

Project Name Nigeria-Universal Basic Education Project

Region Africa Regional Office

Sector Primary education (33%); Secondary education (33%); General education sector (34%)

Project ID NGPE71494

Implementing Agency
 Universal Basic Education Commission
 Address: Abuja, Nigeria
 Contact Person: UBEC Coordinator,
 Prof. Gidado Tahir
 Tel: 09 5230089-90
 Fax: 09 5239741

Environment Category B

Date PID Prepared July 18, 2002

Auth Appr/Negs Date July 9, 2002

Bank Approval Date September 12, 2002

1. Country and Sector Background

Major Issues The situation for Basic Education in Nigeria currently requires major improvements. It can be characterized as follows: A General Deterioration of the System - The education system has deteriorated very much over the last ten years. The enormous gains (and public investments) in education which began in the southern regions in the mid 1950's and in the north in the 1970's and which produced near universalization of primary schooling in large parts of the country have been seriously undermined in the last decade. Physical conditions in the public schools have worsened. Many schools are no longer operational or operate with much fewer classrooms than needed; most are without furniture or teaching materials. For example, Ondo state reports of the 11,041 classrooms, 8,346 are in bad condition and unusable. Borno state reports 2,808 of its 4,016 classrooms needing rehabilitation. Teachers have lost much of the post-independence enthusiasm, dedication and devotion to nation building. Although the provision of teachers seems to be adequate on average, there are very large and overcrowded schools in urban areas, and there is a wide range of pupil/teacher ratios across the country. The ratio varies from 1:105 for Bayelsa, to 1:39 for Katsina and 1:31 for Niger state. A Decline in Gross Enrolment Ratio - Primary Education enrollment figures for 1998 (latest year of reliable data), show about 16 million children in school, as compared to 13.8 million for 1991. This represents, however, a decline in Gross Enrollment Rate from 84.2% to 80.8 %, and represents wide variations between states, with a low of 38% for Zamfara and 48% for Delta states, while the GER in some states is well above 100% (Osun, Oyo and Akwa-Ibom). The number of schools, now at about 40,876, represents an average school size of 383 pupils per school, with an average of ten teachers each; not an ungenerous situation overall. The Impact on the Poor - The poor have born the greatest impact of the deteriorating situation. Because of the failure of the public school system, where few schools are operating adequately and where the quality of instruction is

generally poor, parents are turning to private schools. But the costs of private education are high and this education is available only to children whose parents can afford it. For example, during the 2001 school year, primary school teachers were on strike for seven months until their arrears in salary increases were paid. Parents with the means and with concern for their children's education increasingly transferred their children to private schools, while those who could not afford this, went without schooling. Schools in poor and rural areas are also physically in the worst conditions and with the least instructional materials. Limited Access to education for girls in some parts of the country - Across the country, girls enrollment was 45% in 1998, with wide disparities between the states. Enrollment of girls was near equal in Oyo and Osun, while only 18% of the girls go to school in Zamfara, 23% in Sokoto, and 34% in Katsina. For many Moslem parents, there is resistance to sending their girls to receive a secular education, and the location and physical conditions of schools often do not help to overcome these concerns. There are, however, some state initiatives to address this trend. Some states (for example, Kano) have started "girl center" programs where girls are given a basic education, while several of the northern, largely Islamic states are improving the quality of the koranic schools, attended by many girls and which are currently not part of the formal system. This poor situation can be largely ascribed to the following issues: Institutional and Organizational Weaknesses. The basic education sector, and individual organizations within it, are weak because of the following factors: (a) The division of labor in the sector is inefficient. Major functions are duplicated, fragmented, or inappropriately placed among the three tiers of government, especially in the management of primary education. While there is primary education responsibility in the federal ministry of education and in the state ministries, the National Primary Education Commission (NPEC) and State Primary Education Boards (SPEBs) in each state also have responsibilities for primary education. The recent Supreme Court ruling, more firmly placing basic education responsibilities with the states may bring greater clarity in roles and responsibilities. (b) The sector lacks a clear, detailed and shared direction. This refers both to vision and to strategies. Parliament has declared a vision of 'free, compulsory, universal basic education for all', and the federal ministry of education has produced a more detailed draft statement of vision based on this declaration, at the national level; but the vision is accompanied only by bits and pieces of strategy, and not by an integrated, holistic national strategy. Moreover, the vision, as well as the elements of strategy that do exist, have not been effectively disseminated and are not fully shared by all. Beyond an acquaintance with the general statement, there is little knowledge and understanding at state and local levels of where education is heading, and how it will get there. It is not clear that there is consensus regarding girls education and the content of education. Recently, however, the minister has established and Education-for-All Secretariat, that is embarking on an ambitious program of sensitization and more systematic planning at the state level. (c) The sector seems to be bloated with people in non-teaching positions, and the ratio of non-teaching to teaching staff is rather high. In addition, many people are not fully utilized, and many are inefficient even when utilized. Inefficiency results not only from a low level of skill, but also from lack of incentives and poor monitoring and control. (d) The sector suffers from poor administration and management, not only because managers and administrators lack basic skills, but also because the

