



Program Information Documents (PID)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 19-Jan-2021 | Report No: PIDA234344



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Program Data

Country Nigeria	Project ID P173309	Program Name Better Education Service Delivery for All Operation Additional Financing	Parent Project ID (if any) P160430
Region AFRICA WEST	Estimated Appraisal Date 24-May-2021	Estimated Board Date 29-Jun-2021	Practice Area (Lead) Education
Financing Instrument Program-for-Results Financing	Borrower(s) Federal Republic of Nigeria	Implementing Agency Universal Basic Education Commission, Federal Ministry of Education	

Program Development Objective(s)

To increase equitable access for out-of-school children and improve literacy in focus states, and strengthen accountability for results, in basic education in Nigeria.

COST & FINANCING

SUMMARY (USD Millions)

Government program Cost	123.80
Total Operation Cost	123.80
Total Program Cost	76.50
IPF Component	47.30
Total Financing	123.80
Financing Gap	0.00

FINANCING (USD Millions)

Total Non-World Bank Group and Non-Client Government Financing	123.80
Trust Funds	123.80



B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

- 1. Nigeria, the most populous country in Africa and accounting for the largest economy on the continent, is often referred to as the ‘Giant of Africa’.** With a gross national income (GNI) per capita of US\$1,960, Nigeria is classified as a lower-middle-income country (LMIC).¹ The country’s economy is predominantly dependent on the oil sector and has suffered frequent boom-and-bust cycles that are linked with fluctuations in the global price of oil. Nigeria’s growth has not translated into significant poverty reduction,² with poverty rates declining by only 6 percentage points in 15 years, from 46.0 percent in 2004 to 40.1 percent in 2019.³ More recently, Nigeria’s economy was threatened by the twin shocks of the Coronavirus Disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic and the associated fall in international oil prices.⁴
- 2. Measures to contain the COVID-19 outbreak are negatively impacting economic activity in Nigeria, posing challenges, in particular, for the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable populations.** Since March 2020, lockdown measures have been undertaken with stringent restrictions imposed on international and domestic flights, interstate road traffic, and the movement of people in urban areas. The immediate impact on services and industry in both the formal and informal sectors resulted in a negative gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate in the second and third quarters of the year. Notably, the pandemic and its associated macroeconomic shocks disproportionately disrupt economic activities among poorer and more vulnerable populations, including women.
- 3. Nigeria ranks low on the human capital index (HCI).** The country’s score on the HCI is 0.36⁵, which is poor compared to many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) as well as LMICs. Nigerian children lag on all six indicators measuring survival, schooling, and health scoring below regional and global averages. In addition to preventing children from reaching their full potential, low human capital outcomes have large effects in terms of economic growth. Estimations show that the country’s GDP could be 2.9 times higher if the benchmarks of full education and health were reached. This is the equivalent of 2.1 percentage points of extra annual growth over fifty years. Thus, investing in human capital is key for Nigeria’s development and economic prosperity and for reaping the demographic dividend.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

¹ The figure is based on the Atlas method (World Bank, 2019).

² World Bank. 2016. Poverty Reduction in Nigeria in the Last Decade.

³ National Bureau of Statistics. Poverty and Inequality in Nigeria 2019.

⁴ Fouda, L. M. (2020, April 7). Statement by IMF Managing Director Kristalina Georgieva on Nigeria. IMF.

⁵ The Human Capital Index (HCI) measures the amount of human capital that a child born today can expect to accumulate by age 18, measuring her productivity compared to a benchmark of complete education and full health.



4. **One in every twelve (or 8 percent) of the world's out-of-school (OOS) children are in Nigeria⁶, and only 4 percent of the poorest quintile are covered by social safety nets (World Bank, 2018).** Of the 11 million OOS children aged 6-15, an overwhelming majority are in the North, and OOS rates are higher among girls, in rural areas, and among the poorest. Though there are OOS children throughout Nigeria, most OOS children in the North never attended school, while in the South most OOS children have dropped out of school.
5. **Among those children who are enrolled in school, the levels of learning are very low.** According to international standards, children who have completed grade 3 are expected to be fully literate, but this goal is yet to be achieved in Nigeria. The preliminary results of the 2020 National Learning Assessment (NLA)⁷ show that grade 4 completers only mastered one-third of their grade-level competencies in reading and more than 55 percent of grade 4 completers were not able to: (a) recognize all words that were read out; (b) name all pictures shown; (c) read fluently and accurately; (d) answer comprehension questions correctly; and (e) draw inferences from the text. Similarly, the 2020 Nigeria Education Data Survey (NEDS) data show that only 66.8 percent children ages 12 to 14 years can read at least one of three words and 67.3 percent of children of the same age group can add single digits. Teachers are also expected to conduct regular in-class assessments of students, but these assessments are often not structured properly, and the results of these assessments are not used to obtain insights to better adapt the teachers' teaching practices to improve student learning outcomes.
6. **Nigeria is committed to achieving UBE.** The Government introduced the UBE Program in 1999 with the aim of providing greater access to and ensuring quality of basic education in Nigeria and adopted the UBE Act in 2004. This Act stipulates free, compulsory, and universal basic education, i.e., grades 1-9, or six years of primary school followed by three years of junior secondary school (JSS). It also included provisions for the establishment of the UBEC (federal entity) to coordinate the implementation of the national UBE Program in the states and in the Local Government Areas (LGAs) through the SUBEBs and Local Government Education Authorities (LGEA), respectively. UBEC aims to improve the capacity of states, LGAs and communities in the provision of universal access to quality basic education in Nigeria. While the 2004 UBE Act mandates that the overall financing of basic education is the responsibility of state and local governments, the Federal Government provides support to basic education (in states) through fiscal transfers to the states from the UBE Intervention Fund managed by UBEC. The UBE Intervention Fund receives at least 2 percent (guaranteed) of the Consolidated Revenue Fund (CRF) (total federal government revenue). The current UBE Program Five-Year (2015–2020) Road Map focuses on addressing system challenges, entrenching strategic planning, and ensuring results-oriented implementation at the national and state levels.

