

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

IDENTIFICATION / CONCEPT STAGE

Report No.: ISDSC17471

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 31-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Kyrgyz Republic	Project ID:	P159699
Project Name:	Engaging Communities for Better Schools in the Kyrgyz Republic		
Team Leader(s):	Janelle Plummer		
Estimated Date of Approval:	30-Dec-2016		
Managing Unit:	GSU03	Lending Instrument:	IPF
Sector(s):	Primary education (50%), Secondary education (50%)		
Theme(s):	Decentralization (10%), Participation and civic engagement (50%), Education for all (40%)		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	0.000003	Total Bank Financing:	0
Financing Gap:	0		
Financing Source			Amount
Japan Social Development Fund			0.000003
Environment Category:	C - Not Required		

B. Project Development Objective(s)

The Development Objective for this grant is to support improvement in the performance of teachers and management of primary and secondary schools in the poorest districts of Kyrgyz Republic through enhanced community engagement, transparency, accountability and responsiveness.

C. Project Description

The project is comprised of three components:

- A. Community Engagement Processes and Capacity-Building to support schools in developing the mechanisms and skills they need to meaningfully engage with communities.
- B. Small Grants for Priority Investments in Underprivileged Schools to provide matching funds to schools for the implementation of collectively identified school improvement projects.
- C. Project Management, Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Communication to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of project activities, to monitor progress and share lessons.

Summary of Project Coverage: 9 Districts in 9 oblasts, with 349 villages, 183,300 HHs, 830,000

people. 61% or 507,000 are living in poverty. The target area includes 350 schools and 170,000 students.

Component A.

Community Engagement Processes and Capacity-Building (\$US 1.70 million)

Component A, composed of three sub-components, (i) develops and strengthens school-level Boards of Trustees as a platform for citizen engagement; (ii) provides citizens with the (budget and performance) information they need to engage effectively, and (iii) introduces a mechanism for ongoing citizen feedback and joint action (community scorecards) at school level. This component supports capacity building for both local officials/service providers and community members. Through joint training events, multi-stakeholder reflection and learning forums, the component introduces a collaborative approach, whereby both sets of actors work in partnership according to a set of clearly defined and jointly agreed roles and responsibilities. In support of this component, MOES will approve and ratify operational guidelines and training modules for BoTs; school administrators will generate and post budget and performance information that will be disseminated and explained by AKFK in public hearings. In addition, the recommended actions resulting from the community scorecard process are jointly agreed by both service users and providers and are timed to feed into the existing school development planning cycle.

Component A1: Development and Strengthening of Boards of Trustees.

To assist with the improvements of financial management of schools, in 2014 the MOES issued a decree instructing all schools to create a Board of Trustees (BoT). Currently however the formation and functioning of BoTs is incomplete. Official provisions for BoTs have been drafted and are currently in the process of ministerial verification, prior to approval. However, these provisions are not accompanied by operational guidance or capacity development (on formation, roles and responsibilities) to guide the creation and functioning of Boards of Trustees. Ensuring the transparent and effective management of parental financial contributions is one of the key motivating factors behind the creation of BoTs, which represent a critical platform for potential citizen engagement, participatory governance and social accountability at school level.

Component A.1 will improve the transparency, accountability and responsiveness of target schools by supporting the implementation of the BoTs decree in 9 target districts. The project will support the establishment or strengthening of BoTs in 350 target schools through: (i) a stock-taking of BoTs in target districts; (ii) the preparation of draft operational guidelines and training modules for BoTs, approved by MOES and ratified by a ministerial order and capacity building in each target school, and (iii) establishing and/or strengthening the BoTs in target schools, including skills development; and (iv) development of BoT networks at rayon (and ultimately at national) level.

Component A2: Access to Information and Awareness Building on Performance and Budgets

The MOES currently compiles and publishes comparative data regarding learning outcomes in schools across the country. The extent to which local-level stakeholders in practice are: aware of the existence of this data (on the MOES website), able to access it, and equipped to make use of it, however, remains unknown. At the same time, schools have multiple revenue sources, and these revenues and expenditures are not captured in a single transparent statement. Comprehensive information about the school budget (including parent contributions) is held by the school director

and is often not known by staff, parents, students or other community members.

