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Context

The emergence of the Boko Haram insurgency in 2009 has significantly escalated the level of violence, through ethno-religious and inter-communal strife. These actions – which focus primarily, but not exclusively, on the three North-Eastern states of Borno, Yobe, and Adamawa – are characterized by attacks on civilian populations, the military and police, federal and state infrastructure. Despite the State of Emergency (SoE) imposed on the three North-Eastern states in 2014 to enable security forces to conduct counter-insurgency operations against Boko Haram, the scale and scope of these violent attacks continued to increase and have impacted negatively on the gains made in human development – particularly in the education sector.

The education system has been disrupted by the insurgency, with school children killed, abducted and displaced. Many of the school facilities within the North East have been partially or completely destroyed with large numbers of the population in the affected states having been displaced leading to thousands of children being out of school. Since the start of the insurgency more than 910 schools have been destroyed and 1500 forced to close, 611 teachers had been killed and 19,000 forced to flee. In 2016 it was estimated that 952,029 school-age children were displaced with little or no access to education[[2]](#footnote-2). In addition, the insurgency has led to high levels of trauma for children, teachers and the affected and surrounding communities.

The disruption of the schooling system has negatively affected the gains in the education sector achieved prior to the insurgency in 2009. It is clear that with large numbers of children out of school, the North East states (especially Adamawa, Borno and Yobe) and Nigeria as a country will suffer socially, economically and even politically unless meaningful interventions are devised to circumvent the situation.

The “Safe Schools Initiative” (SSI) was launched in May 2014 by the Government of Nigeria and the UN Special Envoy for Global Education in partnership with the Nigerian Global Business Coalition for Education. The SSI aims to respond to the real threats posed by the BH insurgency to the fundamental rights of children to education as evidenced by the growing number of attacks on educational facilities in the region characterized by multiple incidents of violent attacks and even deaths of school pupils and students; and the eventual abduction of over 200 school girls from the Government Girls Secondary School, Chibok in Southern Borno in April 2014.

By early 2016, the education sector was one of the most affected sector by the protracted insurgency. An estimated 3 million children were in need of education assistance in the three states of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe by the end of 2016 (HRP Nigeria, 2017). Children who have never attended school or dropped out (ages 4-16 years) from NE are estimated to be the highest in Nigeria: Boys 54.9% and girls 55.6%, (NEDS Report, 2015). More girls are out of school (4-16yrs) than boys - (55.6%) as a result of the disruption of learning for more than five years. Children are displaced and exposed to risks of abuse and exploitation – including conscription to armed groups resulting in massive destruction of social and economic well-being and harmony especially for children and adolescents.

According to Recovery and Peace Building Assessment conducted in 2016 the overall needs for reconstruction of education facilities in Borno state amounted to over USD 143 million, out of which rehabilitation of schools constituted nearly USD 66 million and provision of perimeter fence to increase security around USD 50 million.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of facilities | Million USD |
| 6 classrooms blocks  | 65 900 |
| Office blocks | 9 900 |
| Hand pumps boreholes | 1 300 |
| Motorised boreholes | 4 600 |
| Latrines | 6 600 |
| Pupil seats | 4 800 |
| Teacher tables & seats | 0.600 |
| Perimeter fence | 50.100 |
|  | 143.800 |

**Previous Experience in the North East**

In 2016, UNDP has implemented a number of projects supporting livelihoods and rehabilitation of basic infrastructure in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa state, including school rehabilitations.

Building on the experience and lessons learnt from these interventions, UNDP has developed a methodology of an “integrated package for early recovery”. The concept of the Integrated Package essentially prepares local communities, which were devastated by the onslaught of Boko Haram, to receive returning IDPs (individuals and/or families) into a host of interventions that cut across four interrelated support areas namely:

* Livelihoods Stabilization infused with immediate opportunities for employment and wealth creation through organized Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA)
* Provision of basic services through the repair and reconstruction of essential infrastructure necessary for the pursuit of a dignified life
* Support for strengthened local governance through systematic social engagement and community mobilisation
* Support for enhanced social cohesion and community security

**UNDP Management Capacities in the North East**

UNDP has an effective management system and a long record of managing complex projects in emergencies. It has a well-established system of risk management through its result-based management structures, monitoring and evaluation, and working in partnership with multiple organisations, including the government.