Challenges facing the Education Sector in Oyo, Adamawa and Katsina states

7. Education Sector Analyses (ESAs) undertaken in 2019/2020 in these three states identifies a number of challenges facing the education sector, including: a) a lack of access to basic education and severe deficit in existing schools, particularly in rural areas contributing to a large number of OOS children; b) low qualifications of teachers and poor teaching practices that contribute to low learning outcomes; and c) weak governance, limited accountability, and a lack of planning and management capacity in the sector, which impedes both the efficient deployment of teachers and the efficient use of existing resources. The challenges are likely to be exacerbated by COVID-19. Each of these issues is described in further detail below.

⁶ UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) (2018). "One in Five Children, Adolescents and Youth is Out of School." UIS fact sheet No. 48. Montreal: UIS. <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs48-one-five-children-adolescents-youth-out-school-2018-en.pdf>

⁷ Nigeria Education Data Survey (NEDS) 2020 and Nigeria Living Standards Survey (NLSS) 2018-2019 are the two latest household surveys in Nigeria referenced in this document.



- 8. Lack access of access to basic education.** According to the NEDS 2020, approximately 72, 66, and 88 percent of children ages 6 to 15 years are attending regular formal schools or integrated Islamic schools⁸ in Adamawa, Katsina, and Oyo states, respectively. Across OAK states, there are a total of 1.6 million children aged 6-15 who are not attending formal schools of which 940,000 never attended school, 460,000 have dropped out (of primary and junior secondary age), and 210,000 are attending traditional Islamic schools. Most of these children are concentrated in the lowest wealth quintiles (for example, 91 percent of the total number of OOS children in Katsina), with rural areas having a larger portion of OOS children (i.e., in Oyo, 20 percent of children in rural areas are OOS whereas only 2 percent in urban areas are OOS). In addition, there is a high dropout rate in primary school, with only a small portion of students transitioning from primary school to JSS. Both retention and transition rates tend to be lower for girls. Although states have made significant progress in closing gender gap in school attendance in basic education school, and Oyo has achieved gender parity in enrollment in basic education, these gaps persist in Adamawa and Katsina, with fewer girls enrolled in basic education than boys.
- 9. Low retention and completion rates are driven by both demand- and supply-side factors.** On the demand side, household wealth and language spoken at home have an important impact on whether a child attends school. Perceived low benefits of education, especially for girls, and perceived inappropriateness of formal education are also important contributing factors. On the supply-side, some factors include a lack of schools within walking distance, weak infrastructure and a lack of water and sanitation (WASH) facilities, especially for girls. Currently, many schools in OAK states do not meet the UBEC's minimum standards for learning conditions – lacking basic amenities, facilities and resources such as water, electricity, toilets, furniture, and textbooks. There is an insufficient number of classrooms: 13,454 classrooms in Oyo; 2200 classrooms in Adamawa; and 26,471 classrooms in Katsina will need to be added to achieve a Pupil-to-Classroom ratio (PCR) of 40:1 at the primary level. Further, classrooms are overcrowded with the mean (median) public primary school PCR of 88 (73) in Oyo, 49 (36) in Adamawa, and 107 (87) in Katsina states. The shortage of WASH facilities is significant with lack of latrines/toilets in 57 percent, 56 percent, and 24 percent public primary schools in Oyo, Katsina and Adamawa states, respectively. Further, only about 20 percent of public primary schools in Oyo, 32 percent in Adamawa, and 39 percent in Katsina have access to a source of drinking water. In many cases, the lack of information on schools, their infrastructure and the population they serve are impediments to addressing these issues.
- 10. Low qualifications among teachers and inadequate teaching practices.** Teachers score very low on a competency index that combines subject and pedagogical knowledge, and they do not have the requisite skills to teach in the classroom. The NLA 2020 found that more than 50 percent of teachers disagree with the view that students deserve more attention if they are lagging behind. This is a result of several factors. First, teachers have limited, if any, opportunities to participate in teacher professional development (TPD) and receive pedagogical support. Furthermore, it is often the case, as it is in Oyo, for example, that older male teachers are more likely than female teachers to be provided these limited training opportunities. Furthermore, teachers in most instances do not receive support in the form of guided or structured lesson plans and are given very limited feedback on their classroom teaching, which hampers their ability to improve their skills or to tailor their teaching to the needs of the students. While teachers are expected to undertake assessments, assessment data is not recorded properly to undertake an analysis to identify reasons for low learning levels as suggested by occasional national learning assessments. Of growing importance, the portion of teachers who are computer literate is variable and limited in some states– while close to 90 percent of

⁸ Integrated Islamic schools refers to Islamic schools that have integrated basic education curriculum (literacy and numeracy) into their curriculum.



female teachers and 89 percent of male teachers report being computer literate in Oyo state, only 43 percent of female teachers and 57 percent of male teachers in Katsina State report being computer literate.

11. **Weak governance and accountability.** The weak governance and accountability in education systems is manifested in four related issues: a) the existence of weak education management systems (EMIS); b) the weak planning capacity, including the low capacity to develop policies based on the available evidence; c) the lack of transparency in decision-making, especially regarding budget issues; and d) the inefficient allocation of resources, including human resources, which is reflected in the unequal deployment and distribution of teachers. States have weak education management systems and limited capacity to collect, manage, and analyze education data, particularly using digital systems. In many cases, the lack of information on schools, their infrastructure and the population they serve are impediments to addressing these issues.
12. The inefficient deployment and distribution of teachers in public schools in Nigeria is of particular concern driving large inequities in learning. There is significant variation in OAK states in the pupil-to-teacher ratio (PTR). Among public schools in Oyo, the PTR is high, with an average of 64 and the highest being 129. Katsina's PTR is even higher with an average of 73 and the highest being 153. In contrast to this, Adamawa's PTR is relatively low, with an average of 28 and a high of 57. Across OAK states, PTRs are higher in rural areas than in urban ones. There are several factors which drive this rural/urban divide including: a lack of amenities in rural areas; better employment prospects for families in urban areas (only 25 percent of teachers in rural public primary schools are female, whereas 63 percent of urban public primary teachers are female); and a lack of incentives for teachers to move to rural areas to teach in rural schools.

