of psychosocial services.

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

The project will focus on the following states spread geographically across the country with Ekiti, Bauchi, Anambra in addition with Adamawa, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Joseph Ese Akpokodje (GEN07)

Michael Gboyega Ilesanmi (GSU01)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The ongoing SEPIP works with individual states, and the AF has established agreement with the five additional North East States. The bulk of the IDP population is in Borno, followed by Yobe and Adamawa, the security situation in those three states is most precarious. The complexity of operating in the additional five states will require greater coordination and harmonization of activities, especially in the context of conflict and the need for peace and rebuilding. Accordingly, overall coordination for emergency response to the North East will rest with the Presidential Committee for Northeast Initiative (PCNI), with the National Emergency Management Agency, other government and non-government agencies, with support from international development partners. At the project level, institutional capacity will be strengthened at Federal, State, and Local Government Authority levels, as well as school level. This will include support from the Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE), the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), the National

Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), the State Ministry of Education (SMoE), the State Universal Basic Education Board, the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA), Local Government Education Authority, and SBMC, respectively. In addition, the existing set-up under SEPIP will be enhanced under the AF to include non-state actors (e.g. such as civil society, community-based organizations) more fully, which will play a vital role in the implementation of the AF project. This will include national and international development partners, civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, philanthropies, and foundations. The roles and responsibilities, including supervision, reporting, coordination, and implementation arrangements at the federal, state, local, and school level would essentially remain the same as the original project, except for an expansion to include, as mentioned above, relevant state and non-state actors including community-based organizations and as the need arises, to be able to meet the needs for intensive community mobilization and support toward stronger school level management in a fragile context, whilst also ensuring school safety.

III. 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 original project, provision was made for an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to take account of eventual needs for rehabilitation. This ESMF remains applicable to the AF project. However, to include the five new States of the North East, an updated ESMF detailing the processes and procedures was prepared and disclosed to cover larger rehabilitation needs as well repairs/ maintenance, through the proposed school grants under the AF project.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	No	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify
--

and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:
<p>The AF project is expected to have little or no environmental impact: In addition, to the extent that it will focus improvement in the quality of basic education in Participating States of the North East Nigeria, it will promote sound education. An Environmental and Social Impact Framework (ESMF) was prepared for the original project, and disclosed in Nigeria. The provisions of this ESMF will continue to be applicable to the AF project. These include screening processes to determine the appropriate environmental and social instruments to be prepared, approved and disclosed prior to implementation of individual interventions whenever the need arises.</p>
2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
<p>The project is unlikely to have any potential indirect and/or long term negative impacts through its future activities. To the extent that the focus is on improving the quality of education, with strong emphasis on effective school level management, some unintended positive environmental and social development effects may accrue in project areas.</p>
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
n/a
4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.
<p>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 by the proposed project. In Nigeria, the Federal 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 State Ministry of Education will be responsible and accountable for all safeguard issues.</p>
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
<p>Key project stakeholders are the Federal Ministries of Finance, and Education, the National Planning Commission, the Universal Basic Education Commission, the State Ministries of Education in Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe, the State Universal Basic Education Boards in these states, school based management committees and their associated communities, and civil society organizations. Project design and formulation comprised these key stakeholders, and consultation meetings and workshops took place in October 2015 and February 2016 both at Federal and state levels. Draft framework will be presented to new Participating States during appraisal. Participants' comments and observations will be sought, related to the need to: (a) provide an adequate physical learning environment; with safe drinking water and appropriate sanitation facilities; (b) revive hygiene education; (c) adhere to environmental guidelines (especially those related to waste disposal); (d) ensure appropriate presentation in school level management through school-based management committees (e.g. composition, representatives, authority and decision-making); (e) provide third-party monitoring (including CSOs and NGOs); and (f) ensure appropriate information dissemination and community mobilization to ensure school safety and strengthen school level management and accountability (e.g. community gatherings, annual parents' assemblies, social audits, etc.). These are reflected in the project design, and will be incorporated in the updated safeguards instrument.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	16-May-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	16-May-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Nigeria	16-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i> Public disclosure took place in two national newspapers, and through radio announcements in all North East States (Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe).	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	
--	--

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Irajén Appasamy
 Title: Senior Operations Officer

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: FEDERAL MINISTRY OF FINANCE (IERD)
 Contact: Haruna Mohammed
 Title: Mr.
 Email: cis500_hm@yahoo.com

Implementing Agencies

Name: Federal Ministry of Education
 Contact: Adamu Adamu
 Title: Hon. Minister of Education
 Email: a.adamu@Edu.gov

VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop
 The World Bank
 1818 H Street, NW
 Washington, D.C. 20433
 Telephone: (202) 458-4500
 Fax: (202) 522-1500
 Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Irajén Appasamy	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Maman-Sani Issa (SA)	Date: 16-May-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Meskerem Mulatu (PMGR)	Date: 16-May-2016
Country Director:	Name: Rachid Benmessaoud (CD)	Date: 24-May-2016