environment in which they have to do their work is often deprived of even basic material resources, such as office space, energy, office equipment, telephones, filing cabinets, vehicles, etc. (e) One of the key functions of management is to plan. However, managers and planners at all levels have difficulties in planning not only because they lack planning skills, but also because much information is lacking, and because the information that is available is highly unreliable. The FMOE, the SMOEs, the SPEBs lack the necessary data to produce good projections. Most states are unclear on key questions, such as the number of children who are out of school and who need to be accommodated. The action plans they produce remain largely general enrollment drives and UBE campaigns, and they do not reflect appropriate thinking on how the supply of schools and teachers would cope with any possible increase. Low Quality of Basic Education. Public schools, which the majority of Nigeria's children attend, do not deliver adequate levels of teaching or learning outcomes. An achievement study, carried out in 1996 by the Federal Ministry of Education with support of UNICEF and UNESCO, shows that nationwide, students in primary Grade 4 in public schools on average responded correctly to 25 percent of items in the literacy test and 32 percent in the numeracy test. The very low scores in literacy (and indeed in the other subjects) may be largely a result of the very poor implementation of language policies and the use of English only in the tests. The language policy states that teaching and learning in the first three years of primary education is to be carried out in one of the three major languages (Hausa, Yoruba, Igbo) with transition to English medium in upper primary beginning in class 4. Teachers however are inadequately trained to structure learning effectively in a bilingual environment, and texts and materials to support the use of Nigerian languages are inadequate. Lack of teaching materials generally and the poor physical environment are not conducive to good teaching and learning. Teachers are trained poorly and inadequately in the colleges of education, with an inappropriate curriculum for preparing primary school teachers that is largely geared towards producing subject teachers, even for primary schools. While teachers had been highly underpaid, with the resulting low morale, teacher salaries at all levels were increased substantially (up by 200 percent) during the past year, making the teaching profession a more attractive one. Poor teacher management Teachers and teaching have low status in Nigeria, especially primary school teachers. This has arisen as the result of declining conditions of service, extremely poor working environments and lack of incentives and reward systems to improve performance. Recent large salary increases and alignment of teachers' salaries with that of other public servants should help to redress some aspects of low teacher morale. But to regain the confidence of parents and communities, there will need to be better school performance and higher learning achievements of students. There are dedicated teachers working under severely constrained conditions but for teacher and school's performance to improve there are several parallel sets of issues to be addressed. These have to do with improving the physical aspects of the working environment (adequate and safe space, furniture, blackboards, books and materials), deploying qualified teachers more efficiently and making teacher education and training programs much more relevant to the learning needs of students. Primary school management is at a low point with considerable confusion over who is responsible for which aspects of teachers management under the current federal, state and local government arrangements. Secondary school teachers are managed by the state in which they are employed and their

salaries are the responsibility of the state. On the other hand, primary school teachers are employed at state level by the State Primary Education Board which is accountable to local governments for payment of teacher salaries and to the federal Universal Basic Education Commission which channels the funds. Funds for primary school teachers' salaries are provided by Local Government Authorities through the statutory allocation they receive from the Federal Allocation. The share of allocation for primary teachers salaries is 'deducted at source' (i.e., withheld from each local government allocation at the federal level) from their share of statutory allocation. This is becoming a highly contentious issue affecting local government budgets over which they feel they have little control. And, it leads to a reluctance to recruit sufficient numbers of teachers or to provide the kind of incentives that might encourage teachers to work in rural and remote schools. This is reflected in the wide range of teacher to pupil ratios seen across local governments within a state, and across different states. Local governments are responsible for primary schools but have few if any resources to support schools other than through deployment practices and school supervision. Resources for regular in-service teacher training and professional support activities are provided at the state level but are extremely limited and come mostly from donor sources. The result is that most teachers have not participated in any in-service training since they graduated from their initial teacher training course and the majority of teachers participating in certificate upgrading programs are paying for their own participation in distance education or part time courses at colleges of education.