The impact of COVID-19

13. **COVID-19 is likely to exacerbate existing challenges facing the education sector in Nigeria and in OAK states.** An estimated 147,000 primary and junior secondary schools were closed between March and October 2020, disrupting the education of more than 37 million students. In OAK states alone more than 6,000 schools were closed affecting more than six million students. Although most schools have now reopened, they are operating only two days a week or double-shifting to allow for social distancing whereby the impact of COVID-19 on learning continues. While the SMOEs in OAK states have tried to provide distance learning opportunities through radio and television program, the coverage and level of engagement are limited in OAK states with access being inequitable. According to a recent survey conducted by the World Bank in Nigeria, only 58 percent of those children in the lowest income quintile and 70 percent of those in the highest quintile have been engaged in any educational activity during school closures.⁹
14. **These short-term impacts in terms of schooling and learning can also be expected to have long-term effects in terms of income.** Thus, the average annual earnings per student, measured in 2011 USD purchasing power parity (PPP), would decrease significantly. For the economy as a whole, this implies a reduction of US\$25 billion in terms of the present value of all students' lifetime earnings. The implications are also significant in various other domains in light of research which shows the strong linkages between increased educational attainment and health outcomes, among others. School closures are likely to affect poor and vulnerable populations, including girls, disproportionately. With limited if any access to remote learning opportunities and supports usually provided through school, children from poorer households are more likely to drop out of school. Prior to the pandemic, among Nigerian children ages 6-15 from households in the lowest wealth quintile, 13 percent reported dropping out of school and 31 percent reported never attending school, while less than 10 percent of children from households in the top three wealth quintiles reported either never

⁹ The most common type of engagement has been through radio instruction, followed by sessions with teachers, TV, and, finally, mobile learning apps. Josephson, Ana; Kilic, Talip, and Michler Jeffrey, 2020. Socioeconomic impacts of COVID-19 in four African countries, Development Data Group, World Bank.



attending or dropping out of school¹⁰. In Sierra Leone during the Ebola epidemic, pregnancy rates among adolescent girls increased. When schools re-opened after one year, girls ages 12-17 were 16 percentage points less likely to be in school than their male counterparts. Prior to the pandemic, girls in northern Nigeria were at high risk of dropping out of school/not transitioning to the JSS level. COVID-19 might further exacerbate these trends.

PforR Program Scope

15. Under the PforR component of the parent program, participating state governments receive financing upon achievement of DLIs (i.e., DLRs) in three results areas which are also key outcomes of the federal UBE program: Result Area 1: Reduction in the number of the OOS children; Result Area 2: Improvement of literacy rates; and Result Area 3: Strengthening accountability for results. The parent program covers 17 focus states¹¹ under Result Areas 1 and 2 and all 36 states and Federal Capital Territory (FCT) under Result Area 3.
16. The three results areas of the BESDA Operation support the Government's UBE program¹², which is financed by the UBE Intervention Fund, and aim to support three key approaches to improve the UBE Program's performance: (a) adopting a results-oriented approach that fosters mutual accountability for results among federal and state actors; (b) allocating funds to those states that demonstrate the greatest need (defined in terms of size of OOS population) and performance (defined in terms of reducing numbers of OOS children and improving literacy); and (c) addressing constraints in access to basic education in a holistic manner, that is, addressing both demand- and supply-side constraints where relevant. In the longer term, BESDA aims to bolster the UBE Program's ability to channel more funds to states with greater needs and, as such, focuses most of its interventions on the 17 focus states that are facing the greatest challenges in ensuring access to basic education -- under Results Areas 1 and 2 (building on existing World Bank-financed operations) and on all states for Results Area 3.
17. In addition to the PforR component, the TA component finances activities both at the federal and state levels, which, in addition to supporting management of the BESDA Operation, aim to strengthen the capacity of relevant education sector entities, support a critical research agenda that will build partnerships with local think tanks and universities, and support third-party verification and monitoring. Costs of these activities, including related consulting services, training, and operational expenditures, are covered by the TA component, using an IPF instrument in accordance with the World Bank's fiduciary policies and guidelines.

Implementation Progress

18. Overall implementation progress under the BESDA Operation was rated Moderately Satisfactory in the latest Implementation Status and Results Report (ISR) dated January 6, 2021. While there was a seven-month delay

¹⁰ 12 percent children from the poorest wealth quintile households reported attending traditional Islamic schools and only 44 percent children reported attending formal school. Overall, school 78 percent children of ages 6-15 report attending formal school (NEDS 2020).

¹¹ These 17 states include Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Ebonyi, Gombe, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Niger, Oyo, Rivers, Sokoto, Taraba, Yobe, and Zamfara.

¹² The Ministerial Strategic Plan (MSP) 2018-2022 further highlights the Government's commitment to these areas- though focusing on all levels of education – it also focus on three result areas; access, quality and systems strengthening.



in the Operation's effectiveness, the Government has since made notable progress towards the achievement of the PDO, across the three result areas, and this was confirmed during the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the operation in August, 2020. Total IDA financing for the BESDA Operation is US\$611. With the achievement of DLIs 1 and 3 under BESDA as verified by data from NEDS 2015 and 2020¹³, disbursement of around US\$192 (25% of the total value of the operation) million to 14 of the 17 focus states that registered progress on these two DLIs has been approved.¹⁴ After this financing for these two DLIs is disbursed, the cumulative disbursement under the PforR component will reach US\$290 million or more than 50 percent of the total amount allocated to this portion of the Program. As of January 18, 2021, US\$12 million (or 36 percent of the total) TA component allocation has been disbursed. Progress under the PforR component and the TA Component are described below.

