

Universal Basic Education Project 2nd Annual Review of CUBE

Executive Summary

1 Introduction

The Universal Basic Education Project (UBEP) is co-sponsored by World Bank, through IDA credits, and DFID, through support to the capacity-building component of UBEP: the Capacity for Universal Basic Education project, CUBE.

UBEP terminates with effect from 30 June 2006 (apart from some winding-down closure activities) and will henceforth be replaced by the WB-DFID-supported State Education Support Programme (SESP). CUBE will continue until its closing date (31 July 2008) but will now support the design, start-up and implementation of SESP in selected States: Kaduna, Kano, Kwara initially.

This report has two objectives: (a) to determine CUBE progress during the year July 2005 to June 2006 towards the achievement of the project purpose and its effectiveness to date in support of UBEP and the FGN overall UBE programme at both federal and state levels; (b) to make recommendations on how best current outputs and activities can be adjusted to satisfy existing and new commitments arising from the closure of UBEP and the proposed implementation of new WB supported state education projects (SESP).

This is the second annual review of CUBE, the first having reported in July 2005.

2 Annual Review

Pages 4 to 15 of this Annex contains, in PRISM format, the formal review of CUBE performance during y/e June 2006. Table 1 below summarises CUBE performance in the five output areas and indicates outline actions required to raise performance ratings. This should be read in conjunction with the recommendations (pages 2, 5 and 6).

Table 1: CUBE Performance ratings as at May 2005 and June 2006

| Logframe Output Areas | July 05 rating | June 06 rating | Comment | Proposed Action Plan to raise rating |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1 Enhanced UBE capacity | 4 | 3 | Steady improvement | Appropriate resident TA appointed by August 2006 in the 3 States |
| 2 HIV&AIDS State level | 4 | 4 | Focus remained at Federal level | Enforce the changed TOR (Feb 2006) to have a Federal/State focus of 20/80 |
| 3 SWAp establishment | - | 2 | Good progress | Permanent TA required to be in place by Aug 2006 in order to complete project cycle by January 2007 |
| 4 Access, Quality, Equity | 4 | 3 | Moderate progress | Restructured TA support, strategically led, in more strategic positions [Fed and the selected State(s)] providing emphasis, short-term planning and costing for access and quality within the ESP |
| 5 Federal capacity | 3 | 3 | No substantive change | Concentrate Federal support at a more strategic level in three agencies only: EDB, HIV&AIDS unit and UBEC ; shifting focus to State level. |

The mission scored CUBE performance as 3, meaning that the project purpose is likely to be achieved to a very limited extent. Only some of the outputs are likely to be achieved if present approaches to the logframe outputs do not change.

3 Recommendations

Recommendations are provided in full on pages 5 and 6 and are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Recommendations

| Summary of Recommendations | Responsibility |
|---|----------------------|
| Generic (CUBE and SESP): | |
| 1. Undertake institutional appraisal and capacity building in advance of any project activities in the SESP States | TAMC |
| 2. Encourage, through policy dialogue, Federal and State Governments to undertake to meet EMIS costs (especially recurrent costs: e.g. annual census, generator fuel, etc). | DFID |
| 3. Devise, with immediate effect, a management strategy for CUBE/SESP | TAMC [+ DFID, WB] |
| 4. Make slight adjustments to CUBE logframe to reflect emphasis on SESP States and less Federal level engagement. | TAMC, DFID |
| CUBE-specific: | |
| 5. Engage immediately with SESP preparatory activities, while continuing to provide wind-down support to UBEP, e.g. on the finalisation of the state and federal consolidated reports. (For details see Appendix 1 of this Annex.) | TAMC |
| 6. Accelerate recruitment of long-term and short-term, and centrally- and state-based TA with immediate effect (see Appendix 1). | TAMC |
| 7. Discontinue strategic planning inputs in Benue, Ekiti, Enugu, Ebonyi, Lagos, Plateau States immediately. Focus strategic planning inputs initially on the three SESP States and, later, on others as they are identified. | TAMC |
| 8. Ensure that M&E is specific to each project sub-component (do not rely on 'general M&E'). Prepare performance indicators for revised CUBE (implies a requirement for immediate baseline studies with sub-component specificity as part of SESP preparation). | TAMC |
| 9. Intensify Federal and State HIV&AIDS and EMIS inputs in the ratios as in the agreed TOR of April 2006. | TAMC |
| 10. Strengthen EMIS in the SESP States and NEMIS nationally. Focus on building capacity in strategic analysis and the use of simple statistics coupled with better quality data for planning and performance monitoring. | TAMC |
| 11. Focus on the implementation of the FLHE curriculum and HIV&AIDS awareness, prioritising the SESP States. | TAMC |
| Special Contingency Recommendation:¹ | |
| 12. Provide support to the Federal Government of Nigeria to develop a national 10-year costed whole sector strategic plan that is Fast Track Initiative (FTI) compliant. | TAMC [+ DFID] |

Appendix 1 of this Annex (p 17) contains recommended activities in support of SESP preparation. Note, Recommendation 4 above, that the Project Logframe outputs (though not the purpose or goals) should be slightly amended in order to reflect the SESP focus of support for UBE and the special contingency recommendation. It is recommended that TAMC in association with WB and DFID undertake logframe revision early in July 2006.