Government Strategy

The new president, elected in 1999, is highly committed to the education system. He has strongly reaffirmed the vision of universal basic education for all and initiated the introduction of the UBE Bill into Parliament. The Nigerian Government now has a universal, 8-year basic education policy, and the target date for its achievement is 2015. The government has substantially increased capital expenditure allocations to the education budget (US \$ 100 million annually over the last three years), and has embarked on a massive national program to achieve UBE. At the national level, the government's strategy for dealing with the issues listed above and achieving UBE is clear, though not complete. Its strategy to deal with the issue of access is to: (a) rehabilitate the current stock of schools and to build new schools and/or classrooms where necessary; (b) design special programs targeting girls and hard-to-reach groups (such as children in fishermen and nomadic communities); (c) decrease the ratio of pupils to teacher in the schools; and (d) form strong partnerships with local governments and communities. Its strategy to improve the quality of education is to: (a) expand early childhood care and education; (b) improve teacher training; (c) ensure the provision of teaching/learning materials; and (d) provide other forms of teacher support. In some areas, a clear strategy from the federal government is lacking. An important example relates to the supply of teachers. From the UBE capital budget allocation, a substantial amount has been allocated to upgrading existing teachers to the required qualifications. But, planning in the country's teacher training colleges on how to ensure for an adequate supply of suitably trained new teachers, is currently nonexistent. Another example has to do with the impact of current conditions on the poor. The government has no specific strategy for this, other than to pay particular attention to rural schools and ethnic minorities when it implements the general strategies for improving access and quality. In the area of institutional capacity too the

government does not have yet any strategy, among others, because it has not yet fully analyzed issues in this area. Only now it is analyzing the capacity of the education sector in the context of the Education Sector Analysis (ESA), and the institutional weaknesses are beginning to receive attention. To its credit, though, it may be stated that the government is fully aware that institutional and organizational weaknesses exist and has added capacity building to its list of key objectives. The federal government's strategies are general. In most of the areas indicated above they need to be, because it is up to each and every state to select specific ways and means for achieving the national objectives in its own education system, based on its particular conditions. But most of the states have not yet developed the more specific strategies to deal with the issues of access, quality, equity and capacity. During the last year, some states, mainly those seeking to receive support through this project, have started to develop their strategies, and a number now have at least some of the key elements in place. These elements fit well into the national strategy. All states emphasize the rehabilitation and construction of classrooms and are already implementing building programs with federal and state funds. Many have made action plans for increasing enrollments, and some are targeting girls in particular. In many states, especially in the South East and increasingly in the North, an important element of the strategy is to develop partnerships with local governments and communities. In the Southwestern states, where the emphasis is on quality, an important element of the strategy is to decrease the pupil/teacher ratios and ensure sufficient teaching materials are in place. These states have also decided to develop special programs to address hard-to-reach groups, such as the delta fishermen. In the Southeast and South-South, where most children are in school, but completion rates are low (averaging from 63% for South-South, to 77% for Southeast), a strategies being followed are to make school generally more attractive, by giving them more resources and, where the completion rate for boys is lower than for girls, to target boys especially. During the last several years, the Bank supported Primary Education Projects (PEP 1 and PEP 2), have introduced highly successful self-help programs, with grants provided to schools and communities to assist in renovating and improving primary schools.

2. Objectives

The project would support Government of Nigeria's plans to implement a program to achieve universal basic education (UBE). The objective of the Bank's support would be to increase the capacity of states and local governments to manage and implement the UBE program effectively and efficiently. The goals are to assist states and local governments to establish and manage schools with local participation and to build capacity in critical skills such as budgeting, participatory planning, financial management, procurement, and project implementation.

3. Rationale for Bank's Involvement

Bank support would bring the technical expertise and assistance for improved planning and budgeting for UBE at state and local government levels. While other donors are also providing assistance in this area (most notably DfID and USAID), Bank involvement would provide additional incentives for increasing capacity and developing these management and planning skills. The Bank's role in coordinating the network of donors for education sector analysis will assist further in bringing a coherent

framework for UBE. Although substantial government resources are being allocated to the UBE program, this represents only a portion of what is needed. Similarly, other donors are providing support to basic education, but this is still fairly limited. To make UBE a success, two elements need to be in place, both of which would benefit from Bank support. First, setting-up of a cadre of trained and reliable people who will be able to develop sound UBE plans and be able to implement them. Second, communities need to be mobilized and empowered to improve their schools with appropriate inputs of funds. The percentage of Bank support for UBE, in relation to overall government spending at federal, state and local government levels is not known. Each participating state would, during the preparation process, identify all of the sources of funds that are to be allocated to UBE, to form a complete picture and to determine sustainability of the programs. The Bank would be instrumental in setting up this process.