In order for students, parents, and other community members to interact constructively with school management (including BoTs) and contribute to improvements in the performance of schools, all stakeholders, be they users or providers of services, need to be aware of rights and entitlements to schooling, the standards and targets set at the national level, and how the performance of their school compares to other schools at district and national level. In order to seek accountability, it is also important for local stakeholders to have information about their own school's budget, revenues and expenditures i.e. how school finances are spent to improve standards. Accordingly, Component A.2 will improve the transparency, accountability and responsiveness of 350 target schools through activities which support: (i) the public posting of school rights, national standards and targets, school performance and budget information (revenues and expenditures); and (ii) proactive reporting by school administrators and BoTs of key information related to school budgets and performance and awareness building to improve citizen understanding of financial and performance information and how they can use it.

Component A3: Citizen Feedback and Joint Action

While the preparation of school development plans (SDPs) is described in the Guidance on SDPs as a participatory process, in most cases, plans are prepared by school directors and, at best, presented for cursory validation in parent assemblies. School users and community members do not have the platform to provide feedback on the strengths and weakness of school services, to express concerns, or propose recommendations for improvement. Yet it is recognized by MOES that mechanisms for parent/student/community involvement are essential to better address the needs and priorities of service users.

This component aims to improve the responsiveness and performance of target schools by developing processes and introducing regular community activities for multi-stakeholder feedback and joint action planning that will feed into the SDP. The project will support three sets of community activities in 350 target schools (i) the identification and training of facilitators in each target school to facilitate two tried and tested citizen engagement processes at school level: (ii) the collective development of a social contract between service users and providers, and (iii) a community scorecard and joint action plan which allows parents/students/community members to provide feedback on school services and collectively identify actions for improvement. A subcommittee of the BoT which ensures community participation (Joint Action Committee) will coordinate, support and oversee the implementation of the annual JAP and absorption into the SDP. Social contracts, community scorecards/JAPs are integrated into the annual school cycle, directly involve all concerned actors and feed into existing processes of school planning, budgeting and management.

Component B.

Small Grants for Priority Investments in Underprivileged Schools (\$US0.80 million)

The objective of Component B is to provide matching funds to underprivileged target schools for the implementation of community-managed micro-projects that have been collectively identified through the community scorecard and joint action planning processes, and integrated into the SDP. This component will provide schools with the opportunity to jointly implement a specific investment of their choosing, testing the systems put in place to improve transparency, accountability and

responsiveness.

This component will: (i) provide support and assistance to BoTs in their efforts to support, oversee and mobilize local community resources for the implementation of priority school improvement actions identified in the JAP. (ii) support schools to prepare a funding proposal; (iii) provide schools the opportunity to apply for matching funds for the implementation of one priority action through a competitive, community-managed micro grants program; and, (iv) support and monitor the implementation of funded actions. Schools will be encouraged to (v) incorporate any outstanding priority JAP actions (i.e. those that require longer-term effort, larger-scale investment or broader collaboration) into their school development plan (SDP).

This series of actions will promote an active >(learning by doing>(approach for BoTs, school administrators and communities working together on micro investments in schools. Examples of actions supported by micro-grants could include: the purchase of new classroom, sports or teaching equipment, small school renovations or repairs, or support for teacher training/upgrading. The project will include a negative list to guide project investment, which will ensure that the funds provided are utilized on actions that generate human or physical assets (and that any small-scale construction occurs within the school compounds).

District-level review panels (composed of a mix of district-level education officials and community representatives) will be created to review funding proposals and select successful schools based on available funds. Funds will flow to school-level BoT bank accounts. BoTs will manage the funds and monitor and report on expenditures according to agreed guidelines and timelines, and be provided with capacity building for this purpose. The grant program will support no more than 50% of total micro-project cost, up to a maximum of \$1,500. The remainder will be mobilized by the school community. The upper and lower limits of this micro-grant will be determined during preparation, but is anticipated to be \$3-5000 for about 180-200 schools.