¹ This recommendation, and the reasons for its inclusion, are spelled out in greater detail on page 6.

4 Risk Assessment

A full risk assessment, including updates of the initial project memorandum risks, is attached at Appendix 2 (pages 18 - 19 of this Annex). CUBE remains a HIGH RISK project.

The Review team is concerned that since April 2004 the management climate in the three key agencies (World Bank, DFID, TAMC) should have been more conducive to meeting the UBEP purpose. However, the introduction of SESP, which, unlike UBEP, is taking place at a time when all key actors are *in situ*, presents an opportunity to rectify these concerns.

[End of Executive Summary]

Annual Review

Part A - Project Data

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| Project Short Title | Capacity Building for Universal Basic Education (CUBE) | | |
| Benefiting Country / Region | Nigeria | MIS code | 048550032 |
| Current Project Officer Name | John Leigh | Approved Commitment | £12 500 000 |
| Actual Start Date (dd/mm/yyyy) | Inception: 01/09/03 – 31/03/04 Effective start: 01/04/04 | Spend To Date | £6 005 000 (of £10 800 000 available to TAMC = 56%) |
| Planned End Date (dd/mm/yyyy) | 31/07/2008 | Date of Review | 29/05/06 to 16/06/06 |

Part B – Recommendations

| Summary of Recommendations | | Responsibility |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Generic (CUBE and SESP): | | |
| 1 | <i>Undertake institutional appraisal and capacity building (especially in strategic and operational planning, procedural requirements and procurement) in advance of any project activities in the SESP States (Kaduna, Kano, Kwara).</i> | TAMC |
| 2 | <i>Encourage, through policy dialogue, Federal and State Governments to undertake to meet EMIS costs (especially recurrent costs: e.g. annual census, generator fuel, etc). [This is a necessary undertaking for project success and sustainability as WB-DFID support re-focuses at state level.]</i> | DFID [+WB] |
| 3 | <i>Devise, with immediate effect, a management strategy for CUBE/SESP (including SESP design, outputs & work programming - initially for the period to 31 January 2007). [This implies an enabling project management culture in the three key agencies (World Bank, DFID, TAMC, meeting twice a month (minimum) and responding positively and effectively to the challenge of project revision, each taking account of the others' institutional constraints.]</i> | TAMC [+ DFID, WB] |
| 4 | <i>Make slight adjustments to CUBE logframe to reflect emphasis on SESP States and less Federal level engagement.</i> | TAMC, DFID |
| CUBE-specific: | | |
| 5 | <i>Engage immediately with SESP preparatory activities², ensuring that WB cycles are understood and observed, and WB Board deadlines are met by 28 February 2007 (see Appendix 1).</i> | TAMC |
| 6 | <i>Accelerate recruitment of long-term and short-term, and centrally- and state-based TA with immediate effect (see Appendix 1). [Key short-term TA should have knowledge and experience of WB cycles and procedures.]</i> | TAMC |
| 7 | <i>Discontinue strategic planning inputs in Benue, Ekiti, Enugu, Ebonyi, Lagos, Plateau States immediately. Focus strategic planning inputs initially on the three SESP States and, later, on others as they are identified.</i> | TAMC |
| 8 | <i>Ensure that M&E is specific to each project sub-component (do not rely on 'general M&E'). Prepare performance indicators for revised CUBE (implies a requirement for immediate baseline studies with sub-component specificity as part of SESP preparation).</i> | TAMC |
| 9 | <i>Intensify Federal and State HIV&AIDS and EMIS inputs in the ratios as in the agreed TOR of April 2006. [Inputs should be based on clear work plans and should prioritise the SESP States.]³</i> | TAMC |
| 10 | <i>Strengthen EMIS in the SESP States and NEMIS nationally. Focus on building capacity in strategic analysis and the use of simple statistics coupled with better quality data for planning and performance monitoring.³</i> | TAMC |
| 11 | <i>Focus on the implementation of the FLHE curriculum and HIV&AIDS awareness, prioritising the SESP States.⁴</i> | TAMC |

[cont ...]

² While continuing to provide winding down support to UBEP, particularly on the finalisation of the state and federal consolidated reports

³, ³, ⁴ All inputs/work plans should be compliant with the agreed SESP strategic and implementation plans.

Special contingency recommendation:

[Note: the following recommendation relates neither to the CUBE annual review, UBEP nor SESP. (Although there is a tenuous link to SESP.) It is included so that DFID, through CUBE, can provide contingency support to an unforeseen requirement that is connected to education sector development in Nigeria.] There have been Presidential and Ministerial requests that such support be provided.