In January 2017, UNDP has established a Sub Office in Maiduguri coordinating and managing activities in Borno, Adamawa, and Yobe. Currently there is a team of 6 international and 10 national stuff working from the office in Maiduguri and implementing UNDP’s current activities in the NE. The present project will be implemented by our **early recovery project team** based in the Sub-office with a full time Programme Coordinator for NE responsible for the overall management of the project.

Project Description

The proposed project **Communities for safer schools** aims at “providing accessible, safe and quality education for conflict-affected children of school ages, thereby supporting the sustainable reintegration of returning IDPs into their communities of origin and/or host communities.

The key **3 objectives** of the project are as follows:

1. Improved standard of school infrastructure in the newly liberated communities through rehabilitation of school facilities (MDTF).
2. Improved safety and security of schooling through building community security (UNDP)
3. Improved planning for integrated service delivery at local level (UNDP)

The requested MDTF fund will be used to rehabilitate **10 schools** in the newly accessible communities in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe and equip these with simple solar powered energy systems. The project will target communities with a high number of vulnerable children (displaced, returnees, home) without access to schools. It will benefit a total number of **2,400 children** through the reconstruction of 10 permanent schools and the improvement of security conditions through community initiatives. In addition, the project will provide immediate employment of **36,000 labour days for unskilled workers and 15,000 labour days for skilled workers** from the same communities, thereby contributing to revitalisation of local economy.

While the MDTF fund is requested to cover the main component of physical infrastructure rehabilitation, UNDP will complement these interventions and fund the remaining 2 components in the same locations.

Furthermore, UNDP will link their programmes with other donors’ activities to support education in selected communities such as improved quality of education and other complementary components in order to achieve an integrated approach for improved education level.

**

This approach will create effective complementarities between the different components implemented in the same locations.

**Implementation Modalities**

The selection of target locations will be based on the following criteria:

1. Security – liberated and newly liberated communities
2. Accessibility – a minimum criterion is for our local implementing partners and monitoring agents to be able to access the schools
3. The returns have already taken place or there is a significant movement at the time of selection
4. Number of children under 16 years old who can access the schools - both from the location and the vicinity
5. Locations and facilities are included in the prioritised list of the Ministry of Education. Ministry confirms that both teachers and O&M budget will be made available to operate the school
6. Locations shared and approved with other agencies in the Recovery Cluster in order to avoid duplication and double funding

For the initial selection UNDP will use to the extent possible the needs assessment and prioritisation done by the Government. For this purpose, the three states have shared a list of proposed locations, which is reflected in annex C.

Based on the proposed list of priorities, and following the above mentioned basic criteria, UNDP, and the Ministry of Education / State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB), the Borno Ministry of RRR and Sema Adamawa / Yobe will jointly finalise the list of schools to be supported by the project.

In addition, the up to date number of children under 16 will be needed to establish the actual number of classrooms required at the moment. Moreover, a quick validation with the communities will be done in the selected locations, profiling of children per household (to determine age, gender, level of education) as well as the engineering assessment of facilities to develop BOQs and scopes of works including solar systems.

Rehabilitation of schools will be done using the Cash for Work (CfW) approach. The workers will be selected in consultation with the local community and they will be members of the community. Supporting both, safer education and short term income for people, it will contribute to the stabilisation process and improve the overall safety in the target locations. In fact, unemployment has been identified as a key driver of conflict. Youth unemployment, in particular, is seen as a direct motive for joining an insurgency. As such, employment generation is a key factor in securing post-conflict stability.