- 19. PforR Component (US\$78 million).** Under Results Area 1, NEDS 2020 showed that the number of children ages 6 to 15 attending schools had increased in 17 focus states from 15,384,718 in 2015 (NEDS 2015) to 19,591,100 in 2020 (NEDS 2020). This represents a 27 percent increase in coverage of the basic education system. During this same time period, the estimated number of OOS children decreased by 924,590 (of which 633,772 are girls and 290,818 are boys) from 5.511 million to 4.877 million for girls and from 5.167 million to 4.876 million for boys. The total reduction is a product of the differences between the school-age population and the number of children in-school between 2015 and 2020, taking into account the increase in the size of the school-age population (ages 6 to 15) by 3,299,308 in the last five years due to the high fertility rate. For Results Area 2, 11 out of the 17 focus states registered improvements in literacy rates with Borno, Taraba, Ebonyi and Zamfara states recording more than a 10 percent improvement. At the same time, Yobe, Rivers, Gombe and Kebbi states did not show any improvement and the improvement in Kaduna and Sokoto was less than the target of at least 2 percent. Under Results Area 3, UBEC completed the 2018 annual review of the UBE Program and all states have prepared 2017-2019 State Basic Education Strategic Plans for their respective states, which are pending verification.
- 20. TA Component (US\$33 million):** Financing under this component covers costs associated with (i) coordination under the Operation as well as fiduciary and safeguards support to focus states; and (ii) the independent verification of the DLIs. Activities under the TA component are proceeding according to the agreed workplan.
- 21.** Progress towards achievement of the PDO was rated Moderately Satisfactory in the most recent ISR. Despite this, the MTR found that a few changes would be needed to the RF to: (i) emphasize efforts in expanding school attendance and adjust the target for the reduction of OOS children factoring in the increase in the school-age population in Results Area 1; and (ii) include DLIs in the upcoming restructuring to measure progress on specific activities. The MTR also determined, a restructuring would be beneficial in supporting the Operation to fully achieve its PDO as it would allow the Operation to: (i) adjust the timeline for achievement of DLIs in light of the delay in effectiveness; (ii) reward the continued efforts of the governments to provide basic education in non-formal learning centers for children who have dropped out and/or who have never – and are not likely to – attend formal schools (Result Area 1); and (iii) adjust the PDO-level and intermediate results indicators to better track process, efforts and overall progress during the life of the Operation. Finally, it would (iv) support the federal and state governments in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, specifically to minimize its impact on learning. The proposed restructuring is expected to be completed by March 2021 and will not affect the proposed AF, but rather make adjustments to the parent program.

¹³ NEDS 2020 was completed in March 2020 for which preliminary results are available.

¹⁴ The withdrawal application has been submitted and is being processed by the Bank.



- 22. Program coordination and monitoring and evaluation.** At the Federal level, the FME established a fully functional BESDA Program Management Unit called the National Policy and Monitoring Team (NPMT), reporting to the National Program Coordinator. The Unit is responsible for: (i) advocacy for the BESDA program; (ii) monitoring BESDA implementation by state and UBEC; (iii) supervising the verification agents (i.e., NPoPC) and National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)) engaged by the Federal Ministry of Finance (FMoF); and (iv) TA on the NLA and compilation of annual school census (ACS) data. The UBEC also established a program unit called the National Coordination Team (NCT), responsible for the overall implementation of BESDA which includes: (i) providing guidance and technical support to states in the delivery of DLIs; (ii) monitoring the day-to-day implementation and reporting to the FMoE, FMoF and the World Bank and other stakeholders on progress; and (iii) ensuring participating states' compliance with safeguards and fiduciary standards/requirements. At the state level, after initial delays, program management teams have been firmly established in 17 focus states with clear responsibility for delivering DLIs in each of the Results Area.
- 23. Program Action Plan.** No new actions have been proposed by the fiduciary team. The Integrated Fiduciary Systems Assessment (IFSA) concluded that the examined program fiduciary systems (FM and Procurement), institutions and practices of the proposed AF are adequate to provide reasonable assurance that the financing proceeds will be used for intended purposes, with due attention to principle of economy, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability, and for safeguarding program assets. Appropriate systems to handle the risks of fraud and corruption, including effective complaint mechanisms, have been agreed on and established, subject to full implementation of the PAP.
- A. The proposed AF and State Selection**
- 24. Nigeria is eligible for a new grant in the amount of US\$123.8 million from the GPE to support the implementation of the UBE Program – which is supported by the BESDA Operation (parent program) described above.** The UBE Program will continue to serve as the Operation's program boundaries. As noted above, the World Bank has been selected as the GA for the proposed grant. Upon consultation and agreement with the government, it was agreed that this grant will be processed as an AF to the ongoing BESDA Operation and will focus on Oyo, Adamawa, and Katsina (OAK) states given that (a) they are facing a substantial funding gap and would need additional resources to achieve the goals of the UBE Program; (b) the aims of the new GPE grant can best be achieved through a hybrid approach of RBF and IPF; and (c) OAK states are also BESDA focus states.
- 25. OAK states were selected to benefit from the proposed AF as additional targeted investment in these states will provide an opportunity to introduce significant reforms in each state's education system.** These proposed reforms will, in turn, improve their overall capacity both to achieve and maintain education sector gains. To this end, criteria were used to assess whether or not a state had an environment conducive for undertaking far-reaching education sector reforms. The criteria included: (a) having a government-endorsed sector-wide State ESP; (b) government commitment to and ownership of ESP implementation and undertaking activities if selected to receive financing by GPE; (c) demonstrated capacity and willingness to provide data and evidence for planning and budgeting. For the latter, states were required to: (i) have undertaken an ASC (and submit available reports for the 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 school years), and (ii) submit state education budget and expenditure records for the past three years; (d) provide evidence of up-to-date payment of teacher and other education personnel salaries and remuneration as of August 2019; and (d) provide data on the proportion of OOS children and the gross/net enrollment rates for basic education in the state. Oyo, Adamawa and Katsina states met these criteria and were selected from the Southern, North Eastern and North Western regions of the country, representing three different geo-political zones. In addition, OAK states' priorities in education are aligned with the country's larger education sector priorities and those of the GPE.



26. The proposed AF will help tackle some of the most pressing issues facing the education sector as identified in the 2020 ESA conducted in OAK states:

- Approximately 1.6 million children ages 6-15 are not in the formal education system in OAK states, of which 940,000 children have never attended school and 460,000 students have dropped out of school.
- Transition rates between primary and junior secondary school are very low in OAK states, and particularly low in rural areas – the transition rates in urban areas are 46, 50 and 70 percent in Oyo, Katsina and Adamawa, respectively, while the transition rates in rural areas in these states are 21, 20 and 30, respectively.
- Lack of easy access to primary and junior secondary schools is one of the main reasons for never attending school or dropping out of school. Most primary schools are overcrowded¹⁵ and lack access to drinking water and sanitation facilities and there is an insufficient number of JSS particularly in poor and rural areas.
- There are an insufficient number of teachers and a large portion of existing teachers do not have the requisite skills. The average PTRs in these states range from 28 (Adamawa) to 73 (Katsina). The distribution of teachers in public schools is inequitable with wide variations in PTRs across states. Teachers have limited if any professional development opportunities to acquire/further build the necessary skills to teach and assess students.
- Learning levels are low in OAK states with a large proportion of children lacking basic skills in reading and mathematics. Among 6-11 year old students currently attending school, only 73.6 percent in Oyo, 36.8 percent in Adamawa, and 24.6 percent in Katsina can read at least one of three words and among 12-15 year old students currently attending school, only 93.0 percent in Oyo, 76.4 percent in Adamawa, and 65.3 percent in Katsina can read at least one of three words (NEDS 2020) – showing that learning outcomes remain low among those children who remain in school. Low learning outcomes are also evident in basic mathematics whereby among 6-11 year old students currently attending school, 20.8 percent in Oyo, 62.1 percent in Adamawa, and 77.6 percent in Katsina cannot add single digits, and among 12-15 year old students currently attending school, 5.2 percent in Oyo, 21.6 percent in Adamawa, and 38.7 percent in Katsina cannot add single digits.