12 *Provide support to the Federal Government of Nigeria to develop a national 10-year costed whole sector strategic plan that is Fast Track Initiative (FTI) compliant. Whereas, with GRN approval, TAMC will be responsible for the team selection, appointment and conditions of service, it is advised that the core team comprises a 3-person international group (a Strategic Planner with experience in whole-sector planning, an Economist/Financial adviser with costing expertise, a Poverty Reduction specialist) and a 2-person national group (an Educationalist with broad national expertise, a Financial adviser who knows Nigeria's financial systems, particularly education financing and who was involved with NEEDS). It is further advised that the DFID FTI specialist (Desmond Bermingham) joins the core team. During part of the mission, the team should facilitate a retreat (outside Abuja) with top management of FGN/FME to include the Hon Minister of Education, Permanent Secretary for Education, Director EFA, Director PRS, and a top MOF representative. The purpose of the retreat will be to finalise the costed ESP and to ensure participation and ownership of the plan by those who will be required to lead on the plan in both national and international arenas.*

TAMC
[+ DFID]

Part C – Project Scoring Assessment

| Goal Statement | | Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Nigeria | | Achievement of Education MDGs: universal primary education by 2015 and equal gender balance throughout education by 2015 | |
| Purpose Statement | Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) | Progress | Recommendations/Comments |
| Development and implementation of sustainable State programmes for UBE in up to 16 States with priority given to educationally disadvantaged LGAs | <p>Strengthened state and local government planning for UBE, meeting IDA project targets.</p> <p>School system able to provide quality schooling in the state, meeting the IDA project targets.</p> <p>Increased primary school attendance and completion rates, meeting IDA project targets, with priority given to the poorest areas and girls.</p> | <p>Improved awareness of the need for planning and demonstration of basic planning techniques IDA targets not met</p> <p>No evidence that school system is able to meet IDA project targets for quality (in terms of learning achievement)</p> <p>Partially met (though attribution is problematic)</p> | <p>More likely to be achieved by EOP as a result of focus on fewer States/LGEAs and higher concentration of resident TA within those States</p> <p>More likely to be achieved by EOP as a result of focus on fewer States/LGEAs and higher concentration on teacher development, learning achievement, textbook provision and other quality inputs</p> |

| Purpose to Goal | |
|---|----------|
| Although some limited contributions towards the goal may have been achieved during 2005/06, the potential for success is likely to be improved through greater in-depth concentration on a smaller number of States in future. | |
| Project Purpose Rating - General / Overall progress assessment | 3 |
| Justification | |
| There has been project improvement over the year to June 2006. Aspects of the purpose are likely to be achieved in part. In future, due to project restructuring and subsequent greater focus in fewer States (3 in 2006/7) and intensified TA inputs in each State, improvement is expected to continue. | |

State how far the project has helped to deliver the objectives of the Country Assistance Plan (where appropriate)

In Nigeria the CPS has replaced the CAP. The project is in the process of realignment to reflect the priorities of the CPS to improve effectiveness through assistance to a smaller number of selected States. In this process, relationships with WB have been strengthened.