Another key aspect of the rehabilitation work will be re-designing the facilities with the principle of Building Back Better in mind, so that improved security for children and compliance with the current standards of the Ministry of Education can be married.

In parallel, the system of better planning for provision of basic services in the selected communities will be established. The objective is to build up and strengthen the existing community structures and reinforce traditional functions maintained by the communities for centuries, and create an opportunity for them to link with the formal government and technical sector specialists, including those from the Education sector.

Provision of adequate community security (community member patrols and escort for children, watch guards for school facilities, etc.) to ensure school children, especially girls, can attend school safely and without fear will be an essential element of the project. A community based approach will be applied with this regard – initiatives and interventions will be identified and implemented by the community in line with their tradition and customs, and supported by the project. In addition, the community will be expected to provide security and maintenance for solar powered energy systems and the project will provide training and technical support in this regard.

**Cost effectiveness and value for money**

Based on UNDP’s previous experience in terms of school rehabilitation, the estimated net cost of rehabilitation of a permanent school with four classrooms can be between 70,000 – 72,000 USD (without furniture or equipment). That equals a maximum of 18,000 USD per class room which is only slightly more expensive than a prefabricated classroom (app. 15,000 USD).

Importantly, community-based rehabilitation of school infrastructure increases local ownership contributing to overall security and stabilisation. The materials are procured locally, generating additional work opportunities for the local community. Furthermore, this income is later spent and injected into the local economy thus adding to the longer effect of rebuilding livelihoods and safety of the place.

Estimated budget for rehabilitation of a solar powered 4 classroom permanent school is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | Unit Price | Qty | Sub-total |
| Consultancy by Engineers | 2,000 | 2 person | 4,000 |
| Construction Material, locally procured |   | Lump-sum | 24,000 |
| Fluctuation of prices (15% of Materials) |  |  | 3,600 |
| Unskilled Worker | 6 | 120 people x 30 days | 21,600 |
| Skilled Worker | 12 | 50 people x 30 days | 18,000 |
| Monitoring |  |  | 2,400 |
| Equipment incl. solar system |  |  | 7,000 |
| **Net total** |  |  | **80,600** |
| General Operating and Other Direct Costs (10%) |  |  | 8,060 |
| Total |   |   | 88,660 |

**Ensuring linkages and synergy with complementary interventions**

While the requested fund will be used for school rehabilitation, UNDP will ensure sustainability and effective support to beneficiaries through its cooperation with other partners on the ground (UNICEF, IOM, and Ministry of Education). Complementary interventions in the target locations will include:

1. Quality of Education: Training for selected teachers and education personnel in child-centred and participatory teaching/learning methodologies, education management, supervision, child rights, etc.
2. Psycho-social support: Psychosocial support and child rights training to enable teachers to systematically handle psychologically traumatised children who need special attention to overcome the trauma they experienced during the conflict and in post conflict situations.
3. Community Dialogue and Sensitization: Factors that impede education in North East Nigeria have been systematic and structural for many decades. Prior to the BH insurgency, school enrolment and completion indices in the region were the very worst in the country and among the worst in the world owing to a combination of factors namely: socio-cultural practices that highly under-prioritized education especially for girls, extremist religious interpretations that stigmatized western education for children of school ages. Therefore, in order to ensure optimal uptake of the provision of necessary infrastructure and other educational inputs, effective communication and dialogue with all stakeholders (parents, religious and traditional leaders, influential opinion leaders, civil society, etc) must be sustained at all levels.
4. Build management capacity of different actors involved in education: At state level government institutions require capacity building in the areas of basic management in education as well as managing in emergencies, child rights, conflict sensitivity education, community mobilisation, monitoring and evaluation. At the community level school and community committees need the same capabilities and awareness.