27. The new GPE grant will be processed as an AF to the ongoing BESDA Operation and will expand the reach and impact of the parent program in OAK states. Providing an AF to the BESDA Operation was considered the most appropriate approach for supporting the UBE Program as: (a) the focus of the proposed new GPE financing is aligned with the objectives of the parent program and, therefore, the larger UBE Program; (b) this will provide the opportunity to further extend the reach and impact of the parent program in OAK states where there are significant challenges and a substantial funding gap for basic education; (c) OAK states are BESDA focus states and, as such, have the necessary experience to maximize the impact of this AF without incurring additional start-up costs and (d) the hybrid instrument used by the BESDA Operation is aligned with that of the GPE modality (fixed/variable) and is well-suited for both incentivizing actions to address key challenges and for building capacity in the sector. The proposed AF is well-positioned to enhance the development impact of the parent program while, at the same time, minimizing the transaction costs and reducing the current financing gap for basic education.

¹⁵ For example, it is estimated that Oyo, Adamawa, and Katsina states will require 13,500, 26,500, and 2200 additional classrooms respectively to maintain a student-classroom ratio of 40.



28. The proposed AF is consistent with the World Bank Policy on PforR Programs, which stipulates that the World Bank may agree to provide additional financing to an ongoing PforR Program to meet: (a) unanticipated significant changes to expenditures parameters required to achieve the original PforR Program results or DLIs; or (b) new or modified results, to be reflected in new or modified DLIs, that aim to scale up the impact or development effectiveness of the original PforR Program.

29. The proposed AF will come at a time in which protecting education investments in Nigeria is challenging and, at the same time, even more critical. The current crisis created by the COVID-19 pandemic and the fall in the oil prices makes financing for education particularly difficult. In the current context, existing fiscal resources are needed to contain the outbreak and to initiate counter-cyclical and pro-poor fiscal measures to protect the lives and livelihoods of the population. At the same time, investing in human capital accumulation is essential to ensuring resilience and for minimizing the intergenerational transmission of poverty as a consequence of the current crisis. The proposed AF will contribute to achieving UBE during these challenging times, protecting education sector gains to date, while taking advantage of the momentum under the current operation and its institutional structures.

C. Program Development Objective(s)

Program Development Objective(s)

To increase equitable access for out-of-school children and improve literacy in focus states, and strengthen accountability for results, in basic education in Nigeria.

30. The proposed AF aims to scale-up and expand BESDA’s development impact through: (a) providing additional support to the implementation of Nigeria’s UBE Program including incentivizing systemic changes which will increase access to quality of basic education in OAK states; and (b) expanded TA, including capacity building within the education system in OAK states, and for coordination and monitoring at the federal level (FMOE and UBEC). To this end, additional DLIs to incentive these changes are included under each results area of the parent program which apply only to OAK states. Similarly, the new DLIs also reflect GPE priority areas as shown in Table 1. A portion of the proposed AF will be used to support activities under the TA component related to program implementation, capacity building and research activities.

31. The proposed AF will support improvements under each of the Results Areas as follows: under Results Area 1, the proposed AF will support additional activities to increase equitable access to education; under Results Area 2, the proposed AF will incentivize improvements in the quality of education – supporting activities to strengthen teaching practices to improve literacy and learning; under Results Area 3, the proposed AF will expand on efforts under the parent program focused on strengthening accountability, to support the efficient deployment of teachers. Each Results Area of the parent program is expanded with the proposed AF to include new DLIs for OAK states. Table 1 illustrates the proposed AF and its linkages with the parent program and GPE priority areas. Note that for Result Area 1 the proposed AF will maintain the parent program’s technical scope. For Results Area 2 and 3, the proposed AF will expand the parent program’s technical scope. Results Area 2, which focuses on improving literacy rates, will be expanded to include improvements in teaching practices to improve literacy and learning. Results Area 3, which focuses on strengthening accountability for results, will be expanded to focus on increasing transparency and efficiency in the utilization of resources and the deployment of teachers, relying on timely and reliable data.



Table 1: Alignment of Proposed AF with Parent Program Results Areas and GPE Priority Areas

Results Area in parent program applicable to all 17 Focus States	Expansion under the proposed AF applicable to OAK states only	GPE focus areas
Reduction in the number of OOS children	Reduction in the number of OOS children (no technical expansion): <i>This expanded results area aims to incentivize targeted allocations from the state infrastructure budget to the most disadvantaged schools and communities as a priority</i>	Equity
Improvement of literacy rates	Improvement in teaching practices and learning outcomes: <i>This expanded -results area aims to incentivize training of teachers, assessment of learning outcomes and improvements in teaching and learning</i>	Learning
Strengthening accountability for results	Improvement in school data collection and state education sector planning: <i>This expanded results area aims to incentivize data-driven and efficient teacher deployment and timely publication of detailed state education budget and expenditure to enhance transparency and accountability</i>	Efficiency

* While this area is the same as the parent program results area, it will expand the reach and activities to reduce the number of OOS children by promoting equitable access. Table 1 only highlights expansions in the technical scope of the result areas, not in the reach or number of beneficiaries.

32. The proposed AF will support OAK states to address further the challenges faced related to inequitable access, low learning outcomes, and system inefficiencies as described above. The design of the proposed AF has several features which will increase the overall impact and success of the BESDA Operation. More specifically, the AF design: (a) supports interventions which are complementary to on-going and planned BESDA activities and other DP-supported interventions in the OAK states; (b) prioritizes interventions that provide direct support to schools (students, teachers) and local communities; (c) includes interventions which can be anchored in the government’s support to the state’s education sector (i.e., both through state resources and through UBE Intervention Fund) – that is education spending for salaries, infrastructure, learning materials, TPD, etc.; (d) focuses on reforms to strengthen the existing government programs’ impact by influencing resource allocation for improving the equity, efficiency and learning outcome focus of these programs; (e) supports the government in ensuring that shifts in resource allocation and access to education can be monitored regularly; and (f) has selected interventions and DLIs, and related targets, to reflect the similarities and differences among the three states.