| Outputs | Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) | Progress [Abbreviated from CUBE report – Q.V.] | Recommendations/ Comments | Score |
|--|---|---|--|-----------------|
| <p>1. Enhanced State and Local Government capacity for the delivery of UBE on a sustainable basis</p> | <p>1.1 SMOE Departments of Planning, Research and Statistics (DPRS) personnel capable of developing functional strategic and operational plans (within a SWAp environment where appropriate)</p> <p>1.2 Efficient SMOE/SUBEB management structures and systems fully operational with competent personnel and effective project management</p> <p>1.3 State-level EMIS functioning with competent personnel and covering the whole education sector in coordination with Federal, parastatal and LGEA systems</p> <p>1.4 State and Local Government personnel delivering accessible and</p> | <p>P1.1 80% of States assisted by CUBE with strategic planning and 93% with the drafting of their annual work plans. CUBE assisted the development of Training TORs especially late 2005-early 2006. CUBE has assisted initial 10-year educational strategic planning in Kaduna (see Output 3) - and is planning similar assistance to six additional states (Benue, Ekiti, Enugu, Ebonyi, Lagos, Plateau)</p> <p>P1.2 CUBE SA team assisted all 16 States (a) to constitute SPACs that promoted the passing of UBE bills, (b) to build inter-PIU-PCU relations.</p> <p>P1.3 14 States with functional EMIS and NEMIS installed by May 06 (8 in May 05); 159 staff trained IT hardware, software and training reviews conducted in all 16 IDA credit states. All states surveyed* (*how many?) reported that capacity was strengthened in EMIS-related activities (e.g IT work plans, procurement documents, training plans, terms of reference, bidding documents and installation of the equipment procured).</p> <p>P1.4 Assistance provided in YE May 06 with procurement and training plans (including financial officers)</p> | <p>Visits to States indicate that limited capacity has been built. However, this has taken considerable time - too late to be of benefit to UBEP (especially in its early days).</p> <p>Despite training in M&E and the developments of a results framework, key UBEP indicators were never modified. M&E remains unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Regarding ESP in Benue, Ekiti, Enugu, Ebonyi, Lagos, Plateau, see comments in Output 3 of this column</p> <p><i>Capacity building (especially in procedural requirements and procurement) should take place in advance of any project activities.</i></p> <p><i>Prepare performance indicators for revised CUBE</i></p> | <p>3</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|
| | <p>effective budgeting and financial management</p> <p>1.5 Key staff regularly and competently use monitoring systems for measuring progress towards stated outcomes of the AWP.</p> | <p>P1.5 Since the 2005 OPR, an M&E consultant developed a results-framework or UBEP and a monitoring report format was developed for Federal, State and LGEA reporting. Training was conducted. The benefits of this training are yet to be reflected in the quality of MTR and M&E reporting.</p> | | |
| <p>2. HIV&AIDS awareness and prevention effectively disseminated at State level and FLHE curriculum taught in schools</p> | <p>2.1 HIV&AIDS workplace policy implemented at State level</p> <p>2.2 FLHE curriculum approved and disseminated to schools</p> <p>2.3 Relevant FLHE support materials developed and disseminated to all schools</p> <p>2.4 HIV&AIDS mainstreamed across the school curriculum</p> <p>2.5 Awareness of national policy on OVCs created at State level</p> | <p>P2.1 A national Education Sector HIV/AIDS Policy was developed and approved by the National Council on Education in December 2005 but guidance on implementation awaited from Fed level.</p> <p>P2.2 Following discussions with NACA and other key stakeholders, 37,000 copies each of the PS and JSS curriculum were produced by NACA and circulated to States (but not yet distributed to schools).</p> <p>P2.3 and P2.4 Strategic guidance documentation developed under CUBE. To date 13 States (all apart from Niger, Borno, Taraba) have conducted FLHE sensitisation sessions; 9 States have held FLHE curriculum modularisation exercises; all 16 HIV&AIDS SMOE desk officers and 16 SUBEB (and 6 Post Primary School Boards personnel) now trained as FLHE TOTs – with further TOT and teacher training to take place – mostly the States' own initiative.</p> <p>P2.4 See above</p> <p>P2.5 To date only Benue and Bayelsa States have done any work in this area</p> | <p>It is difficult to see (from the CUBE report and from field visits) what the actual outcomes for HIV&AIDS under UBEP have been at State/school level (TA has focussed on Federal Level).</p> <p>Very few copies of FLHE curricula are actually in schools (e.g. none seen in primary schools in visits to States). It was reported that SMOEs and SUBEBs are 'still awaiting instructions for distribution'.</p> <p>There appears to be more significant activity and outcomes generated by the States, supported by NACA and other NGOs, than by UBEP. Perhaps a design fault by concentrating too much at FME level.</p> <p><i>In future, TA should intensify inputs at State level (in the ratio Fed : State = 20 : 80)</i></p> <p><i>M&E should be HIV&AIDS-specific and should not rely on 'general M&E'.</i></p> | <p>4</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------|