Management Arrangements

The proposed “Communities for Safer Schools” project will be executed in partnership with local authorities through the use of already well-established implementation modalities for the North East. The UNDP Country Office will be accountable for the planning, implementation, and oversight, as well as financial management and all reporting aspects of the project to the donor, while local authorities will take the lead in implementing rehabilitation works, overseen by UNDP.

Coordination at Federal Level will be done through SSI technical Committee and Federal Ministry of Education.

At the State level the Ministry of Reconstruction, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (MRRR) of Borno and the State Ministries of Education in all 3 states will be the implementing partners, on behalf of the State Governments. They will have responsibility for the timely and effective implementation of the project activities, overseen by UNDP. In implementation of the project activities, the involved ministries will obtain the approval from UNDP for decisions including profiling of workers, selection of national consultants, payments and contracts, and approval of their reports as deliverables.

In addition, coordination will be done through the Recovery Cluster chaired by the MRRR and co-chaired by UNDP, and Education Sector Working Group, chaired by State Ministries of Education with participation of SUBEBs.

At Community levelUNDP will build on existingmechanisms and traditional structures, or establish community management committees as required. These will include community members, IDPs, and returnees fully participating in the implementation including monitoring of infrastructure rehabilitation, management of schools, planning for service delivery and undertaking security measure to protect schools.

Monitoring & Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of the short term results will be done through the following independent channels:

1. Community committee who will be well informed about the scope of all activities within an “integrated package” and expected to check the quality and accuracy of works on the ground
2. UNDP local staff, and site visits of international staff
3. Independent local agents with required technical engineering skills who will be able to assess the compliance with BOQs, scopes of works and monitor payments to workers on the site.

Evaluation of the impact will require a long term analysis. UNDP will set up the mechanism to look across their entire recovery programme in the NE, including the proposed project. A survey will be designed to measure the baseline and impact in mid and long term. We will observe the return pattern and sustainability of return, the difference in quality of life and satisfaction of beneficiaries over the period of two years on 3 groups of communities:

1. communities who have received support randomly and not in coordinated manner, where community security measures were not implemented,
2. communities supported by the proposed project with all 3 components including community security
3. communities who will be supported by entire integrated package of multiple components under other UNDP funding.

Project Budget

The below budget is calculated for rehabilitation of 10 solar powered 4-classroom permanent schools.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY** | **AMOUNT US $** |
| 1. Staff and other personnel costs  | 64,000 |
| 2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials  | 276,000 |
| 3. Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation  | 70,000 |
| 4. Contractual Services  | 24,000 |
| 5. Travel  | 19,618 |
| 6. Transfers and Grants Counterparts | 396,000 |
| 7. General Operating and Other Direct Costs (10%) | 84,962 |
| Total Programme Costs | 934,580 |
| Indirect Support Costs (cannot exceed 7%) | 65,421 |
| **TOTAL** | **1,000,000** |

Explanation of Budget Categories

The Finance and Budget Network approved the above harmonized expense categories for interagency reporting effective 1 January 2012 in decision 54 at the 12th FDN session[[3]](#footnote-3)[1]. This was further confirmed by the HLCM and the CEB in their 20th sessions in later 2010. For detailed explanation on the definitions of each category, refer to Annex A.

**Monitoring And Evaluation**

In accordance with UNDP’s programming policies and procedures, the project will be monitored through the above mention 3 streams of independent monitoring and following monitoring and evaluation plan:

**Monitoring Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring Activity** | **Purpose** | **Frequency** | **Expected Action** | **Partners** **(if joint)** | **Cost** **(if any)** |
| **Track results progress** | Progress data against the results indicators in the RRF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs. | Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator. | Slower than expected progress will be addressed by the UNDP Sub-office project management. |  |  |
| **Monitor and Manage Risk** | Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP’s audit policy to manage financial risk. | Quarterly | Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken. |  |  |
| **Learn**  | Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project. | End of project | Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions. |  |  |
| **Annual Project Quality Assurance** | The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP’s quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project. | Quarterly | Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by project management and used to inform decisions to improve project performance. |  |  |
| **Review and Make Course Corrections** | Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making. | Quarterly | Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections. |  |  |
| **Project Report** | A progress report will be presented to the key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk log with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period.  | Quarterly, and at the end of the project (final report) |  |  |  |
| **Project Review (Project Board)** | The UNDP project management & SSI Steering Committee at the federal level will hold a mid-term review to assess the performance of the project and end-of project review upon completion by the end of 2017.  | Mid-year and final | Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified.  |  |  |