Component C.

Project Management, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (\$US 0.50 million)

Component C1: Project Management.

The project will be managed and implemented by the Aga Khan Foundation Kyrgyzstan (AK K) (the grant recipient) working with its subnational offices in Osh, Bishkek and Naryn. AKFK will be responsible for management, coordination and implementation of the program, including procurement, disbursement and financial management, as well as the capacity building and oversight of any local partners. This sub-component will support the recruitment of staff (managers, coordinators and trainer/mentors), operational support mechanisms, financial management at the national, oblast and district levels, travel, telecommunications, printing and other office expenses, as well as managerial oversight and internal and external audits. The project will not purchase new vehicles, but will provide travel allowances and/or apportion costs for the use of existing vehicles.

This sub-component will also support the establishment of a Project Coordination Committee (PCC) to guide the strategic direction and activities of the project under this component. It will consist of key stakeholders from the MOES, AKFK, SALGIR (State Agency for Local Governance and Interethnic Relations), and the World Bank (phasing out after year 1), and will coordinate with other relevant local and international organizations with similar programming interventions.

Component C2: Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Communication.

A comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and learning plan will measure impacts and outcomes and monitor ongoing progress of project implementation as follows:

- a. An independent impact evaluation (IE) will generate data for the PDO level indicators. It will document changes to service performance and empowerment resulting from project activities and seek to determine the extent to which outcomes are attributable to the project. A difference-in-differences (DD) approach will be adopted, i.e. results indicators will be compared between a base-line and end-line, and between a treatment group (schools that have participated in the project) and a control group (schools that have not), according to best practice. Results will be disaggregated by gender, language group and between rural and urban schools.
- b. The regular monitoring and reporting system for the project will leverage AKFK's existing mechanisms, adapted to meet the calendar reporting requirements of the project. Participatory M&E approaches will be used to inform, engage and empower primary stakeholders. AKFK will report information and data obtained from community visits, meetings, attendance records, participant evaluations of trainings, interviews with project stakeholders, and will provide semi-annual progress reports, and a mid-term and end-term project reports.
- c. Project activities will include a system of process learning: ongoing reflection and learning by project stakeholders to review processes and results, strengths and weaknesses, distill lessons, and propose improvements and next steps. Regional coordinators will monitor the implementation of key activities and conduct reflection meetings with local staff after each major event (e.g. training, social contract and community scorecard activities). The project will also support periodic multi-stakeholder learning forums and the production of learning notes.

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

The project will be carried out in the poorest district of each oblast in the Kyrgyz Republic. The final list of schools is being prepared, locations will be known prior to appraisal.

Social safeguards. The project is classified as category C because it primarily provides capacity development and technical assistance. No social safeguards are triggered. Small Grant investments under component B may fund civil works, such as small-scale school building renovations, building improvement and school campus beautification. These activities will be within the existing floorplans and will not require temporary or permanent restrictions of access, land acquisition and will not have impact on the community's economic activities

Environmental safeguards. The project primarily provides capacity development and technical assistance. The project will not finance any civil works or other works that have a potential for environmental impact. No environmental safeguards are triggered.

E. Borrower's Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies

N/A

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Ekaterina Romanova (GSU03)

II. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	No	
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	

III. SAFEGUARD PREPARATION PLAN

A. Appraisal stage ISDS required?: Yes

i. Explanation

ii. Tentative target date for preparing the Appraisal Stage ISDS

17-Jun-2016

B. Time frame for launching and completing the safeguard-related studies that may be needed. The specific studies and their timing should be specified in the Appraisal Stage ISDS.

N/A

IV. APPROVALS

Team Leader(s):	Name: Janelle Plummer	
Approved By:		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Nina Chee (SA)	Date: 16-Jun-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Nina Bhatt (PMGR)	Date: 16-Jun-2016

¹ 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.