| | 2.6 Staff regularly monitoring progress against HIV and AIDS | P2.6 State HIV/AIDS Desk officers were trained in general M&E and State UBE Project teams were assisted in 2006 to develop an evaluation plan and identify monitoring mechanisms that should set the stage for measuring the degree to which progress is made towards FLHE objectives. A baseline survey on student and pupil/teacher knowledge, attitudes, practices and skills has been carried out and is pending analysis | . | |
| 3. Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) established in two of the Lead States | 3.1 SWAps that prioritise UBE established 3.2 Annual (initially biannual) review of whole sector performance based on state monitoring | P3.1 Kaduna confirmed as 1 st Lead State in Oct 2005 (Kano and Kwara as 2 nd and 3 rd Lead States in June 2006) <i>Kaduna outputs:</i> 10-yr whole sector ESP based on KadSEEDS, UBE and EFA; 3-yr rolling operational plan (ESOP). Both costed P3.2 Too early for Annual Reviews (ESP and ESOP to be presented to wider stakeholder community later in 2006) | Satisfactory progress in 1 st Lead State on ESP/ESOP development. Other Lead States not identified until June 2006. Relatively slow progress on preparatory studies; It was noted in 1.1 that ESP training has been conducted in Lagos with plans to extend in Benue, Ekiti, Enugu, Ebonyi, Plateau. <i>It is recommended not to extend ESP to these States beyond the closing date of UBEP. Focus must be on project preparation for Kaduna (still much to do), Kano and Kwara States</i> | 2 |
| 4. Improved access, quality and | 4.1 Effective implementation of Self-Help Scheme in selected LGAs | P4.1 2223 SH projects by YE May 06 (14 by YE May 05). Commensurate CLEDEP training with an increase in community SH participation since Jan 05 – however this has not always led to communities accessing the SH. | There have been improvements in the access components of this output during the year-ending May 2006 | 3 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| equity in basic education | 4.2 Regular monitoring of school performance by the community and LGEA through effective SMCs in selected LGAs | P4.2 3304 communities trained in management by y/e May 06 (66 in y/e May 05); 636 SMCs established in y/e May 06 60% increase in inspection visits over the past 1½ years in selected State | Self Help is one of the success stories of UBEP with evidence of increased enrolment in selected states. (However there are serious questions about the build quality of renovation & buildings – which raises questions about supervision and M&E.) There is no evidence of quality improvement (in terms of learning achievement) within UBEP. There is very little evidence of CLEDEP having a functional relationship with Self Help. Moreover its high cost makes it difficult to scale up and sustain (there was successful scale-up in only Oyo State – by factor 3) . However it has raised community awareness and may have an important, if uneven, catalytic effect. |
| | 4.3 Improved school facilities (classrooms, toilets, | P4.3 3398 classrooms built or renovated in YE May 06 (852 in YE May 05); over 1500 toilets (slightly biased to female). 29,320 desk units supplied in 797 classes; 128,000 books supplied to 17 libraries built (and to other existing libraries?) | |
| | 4.4 Increased availability and use of teaching and learning resources in basic education schools | P4.4 422,000 books and 10,000 various instructional materials planned for 2006 (building on previously supplied 1.5 million textbooks and 42,000 teaching-aids respectively) | |
| | 4.5 Approved textbook policy (revised) | P4.5 Some CUBE support to NERDC was provided but textbook policy is not yet forthcoming | |
| | 4.6 Effective school management provided by trained Head Teachers | P4.6 784 State CBR and 472 CLEDEB trainers trained. CLEDEP training in 14 of the UBEP states; trainers guides produced and used. 118 HTs/School managers trained (likewise 118 WSD master trainers). | |
| | 4.7 Testing and dissemination of innovative schemes which raise enrolment, attendance and completion rates (e.g. school feeding) | P4.7 A number of innovation schemes were planned; however only 8 were implemented (in girls', nomadic and Islamiya education, adult literacy, and alternative schooling) [Enrolments increased by 160 000 (M) and 143 000 (F) over previous year; transition rates PS-JSS increased by 50% (M) and 59% (F) over previous year. However, attribution for this cannot be solely ascribed to UBEP/CUBE.] | |
| | 4.8 Testing and dissemination of innovative schemes which improve quality of and equity in education (e.g. SBTD, GEP) | P4.8 Quality and equity pursued through some (low disbursing) initiatives in CBR, CLEDEP and LF training. Collaboration with GEP on WSD and SBMC training but no evidence of effectiveness | |
| | 4.9 Harmonisation of the monitoring functions of | P4.9 Project closure resulted in a moratorium on Federal Agency activity and hence nothing was achieved in | |