PROJECT LOGFRAME: SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE (SSI)

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT NAME: Communities for Safer Schools** |
| **DESCRIPTION** | **INDICATORS** | **MEANS OF VERIFICATION** | **ASSUMPTIONS** |
| **Goal:** Provision of sustainable, safe and quality education for all children of school ages in target communities, including the reintegration of returning IDP children into their communities of origin and/or host communities. | **Impact Indicator:**# vulnerable population in target insurgency affected communities that benefit from actions that will enhance accessible, safe and quality education, as well as additional income opportunities.  | Project reporting system | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** Improved standard of school infrastructure in the newly liberated communities through rehabilitation of school facilities **(MDTF fund)** | **Outcome Indicator:**% change in children attending safe and quality education | * Project reporting system
* Schools’ report
* Min of Edu and SUBEB reports
 | * Students are not taken out of school by their parents
* Majority of displaced teachers are willing to return back to communities
 |
| Output 1.1: Community schools reconstructed and rehabilitated  | **Output Indicator:**# of participating community schools rehabilitated with permanent structures | * Partners report
* Monitoring reports
* Quarterly reports
* Annual report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| Output 1.2: Community economy revitalized through youth employment | **Output Indicator:**# of community youth with improved economic livelihood | * Partners report
* Monitoring reports
* Quarterly reports
* Annual report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 1.1: Community schools reconstructed and rehabilitated)** |
| 1.1.1: Community school needs assessment  | * School physical condition;
* # children under 16;
* # classrooms required;
* # schools in integrated recovery packages;
 | * Needs Assessment report
* Integrated recovery packages
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| 1.1.2: Engineering assessment of community school facilities | * BoQ developed
* Scope of work developed
 | Engineering Assessment report |  |
| 1.1.3: Provision of alternative (renewable) energy in community schools  | # community schools provided with renewable energy# beneficiaries (pupils / students; teachers) | * Quarterly report
* Bi-annual project review report
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 1.1.4: School rehabilitation  | # schools rehabilitated# pupil / student beneficiaries, disaggregated by girls and boys | * Quarterly report
* Bi-annual project review report
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 1.2: Community economy revitalized through youth employment)** |
| 1.2.1: Employment of unskilled community labour | # selection meetings held with local community # beneficiaries | * Quarterly report
* Bi-annual project review report
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 1.2.2: Employment of skilled community labour | # selection meetings held with local community # beneficiaries | * Quarterly report
* Bi-annual project review report
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** Improved safety and security of schooling through building community security (UNDP fund) | **Outcome Indicator:**% change in community tension and insecurity  | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| Output 2.1: Community security management improved | **Output Indicator:**# of communities with functional / tested security management | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| Output 2.2: Community dialogue improved | **Output Indicator:**# of community stakeholders promoting peaceful co-existence | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 2.1: Community security management improved)** |
| 2.1.1: Community sensitization on security management | # of stakeholders sensitized on community security management plan  | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 2.1.2: Development of community security management plan  | # of participating communities that have Community Security Management Plan | * Copies of security plans
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 2.1.3: Deployment of community security in and around schools | # of participating schools benefiting from community security management | * Copies of deployment plans