33. The proposed AF maintains the same PDO as the parent program. It will also have the same financing modality (hybrid – PforR and IPF) but will lay out specific DLIs/DLRs, focus on OAK states and will have distinct oversight arrangements. The proposed AF, thus, will have DLIs, PDO-level and intermediate results indicators (and targets) specific to OAK states. In accordance with GPE funding requirements, the AF will also be subject to regular supervision from the World Bank but with strong oversight by the LEG. The proposed AF will be implemented over a 4-year period (2021-2025).

34. There are no changes introduced to the BESDA program boundaries under the proposed AF – the boundaries will continue to be the ongoing UBE Program. The UBE Program in each state is implemented



through two funding sources: (i) the state education budget; and (ii) the UBE intervention fund – funds which are provided by the federal government to the state governments (administered by the SUBEBs). The state education budget covers teachers’ salaries, operating expenses, post-basic education capital investment and state’s share of infrastructure budget¹⁶, while the UBE intervention funds (provided by the federal government to state governments) is used to finance: (i) infrastructure¹⁷; (ii) TPD; (iii) learning materials; (iii) special needs’ education; (iv) good governance; (v) additional support to disadvantaged states¹⁸; and (vi) program operating, monitoring and implementing expenses.

35. State allocations from the UBE intervention fund have been generally equal across OAK states and amounted to approximately US\$9 million annually.¹⁹ SUBEBs in Adamawa and Oyo have accessed the allocated resources from the UBE Intervention Fund up to 2018 while Katsina has already accessed funds for 2019. UBE program allocations in 2019 and those expected in 2020 are smaller than previous years as Nigeria is facing serious revenue constraints due to the volatility of oil price and the economic impacts of COVID-19 pandemic, as described above. Table 2 presents an updated financing framework.

Table 2: Updated Financing Framework (US\$ million)

Financing Source	Parent Program with PEF at Board Approval	Parent Program with updated PEF including proposed AF	AF Increase
BORROWER/RECIPIENT	760	1,220*	460**
IDA (for parent BESDA)	611	611	0
GPE (for 3 OAK states) for AF		123.8	123.8
TOTAL PROGRAM FINANCING	1,371	1,954.8*	583.8

* Revised estimate to reflect OAK states’ spending on basic education projected to 2025. ** The increase represents 55% of the amount in the parent program, which will contribute the acceleration of results as explained in the rationale section.

36. OAK states have acquired considerable experience in the RBF modality through the BESDA operation and have made progress on several of the indicators, though performance has been variable. Significant progress has been made in terms of reducing the total number of OOS children (in Katsina state), and increasing the number of *Almajiri* children enrolled in non-formal learning centers and improving literacy rates for 6-15 year-old children (in all three states). Table 3 below presents the status of achievement of DLLs under the parent program in OAK states:

¹⁶ This allocation allows states to access matching grants for infrastructure from the UBE intervention fund.

¹⁷ This financing is in the form of matching grants which are provided to states as a result of the state budget’s allocation to infrastructure.

¹⁸ A portion of the UBE intervention fund (14 percent) is allocated for Education imbalance fund, 50 percent of which is divided equally among states, and 50 percent distributed to disadvantaged states.

¹⁹ These resources are transferred from the UBEC to states.



Table 3: Progress Under Parent Program in OAK States

Results Areas	DLIs	Oyo	Adamawa	Katsina
Results Area 1: Reduction of out-of-school children	DLI1 - Number of OOS children reduced - determined by the change between NEDS 2015 and NEDS 2020 household surveys	No reduction	No reduction	Reduced by 181,000
	Number of Almajiri and other OOS enrolled in non-formal centers	40,000	63,000	27,000
Results Area 2: Improving Literacy	DLI2 - Number of schools and students participating in the intensive literacy program	1,200 schools 28,874 students	1,264 schools 81,744 students	1,004 schools 147,654 students
	DLI3 - Improvement in literacy rates determined by the change between NEDS 2015 and NEDS 2020 household surveys	8.1 percentage point increase	4.6 percentage point increase	2.3 percentage point increase
Results Area 3: Improving Accountability of Results	DLI 4 - Schools reporting Annual School Census (ASC)	Census of primary schools and JSS completed for 2017/2018 school year - Verification to commence in January 2021		
	DLI5 - State Basic Education Plans²⁰	Verification to commence in February 2021		

37. Data from NEDS 2020, when compared with baseline data (NEDS 2015), show variable performance across OAK states in terms of reducing the number of OOS children (Result Area 1) and improving literacy rates (Result Area 2). With respect to *OOS children*, school attendance rates in Katsina have significantly improved, well above the estimated growth of the school-age population, and it is estimated that the number of OOS children in the state was reduced by 181,000 between 2015 and 2020. In Oyo, the estimated number of children in school also increased – though the increase was only equal to the estimated increase in the school-age population, and as such, there was not a reduction in the overall number of OOS children. In Adamawa, there was an increase in the proportion of children who are OOS from 14 percent for boys and 18 percent for girls in 2015 to 28 percent for both boys and girls in 2020. With support from the FMoE and UBEC, OAK states have adopted a more concrete strategy to engage *Almajiri* and other children who have dropped out of the formal school system to provide them with non-formal basic education. As of March 2020, as a result of additional efforts under BESDA to enroll children outside the formal education system in school - 130,000 OOS children have benefited from non-formal education/education in *Almajiri* centers in OAK states. With respect to *literacy rates*, NEDS 2020 showed increases in the proportion of children who can read simple words in three major Nigerian languages (Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba) and English in OAK states, with Oyo having the largest improvement (8.1 percentage points increase), followed by Adamawa (4.6 percentage points) and Katsina (2.3 percentage points).²¹

²⁰ It should be noted that the State Basic Education Plans are different from the ESPs mentioned above, although there is a lot of overlap in their content. ESPs were prepared by OAK states with funding from GPE and cover all levels of education including Basic education. State Basic Education Plans are being prepared by all 36 states and FCT and cover only Basic education.