| | UBEC and FIS | respect to this OVI | | |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------|
| <p>5. Strengthened Federal capacity in policy development, programme management, monitoring & evaluation and systems to finance and support UBE programmes</p> | <p>5.1 Review roles and responsibilities of key personnel in FME and relevant Federal Agencies (in particular UBEC, ESA, EFA, FIS, EDB, NERDC, NMEC, NCCE, NCNE, NIEPA) select strategic posts and build capacity to support UBE programmes through policy-development and strategic and operational planning</p> | <p>P5.1 Covered in 5.2P to 5.7P below:</p> | <p>There are indications that capacity had been built in key federal agencies (notably UBEC, EDB, NPCU, NIEPA). Training in work-planning and the writing of M&E reports and TORs was provided with modest success (CUBE team need to strengthen their ability in TOR writing). Some agencies were hardly affected by UBEP (notably FIS).</p> | <p>3</p> |
| | <p>5.2 National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU) fully operational with competent personnel and effective project management and procurement</p> | <p>P5.2 Improved coordination between NPCU, WB and CUBE. Long Term TA provided procurement support to NPCU. CUBE through NIEPA provided training through 20 courses in 8 bespoke project management areas to 21 NPCU and 53 UBEC staff</p> | <p>Developments of (N)EMIS within EDB has been a notable success since project inception; this continued throughout YE May 06. However, as has been mentioned already, the gains at central levels will count for little if (a) they are not sustained, (b) they are not rolled out nationwide.</p> | |
| | <p>5.3 National EMIS functioning with competent personnel and covering the whole education sector in coordination with State, parastatal and LGEA systems</p> | <p>P5.3 Software to support NEMIS as been designed and implemented through FME EDB with assistance from CUBE. Federal agencies including ESA and EFA, development partners cite improvements in their capacity to monitor the education sector using NEMIS outputs. The 2004/5 school census data base has been entered into NEMIS and an advanced statistical publication has been produced by FME-EDB with assistance of CUBE. The 2006 school census is currently underway. In addition, 13 FME EDB staff (8 m, 5 f) have received training in databases, internet, computer operation and EMIS taskforce operation and training. FME EDB and all other federal agencies are to be equipped with \$1.2 million of IT equipment to facilitate their activities as a direct result of CUBE. When the</p> | <p>Capacity building for HIV&AIDS appears to have been taken place within the central FME (HIV-AIDS Unit). However the benefits of this remain to be realised in schools and among the general public. Capacity has been strengthened at NIEPA. This is demonstrated by the Institute's ability to mount a number of well-received courses (involving, for them, new modes of delivery and presentation).</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>5.4 FME and Federal Agencies personnel delivering accessible and effective budgeting and financial management</p> <p>5.5 Key FME and UBEC staff regularly and competently use monitoring systems for measuring progress towards stated outcomes of AWP's</p> <p>5.6 The HIV&AIDS unit of FME personnel provide strategic planning and donor coordination ensuring that HIV&AIDS messages are effectively disseminated to education sector personnel and students at all levels.</p> <p>5.7 Improved capacity of key institutions to deliver training, research and dissemination of good practice in relation to planning and management of UBE.</p> | <p>equipment is procured the EDB will be able to host all its data, publications and analysis online. While the NEMIS process is now fairly robust, the quality of the data is questionable.</p> <p>P5.4 In November 2005 a strategic planning workshop was held for federal agencies during which draft 2006 AWP's were drawn-up. The process included assistance with each agency's budgeting; consequently, a consolidated federal plan for 2006 was prepared by NPCU during January 2006.</p> <p>P5.5 Key FME officers trained as trainers of state teams to enable them to complete MTR progress reports and M&E returns. Consequently, 13 of the 16 states completed their MTR returns – of variable quality and lacking key information</p> <p>P5.6 CUBE, in collaboration with UNICEF, supported FME to develop a National Education Sector HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan (NESP), subsequently recommended for submission to the plenary meeting of the JCCE in June 2006. CUBE supported the FME to develop an Education Sector HIV/AIDS workplace policy approved by the NCE in December 2005</p> <p>P5.7 Outcomes relating to institutional capacity building include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive review of NIEPA and the development of a rolling Institutional Development Plan, policies on gender, equity, equality and HIV/AIDS and induction. • NIEPA staff have been trained in 7 key delivery and performance improvement areas • Modern, participative training designs and materials | <p><i>NEMIS should continue to be strengthened nationally and in the States; support for this should be a component of any future roll-out of WB/DFID support with priority given to the priority States(s).</i></p> <p><i>As WB-DFID support focuses at state level, it is imperative that Federal Government undertakes to meet NEMIS costs (recurrent costs: e.g. annual census, generator fuel, etc).</i></p> <p><i>EMIS should focus on building capacity in the strategic analysis and use of better quality data for planning and performance – with priority given to the selected State(s).</i></p> <p><i>Future focus should be on the implementation of the FLHE curriculum with priority given to the selected States.</i></p> | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>developed for use by NIEPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved physical facilities: reconditioned training rooms; additional toilet facilities; renovated and refurbished accommodation units; new computer laboratory under construction. | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | |
|---|----------|
| Project Outputs Rating - General / Overall progress assessment | 3 |
| Justification | |
| Progress has been made since the previous OPR (May 2005) and is expected to continue as project-restructuring, including greater focus on just 3 States, is fully implemented | |