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 2.2: Community dialogue improved)** |
| 2.2.1: Capacity building on community dialogue | # of community dialogue sessions held# of beneficiaries, women and men  | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| 2.2.2: Inauguration of community dialogue forum  | # of communities with tested dialogue forum | * Inauguration report
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 2.2.3: Organize community dialogue meetings | # of trainers / peer facilitators# of communities involved# of dialogue meetings held | * Minutes of meetings
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 2.2.4: Develop and translate dialogue materials on community peaceful co-existence  | # of materials developed / translated# of material produced and distributed | * Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** Improved planning for integrated service delivery at local level **(UNDP fund)** | **Outcome Indicator:**% change in quality of education  | * Baseline assessment report
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| Output 3.1: Synergies and complementarity with development partners built | **Output Indicator:**% change in extreme religious interpretations that stigmatized western education for children of school ages. | * Baseline assessment report
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| Output 3.2: Community planning system for provision of basic services established | **Output Indicator:**% change in management capacity of different actors involved in education  | * Baseline assessment report
* Stakeholder analysis report
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 3.1: Synergies and complementarity with development partners built)** |
| 3.1.1: Baseline assessment of extreme religious interpretation that stigmatizes western education | % change in community attitude on extreme religious doctrine | Baseline assessment report | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| 3.1.2: Hold harmonized meetings  | # harmonized meetings held# reports of harmonized results# staff members in joint coordination structure# complementary activities identified# Common results framework developed | * Minutes of meetings
* Quarterly reports
* Annual / Final evaluation report
 |  |
| 3.1.3: Complementary training of teachers and education personnel on quality of education | # complementary training sessions held# beneficiaries, (teachers and government personnel; women and men)  | Project reporting system |  |
| 3.1.4: Complementary training on psycho-social support | # complementary training sessions held# beneficiaries, (teachers and government personnel; women and men) | Project reporting system |  |
| 3.1.5: Complementary dialogue and sensitization of community stakeholders on socio-cultural practices that under-prioritized education | # complementary dialogue and sensitization sessions held# community groups involved# beneficiaries, women and men | Project reporting system |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Activities (for Output 3.2: Community planning system for provision of basic services established)** |
| 3.2.1: Conduct baseline assessment on management capacity of actors involved in education | % change in capacity of education management actors | Baseline assessment report | The political and security situation remains stable allowing school level actions to be carried out |
| 3.2.2: Conduct community stakeholder analysis | # community stakeholders analysed# communities involved | Stakeholder analysis report |  |
| 3.2.3: Capacity building of community structures on community mobilization | # sensitization visits# training sessions held # beneficiaries and groups, including women and men# community mobilization meetings held# community participants at mobilization meetings, including women and men# issues raised at community mobilization meetings# issues acted upon | Project reporting system |  |
| 3.2.4: Capacity building of community structures on local government accountability and transparency  | # training sessions held# beneficiaries and groups, including women and men% change in training KAP  | Project reporting system |  |
| 3.2.5: Capacity building of community structures on linkages with formal government and technical sector specialists | # training sessions held# beneficiaries and groups, including women and men% change in training KAP | Project reporting system |  |