²¹ With the verification of this DLI completed, Katsina will be eligible for reimbursement of DLI1 while all three states would be reimbursed for DLI3 upon completion of the withdrawal application.



- 38. The proposed AF is fully aligned with the Oak States ESPs and the World Bank Country Partnership Framework (CPF) (FY21-FY25) for Nigeria (which is in the final stages of preparation).** The proposed AF reflects the key priority programs identified in OAK states' ESPs 2020-22, namely: (i) improving access, equity and inclusiveness; (ii) increasing quality of education through improving the teaching and learning experience; and (iii) improving education system management and efficiency. The proposed AF will also directly contribute to achieving the CPF (FY21-FY25) objective 2 of increasing access to quality basic education.
- 39. The proposed AF is also aligned with the GPE's strategic goals of improving quality, equity and efficiency (see Table 1) in education and with the GPE's financing modality with variable and fixed parts.** The Variable part will use the PforR instrument; and the fixed part will use the IPF instrument. Under the proposed AF, in line with GPE requirements, the Variable part will expand the focus of the three parent program's results areas to focus on: (a) reduction in the number of OOS children (aligned with the GPE equity area); (b) improvement of teaching practices to improve literacy and learning (aligned with the GPE learning outcomes area); and c) improvement in school data collection and state education sector planning (aligned with the GPE efficiency area). Each results area will include DLI(s)/DLRs which will cover a mix of process, output (intermediate results) and outcome (PDO-level) indicators.
- 40. The Fixed Part (IPF component) will cover the following costs:** (i) federal-level TA, supervision and verification; and (ii) state level physical inputs such as provision of tablets with curated teacher training modules, TA, and operating costs. Under the fixed part, TA will be prioritized in those areas where government capacity is deemed lacking or areas wherein the government wishes to introduce innovations such as establishing a state level student learning assessment system, developing digital data collection tools and improving the state EMIS for collecting and publishing quality data in timely manner to facilitate better education system planning and resource management.

PROPOSED CHANGES

- 41. The proposed AF will introduce the following changes applicable only to OAK states:** a) new DLIs; (b) new PDO-level and intermediate results indicators and updates to targets under the parent program, as appropriate; and c) additional resources for the TA component for OAK states, as well as federal level entities – FMoE and UBEC. Thus, the AF will have the same hybrid design as the parent program – consisting of two parts: (a) the PforR Component, which is considered as the Variable Part, in accordance with the GPE financing modality; and (b) the IPF component, which is considered as the Fixed Part, also following the GPE financing modality.
- 42. The new DLIs will focus on expanding the impact of the BESDA Operation in the three Results Areas.** These DLIs will support/incentivize: i) the development of a school network for identifying and monitoring communities' access to primary and junior secondary school and those with essential infrastructure deficits for targeted funding for school infrastructure development; ii) targeting resources for infrastructure to those communities in greatest need; iii) improvements in teachers' capacity to teach effectively in core subjects by building a system for a structured pedagogy program based on digital technology; iv) more efficient deployment of teachers, increasing their presence in rural schools; and v) the establishment of a system for making education spending data, and decisions related to resource allocations, more transparent and accessible.
- 43. Additional PDO-level and intermediate results indicators will be included and targets of select indicators under the parent operation in the RF to capture efforts under the proposed AF.** The new indicators will track progress on: i) the number of students from underserved communities with access to schools (basic education level) and adequate learning conditions; ii) the development of action plans for improved access of education for children with disabilities; iii) the development of a policy for supporting vulnerable and poor children; iv)



the establishment of state-level learning assessment systems; and v) the strengthening of digital data collection and distribution system to improve the effectiveness of the state EMIS (see Table 4). New IRIs will be included which are essential for achieving PDO-level indicators’ targets. All of the indicators are time-bound, specific to each of the OAK states and will be disaggregated by gender, whenever feasible. All the indicators under the parent program (including the AF indicators) can be found in the RF of the program document.

Table 4. Expanded Results Areas and PDO-level Indicators for OAK States

Results areas	PDO-level indicators
Expanded Results Area 1: Reduction in the number of OOS children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students from underserved communities with access to schools and adequate learning conditions for Basic Education (disaggregated by gender)
Expanded Results Area 2: Improvement of teachers’ teaching practices and measuring learning outcomes for policy formulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of teachers receiving individualized reports on how to improve their teaching practice based on their interactions with school pedagogical support officers and the results of school-based student learning assessments (disaggregated by gender)
Expanded Results Area 3: Improving teacher deployment and making education expenditures transparent and accessible for policy formulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of States developing and adopting need-based teacher deployment policy Number of States publishing education expenditures, including UBE program expenditures and outputs

D. Environmental and Social Effects

- 1. Review of the available data, extensive consultations with stakeholders, and detailed analysis of the environmental and social effects of the proposed activities under the proposed AF revealed that an Environmental and Social Safeguards Assessment Addendum is not necessary for this operation.** The proposed AF supports activities that are within the scope of the parent program. The parent program’s Environmental and Social Systems Assessment (ESSA) remains valid. The ESSA of the parent program can be found at: <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P160430>.
- 2. The overall environmental impacts of the AF are likely moderate, as this AF is not expected to involve any major civil works that will have significant adverse environmental impacts.** Similar to the parent program, the proposed AF activities may involve rehabilitation, renovation, and construction of school buildings with potential environmental risks that will require mitigation. These risks apply to the DLI that focuses on JSS construction and improvement of essential infrastructure (classrooms and WASH facilities) in primary schools in the most disadvantaged communities and schools. The envisaged potential risks will be site-specific without likelihood of impacts beyond the project’s footprint provided that adequate measures are taken during the design, implementation, and operation phases of sub-operations. Potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the Program include: (a) community and workers’ health and safety risks associated with physical infrastructure (WASH and classrooms); (b) water supply (including potable water), gender-friendly/disability inclusive sanitation and hygiene/latrines facilities in schools; (c) indoor air quality; (d) safety (including absence of perimeter fence) and access for students in schools; (e) disaster/fire safety and emergency response arrangements; (f) flooding and erosion, particularly in the southern states; and (g) debris management resulting from construction and rehabilitation works. These risks and impacts are expected to



be easily mitigated in a predictable manner. Also, routine safety precautions are expected to be sufficient to mitigate these potential risks and impacts in a satisfactory manner. The Environmental Risk Rating of the proposed AF is **Moderate**.