| |
|--|
| Purpose Attribution |
| <p>Attribution in areas such as enrolment increasing is difficult to assess. Nevertheless the mission considers that CUBE complements the many other inputs in this area – most notably those of the Federal and State Governments in UBE and EFA. At federal level CUBE has had demonstrable impact on EMIS development and on policy and curriculum development in HIV&AIDS - but commensurate improvements are yet to be seen across the UBEP States. There has been some, albeit modest, improvement in the strengthening of state planning/management and school development – though it is recognised that in many cases improvement has come from a very low base-line. There were expectations that progress would have been faster – however this has been hampered by delays in Federal Government approval of restructuring. CUBE's work in the communities (mostly through CLEDEP and associated activities) has had a demonstrable impact in some States – less so in others. There may be hidden impact in terms of catalytic and other pull/push effects. The impact of the national experts continues to be mixed.</p> |

Part D – Risk Management

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Risk Category | HIGH |
| New risks identified | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inadequate commitment of the new Governments (Federal and State) to implement the revised support to UBE (through the SESP modality).</i> • <i>Lack of compliance to the UBE Act, adversely affecting UBE/SESP implementation at State, LGEA and School levels.</i> • <i>Low stakeholder commitment to key elements of the project, for example institutional reform (including planning, management and monitoring of UBE); financial reform, HIV&AIDS initiatives.</i> • <i>Ineffective coordination between stakeholders (TAMC-WB-DFID)</i> • <i>Slow development and integration into the planning process of EMIS at State level</i> • <i>Difficulties in obtaining a suitable blend of Technical Assistance with adequate knowledge and experience of World Bank and Government of Nigeria procedures</i> • <i>Lack of financing of SESP components (e.g. recurrent costs of EMIS) from both the Federal and State Governments will threaten sustainability</i> • <i>SMOE and SUBEB resistance to procurement reform and transparency, especially in relation to infrastructure and textbooks adversely affects project implementation</i> | |
| Action being taken to monitor / manage risks | |
| See Recommendations (Part B) In addition, CUBE is advised to appoint a risk manager for each risk. Each risk manager should be given responsibility for following up on monitoring and reducing risks. | |
| Recommended changes to plans or management strategies in respect of project associated risks | |
| The change from supporting UBEP (closed 30 June 2006) to SESP (currently in preparation), requires adjustments to management, especially during SESP preparation activities (including procurement of suitable TA) <i>and</i> during implementation. This is further spelled out in the Recommendations on page 2. | |
| Does the Logframe Require Revision? | |
| No (However, slight adjustments at the output level will be required due to the necessary shifts in focus and restructuring) | |
| Do the PIMS Markers Require Revision? [Mandatory for projects approved prior to 01/04/1998] | |
| No | |
| Method of Scoring – state the team composition, the methods used to conduct the review, how the scoring was agreed upon, and whether partners and stakeholders were involved. | |
| <p>A joint DFID/WB/GRN supervision team comprising (for DFID) John Leigh, Human Development Advisor, TL (CUBE annual review); Charlie Kirkcaldy, Education Advisor; David Reid, Statistician; (for World Bank) Halil Dunder, TL; Olatunde Adekola, Sr. Education Specialist Tanya Zebroff, Education Specialist; Nguyen Feese, Education Specialist; (International consultants) Murray Macrae, TL Technical; Audrey Aarons, Education specialist; Leonardo Concepcion, Infrastructure specialist; (National Consultants) Pai Obanya; Dupe Adelaba; Peter S Abdu; Yetunde Holloway; (Government Consultants) Bola Akingbesote, DD(CP), FIS, FM; Chinyere Agabu-Ekwue, NPCU; Chima O Ubani, DDSM NPCU; Jibo Abdullahi, ADME, UBEC; Iro Umar, APC, UBEC; Carolyn, UBEC; Jamila Su'ara, NPCU; Morakinyo A Ayodele, Pr Admin Officer (IER), MOF</p> <p>The review of conducted by literature review and wide consultation with stakeholders, key federal and State agencies and visits to 8 of the participating States. Scoring was proposed by a core team of consultants (Macrae, Kirkcaldy, Zebroff) and discussed at a wider meeting of national and government advisers.</p> | |

Part E – Lessons Learned

| Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination. | |
|--|---|
| 1. Working with Partners | Importance of clearly defined duties, responsibilities and communications between partners, to include target setting and awareness of the reach other's constraints and working modalities. |
| 2. Best Practice / Innovation | EMIS remains sound but there is recognition that it needs to be validated through greater applications in planning and monitoring. Greater involvement of communities through expansion of Self Help initiatives. The spread of Strategic Planning, during 2005/06 in some States (including Kaduna, Kano, Kwara) |
| 3. Project / Programme Management | A need for improved (and mutually agreed) preparation, planning and priority setting |

| Key Issues |
|--|
| See 2 and 3 in Lessons Learned (above) |

| If appropriate, please comment on the effectiveness of the institutional relationships involved with the project (eg comment on processes and how relationships have evolved) |
|--|
| An open, transparent and equal partnership has been established between WB and DFID. There appears to be tension between WB and TAMC over technical issues (e.g. TOR writing, TA selection and prioritisation, communication, mutual understanding of technical language and terms). However as CUBE moves from implementation of UBEP to participation in providing assistance for the design phase SESP (and developing capacity for SESP implementation thereafter), an opportunity exists for addressing these differences, improving performance and moving towards more effective capacity building. |

| What key documentary evidence is available to support the conclusions of this report? List any supporting documents annexed to this report. |
|--|
| <p>Project progress reports for 2005-06; IDA Mission Aide Memoires, 2004 – 2006; OPR Mission reports; CUBE reports; including (among many):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CUBE OPR Report (July 2005) • CUBE quarterly /annual reports • SESP PCN • UBEP reviews, • Monitoring and evaluation reports • Training evaluations • Aide memoirs of WB missions • NPCU/UBEC institutional arrangements and capacity assessment Study • CPS • Kaduna ESP & ESOP |

2nd Annual Review of CUBE

Appendix 1: Appointments/Studies/Consultancies for SESP Preparation (Indicative)

Urgent:

Prepare a CUBE-TAMC Operational Plan to manage the following and indicate how management, supervision and quality control will be assured.