**ANNEX A - Detailed Descriptions of Revised Harmonized Expense Categories**

The following definitions are as per the F&BN WG paper, which form part of the approved decision

**Staff and other personnel costs:** Includes all related staff and temporary staff costs including base salary, post adjustment and all staff entitlements.

**Supplies, Commodities, Materials**: Includes all direct and indirect costs (e.g. freight, transport, delivery, distribution) associated with procurement of supplies, commodities and materials.  Office supplies should be reported as "General Operating".

**Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation**: For those reporting assets on UNSAS or modified UNSAS basis (i.e. expense up front) this would relate to all costs to put asset into service.  For those who do donor reports according to IPSAS this would equal depreciation for period.

**Contractual Services:** Services contracted by an organization which follow the normal procurement processes.  In IPSAS terminology this would be similar to exchange transactions.  This could include contracts given to NGOs if they are more similar to procurement of services than a grant transfer.

**Travel:** Includes staff and non-staff travel paid for by the organization directly related to a project.

**Transfers and Grants to Counterparts:** Includes transfers to national counterparts and any other transfers given to an implementing partner (e.g. NGO) which is not similar to a commercial service contract as per above.  In IPSAS terms this would be more similar to non-exchange transactions.

**General Operating and Other Direct Costs:** Includes all general operating costs for running an office.  Examples include telecommunication, rents, finance charges and other costs which cannot be mapped to other expense categories.

**Indirect Support Costs:** (No definition provided).

**ANNEX B – summary of accessible LGAs in Borno state**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LGA** | **Accessible as of** |
| DAMASK | January 2017 |
| RANN | December 2016 |
| GAJIRAM | December 2016 |
| GUBIO | December 2016 |
| MAGUMERI | December 2016 |
| GAMBORU NGALA | November 2016 |
| BAGA | November 2016 |
| DIKWA | September 2016 |
| MAFA | September 2016  |
| MONGUNO | July 2016 |
| GWOZA | July 2016 |
| PULKA | July 2016 |
| BANKI | July 2016 |
| DAMBOA | July 2016 |
| KONDUGA | June 2016 |
| BAMA | June 2016 |
| BENISHEIKH | Normal access |
| BIU | Normal access |
| CHIBOK | insecure |
| ASKIRA | insecure |

**ANNEX C – Proposed List of Schools for Rehabilitation**

**Borno**

Secondary Schools:

1. Government Girls Secondary Schools Gajiganna
2. Government Secondary School , Kukawa
3. Government Girls Secondary School Mafa
4. Government Secondary School Konduga
5. Government Secondary School Sakwa

Primary Schools:

1. Budum Primary School
2. Fugoli Primary School
3. Briyel Central Primary  School
4. Mandaragraw Primary School
5. Hoyo Primary School

**Adamawa**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL**  | **LGA** | **LOCATION**  | **NO. OF BLOCK**  | **NO. OF CLASSROOM DESTROY**  | **NO. OF PUPIL SEAT**  |  |
| Jalingo Maiha Primary School  | Maiha  | Jalingo  | 4 | 9 | 135 | 405 pupils  |
| Mutuku Sida Primary School  | Hong  | Bangshika  | 2 | 6 | 170 | 500 pupils  |
| Jigalambu Primary/Sec. Sch. | Michika  | Jigalambu Bazza District  | 3 | 9 | 1000 | 3000 pupils  |

**Yobe**

Please refer to attached letter.

|  |
| --- |
| **Part C. Initial Review of Proposal****(To be completed by the SSI Secretariat)** |
| (a) Is the project explicitly linked to the SSI TOR? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (b) Is the project effective, coherent, and cost-efficient? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (c) Does the PUNO have capacity to carry out this proposal? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (d) Have risk management activities been fully described? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (e) Have social and environmental safeguards been elaborated? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (f) Is the Project Proposal Submission Form fully completed? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (g) Is the Budget in compliance with the standard format? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| (h) Is the indirect support cost within the approved rate? | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| **Part D: Decision of the Board**(to be completed by the Board) |
| **5. Decision of the Steering Committee**[ ]  Approved for a total budget of US$\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[ ]  Approved with modification/condition[ ]  Deferred/returned with comments for further consideration[ ]  Rejected |
| **Comments/Justification:** |
| **Chairperson of the Board****…………………………………………****Name (Printed)****………………………………………… ………………..****Signature Date** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part D: Participating UN Organization acknowledgement***(To be completed by the Participating UN Organization)* |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name/Title** |  | **Date** |  | **Signature** |
| **Focal Point of Participating UN Organization receiving funds:** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

 |

1. The term “project” is used for projects, programmes and joint programmes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Attacks on education in North East Nigeria, HRW, 2016, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2016/04/11/they-set-classrooms-fire/attacks-education-northeast-nigeria> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [1] 12th Session of the Finance & Budget Network Minutes- CEB/2010/HLCM/FB/30. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)