3. **The overall social impacts of the Program are likely positive, owing to the Program design which seeks to improve access, equity, and quality of basic education in Nigeria.** The potential adverse social impacts of the Program are not expected to be significant. For example, the Program will not have significant negative impact related to land acquisition or loss of access to natural resources. However, it should be noted that the Program will operate in a country where the political and governance risks are generally high. Different parts of Northern Nigeria are adversely affected by different types of conflicts that might flare up again and potentially affect Program implementation.
4. To date, the efforts and actions proposed and undertaken on the performance of the environmental and social (E&S) systems under the parent program to improve E&S performance are: (a) UBEC and each of the 17 SUBEBs have formed a safeguards unit and recruited staff and consultants; (b) Capacity building and trainings have been conducted by World Bank E&S team to provide guidance on E&S arrangements such as the content of the ESSA and the Program Action Plan; environmental screening of proposed activities to be implemented supervision, inclusion of E&S safeguards measures in bidding documents, monitoring and reporting requirements as well as the role of the recipient in the E&S management of the operation; (c) a code-of conduct for facilitators (teachers, educators, counsellors and all school staff) for non-formal education centers has been drafted; and (d) a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) structure has been established in some states.
5. Some gaps remain for improvement when it comes to the following areas – (a) GRMs needs to be implemented in all the states. States are requesting more funds for the facilitation (b) civil works under BESDA is not encouraged and the few places where it has taken place there should be appropriate E&S safeguards measures in place (c) registration of non-formal educational institutes needs to take place after proper verification and (d) quarterly progress reports on social and environmental safeguards need to be submitted. The social risk rating of this AF is considered **Moderate**.

E. Financing

1. **The technical assessment of the parent Program at the time of Board Approval (June 2017) remains highly relevant.** The government UBE program requires (i) substantial increase in financing to accommodate the increase in school age population; (ii) a combination of supply and demand side interventions responsive to the specific needs of children who are not yet attending schools; (iii) targeting of limited resources to children, communities and schools that are most disadvantaged; and (iv) focusing on changing education practices i.e. teaching and assessment, school governance and resource management, school pedagogical support, supervision and system-level M&E.
2. **The proposed AF complements key actions already introduced in the parent program and will help expand on the three Results Areas of the parent program to influence the equity, efficiency and learning outcome focused reforms in OAK states with respect to their resource allocation, implementation and reporting of basic education service delivery.** In addition to providing additional resources needed to OAK states and the Federal Government, a significant added value of this AF is the opportunity to directly influence how OAK states use government resources allocated to education sector for improving accountability for results in infrastructure development, teacher deployment, pedagogical support and supervision and community empowerment.



- 3. The expansion of the interventions in OAK states will contribute to the achievement of the PDO**, given the focus on reducing out of school, improving teaching and learning (including literacy) and increasing efficiency in the education sector.

Updated program boundaries and expenditure framework

- 4. The proposed AF will not change the program boundaries.** The on-going government UBE program in the OAK states will continue to serve as the program boundaries for the proposed AF.
- 5. The program expenditure framework in the OAK states has been updated to reflect:** (i) state government spending in basic education and (ii) UBE intervention funds provided by the federal government to the states. State government expenditures cover teacher salaries, operating expenses and infrastructure for junior secondary schools. The State UBE Intervention Fund includes (i) matching grants for infrastructure; (ii) TPD; (ii) learning materials; (iii) special needs education; (iv) good governance and (v) education imbalance programs in basic education and program operating and monitoring expenses.
- 6. OAK states allocated between 22 and 29 percent of their state budgets to education between 2016 and 2018.** Within the education budget, Oyo spent 49 percent, Adamawa spent 51 percent and Katsina spent 60 percent on basic education in 2018. This does not include the SUBEB budget which is allocated and transferred from the federal government. The patterns of state and local government spending are fairly similar across three states, with a high share of actual spending on personnel/salaries, and overall very low capital expenditure, as demonstrated in Figure A2.1 below.
- 7. OAK states ESAs show a significant financing gap in the education sector in all three states.** The financing gap is estimated to be around 8 Billion Naira for Oyo (US\$21 million), 17.9 Billion Naira (US\$47 million) for Adamawa, and 21 Billion Naira (US\$55 million) for Katsina (Figure A2.2). A simulation exercise shows that the financing gap is expected to grow as the number of students entering into the education system increases, requiring higher capital and recurrent expenditures.
- 8. For the UBE intervention funds, allocations were relatively equal across all states including in OAK states and amounted to approximately US\$9 million a year transferred from UBEC to states. Adamawa and Oyo SUBEBs had accessed the allocated funds up to 2018 while Katsina had already accessed funds for 2019.** UBE program allocations in 2019 and expected in 2020 were smaller than previous years as Nigeria is facing serious revenue constraints due to the volatility of oil price and the economic impacts of COVID 19 pandemic.
- 9. The proposed AF is fully aligned with the ESPs for 2020-2022 that OAK states prepared to support the implementation of the UBE program in their respective states.** The design for both the Variable and Fixed Parts of the proposed AF reflects the key sector challenges identified in the ESA and proposed priority programs identified in OAK states' ESPs 2020-2022, namely: (i) improving access, equity and inclusiveness; (ii) increasing quality of education through improving the teaching and learning experience; and (iii) improving education system management and efficiency.



Program Financing (Template)

Sources	Amount (USD Million)	% of Total
Trust Funds	125.00	100.00
Education for All - Fast Track Initiative	125.00	100.00
Total Program Financing	125.00	

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Name :	Thanh Thi Mai		
Designation :	Senior Education Specialist	Role :	Team Leader(ADM Responsible)
Telephone No :	5359+38215 /	Email :	mthanh1@worldbank.org

Name :	Olatunde Adetoyese Adekola		
Designation :	Senior Education Specialist	Role :	Team Leader
Telephone No :	5359+228	Email :	oadekola@worldbank.org

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Borrower :	Federal Republic of Nigeria		
Contact :	Aliyu Ahmed	Title :	Director
Telephone No :	2348055231816	Email :	ahmed4.aliyu@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies



Implementing Agency :	Univeral Basic Education Commission		
Contact :	Hamid Bobboyi	Title :	Executive Secretary
Telephone No :	2348037054764	Email :	hbobbyi@hotmail.com
Implementing Agency :	Federal Ministry of Education		
Contact :		Title :	
Telephone No :		Email :	

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>