Federal level appointments:

1. National Programme Manager (NPM) – based in CUBE
2. Project Administrator with revised TOR – reports to NPM
3. Senior Education Policy Adviser – based in UBEC
4. M&E / Communications Adviser (MECA) – based in UBEC
5. FM Adviser – based in UBEC
6. Procurement Adviser – based in UBEC

Kaduna, Kano, Kwara state appointments:

1. State Implementation Team Leader (SITL)
2. FM/Planning Adviser
3. Procurement Adviser

Kaduna, Kano, Kwara state short term studies/consultancies

Immediate (complete by 31 August)

1. Situation Analysis Kano (3 weeks)
2. Situation Analysis Kwara
3. Institutional Assessment Kano (4 weeks)
4. Institutional Assessment Kwara
5. Economic Analysis Kano (1 week)
6. Economic Analysis Kwara (1 week)
7. ESP/ESOP Workshop (1week ESP review; followed by 2-week ESOP) iKano
8. ESP/ESOP Workshop (1week ESP review; followed by 2-week ESOP) Kwara
9. ESOP Unit Costing Consultancy Kano and Kwara (2 week)

Complete by 30 September:

1. PIM Developed for 3 States (Kaduna for 31 Aug; Kano/Kwara for 30 Sept)
2. PAD Developed for 3 States
3. Teacher Development (3 States) (2 weeks each)
4. School Infrastructure Study Kaduna(4 weeks)
5. School Infrastructure Study Kano (4 weeks)
6. School Infrastructure Study Kwara (4 weeks)
7. Textbook Policy Review (3 States) (2 weeks altogether)
8. EMIS Situational Analysis Kano (JS)
9. EMIS Situational Analysis Kwara (JS)
10. HIV&AIDS Situation Analysis Kano (YP)
11. HIV&AIDS Situation Analysis Kwara (YP)
12. Student Assessment (3 States) (3 weeks altogether)
13. Social Assessment Kaduna (3 weeks)
14. Social Assessment Kano (3 weeks)
15. Social Assessment Kwara (3 weeks)

2nd Annual Review of CUBE

Appendix 2: Risk Assessment

The following are the main risks associated with the project (these include updates on the original – December 2002 – risks).

- [1] *Inadequate commitment of the new Government to implement the revised support to UBE (through the SESP modality).*
 Given the popular demand for UBE and the legislative frameworks now in place it would be politically difficult for an incoming government to reverse UBE policy.
 [High impact, Low probability]
- [2] *Lack of compliance to the UBE Act, adversely affecting UBE/SESP implementation at State, LGEA and School levels.*
 There are already tensions between SMOE and SUBEBs, between states and federal agencies,
 [High impact, High probability]
- [3] *Low stakeholder commitment to key elements of the project, for example institutional reform (including planning, management and monitoring of UBE); financial reform, HIV&AIDS initiatives.*
 The generally poor institutional framework could threaten SESP implementation and even DFID/WB capacity to be able to provide effective support to UBE in the selected States
 [High impact, Medium probability]
- [4] *Ineffective coordination between stakeholders*
 Success of CUBE is dependent on clear understanding between TAMC and the World Bank and DFID; to date working relations have not always been satisfactory
 [High impact, Low probability]
- [5] *Patronage may distort the selection of national TA and the identification of and support to the target groups, notably the LGAs, leading to reduced effectiveness of TA and lack of equity in the allocation of resources.*
 [Medium impact, Medium probability]
- [6] *Slow development and integration into the planning process of EMIS at State level will adversely affect SESP implementation.*
 [Medium impact, Medium probability]
- [7] *Some states will not meet the requirements needed to secure and mobilise the IDA Credit*
 [High impact, Medium probability]

- [8] *Difficulties in obtaining a suitable blend of Technical Assistance with adequate knowledge and experience of World Bank and Government of Nigeria procedures*
[Medium impact; Medium probability]
- [9] *The PCUs may disempower SMOEs if not operated as intended*
[Medium impact, Medium probability]
- [10] *Lack of financing of SESP components (e.g. recurrent costs of EMIS) from both the Federal and State Governments will threaten sustainability*
[High impact, High probability]
- [11] *SMOE and SUBEB resistance to procurement reform and transparency, especially in relation to infrastructure and textbooks adversely affects project implementation*
[Medium impact, High probability]
- [12] *Reluctance of Commissioners and key State, SMOE, and SUBEB officials to attend important SESP conferences at international venues (e.g. in Washington, London)*
[Low impact, Low probability]

Probability/impact matrix

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Impact ↑ | High | [1], [4] | [3], [7] | [2], [10] |
| | Medium | | [5], [6] [8], [9] | [11] |
| | Low | [12] | | |
| | | Low | Medium | High |
| | | Probability → | | |

Since the matrix contains more than two risks in the pink (dark) zone, the project risk assessment is **HIGH**.