4. Description

Over the long-term, Bank support for UBE would be available to all states in the country, if they are interested. Because the approach taken here, however, is new and has not been tried before in Nigeria, initially, up to sixteen states had been invited to participate in this project. It is the intention to use the lessons learned from engagement with this initial set of states for scaling up further within each state and to all 36 states in future Bank operations. Of this initial group, sixteen states that are ready with their proposals and are still interested to participate will be included in the project. These states are: Borno, Taraba, Katsina, Kaduna, Jigawa, Niger, Plateau, Benue, Lagos, Oyo, Rivers, Bayelsa, Ebonyi, Ekiti, Enugu and Imo. Invited states who have indicated their interest, and are eligible to participate and implement the project, have been able to fulfill the following conditions: institutional capacity assessed; core capacity for project implementation in place; and willingness to achieve other capacity strengthening activities as part of the Bank support; financial capacity and financial structure in place, including the financing mechanism for funds to be distributed to communities; State Governor has submitted a written notification of his commitment to the objectives and terms of the project; preparation of a satisfactory proposal from each state, presenting the UBE strategies for the state, with a priority for the underserved areas of low enrollments. In each state, project activities will be carried out in six local governments during the first two years of the project, these local governments to be selected based on identified needs for UBE, and as stated in the proposal. If a state would like to expand the activities to other local governments during the remaining project years, they can do so, provided implementation performance has been satisfactory during the first two years. There are two components in the project: Component 1: State Programs for the Implementation of Universal Basic Education. During project preparation, each participating state has prepared an overall UBE plan for the next three years, based on an analysis of data and existing conditions, and developing detailed strategies for achieving UBE. States have prepared and submitted annual proposals for Bank financing of up to US \$ 5 million per state for the five-year period, reflecting the requirements as stated in the overall plan, and within the context of other sources of funding available to the state. Bank assistance can be requested for: (i) institutional strengthening, including support for EMIS development; (ii) increasing the quality of schools, including upgrading

of physical infrastructure, teacher support and teaching materials; and (iii) increasing access, especially through incentives schemes and strengthening community schools. For the sixteen states, the project would provide assistance for a total of eight operations in each state. These would include the following (this is compulsory);

- ñ Strengthening the organizational, managerial and operational capacity of states and LGA's.
- ñ Support for EMIS development.
- ñ Project management and monitoring and evaluation of the project.

In addition, each state will need to select a maximum of five operations from the following list, providing a balance, to achieve a whole-school approach and reflecting the priority areas towards achieving UBE in the state:

- A. Physical Infrastructure (a maximum of 60% of the funds requested for the five operations)
 - ñ Renovation or reconstruction of existing schools, including construction of additional classrooms and toilet facilities; following the procedures set in the self-help model for communities under PEP II.
 - ñ Construction of new schools, under the management of communities
 - ñ School furniture
- B. Teacher Support
 - ñ Teacher training programs to upgrade existing teachers to the required specifications
 - ñ Teacher training programs to support teachers with ongoing professional support
 - ñ Incentive schemes for teachers in remote areas
- C. Teaching Materials
 - ñ Establishment of school libraries, including the purchase of library books and supplementary readers and the training of teacher librarians
 - ñ Textbooks and instructional materials
- D. Measures to Increase Access
 - ñ Programs for strengthening community (such as koranic and islamiyah) schools
 - ñ Incentive schemes for disadvantaged groups, such as girl enrollment, boy enrollment, including support for alternative schools (market schools, girl centers, etc.)

Component 2: Federal Program Management and Monitoring, Policy Development, and Systems Support Activities at the federal level to support UBE would be financed. The main responsibility for implementing the Government's UBE program is at the state and local (LGA) level, and most of the support provided through the project would targets these levels. However, effective implementation of the program will also require considerable strengthening of the capacity of key federal institutions charged with policy development and with training of education planners, managers and policy makers at all levels of the education system. A total credit amount of US 20 million would be allocated for this component. The project would provide capacity development activities in the following areas:

- Interaction between HIV/AIDS and education.
- Institutional Strengthening of NIEPA.
- Collection, analyzing and publishing education statistics.
- Education sector policy development.
- Support for EFA activities
- Capacity building of Federal Agencies
- Project management and monitoring of implementation.

UBE State Action Plans
 UBE Federal Program Management

5. Financing

	Total (US\$m)
BORROWER	\$18.40
IBRD	
IDA	\$100.00
UK: BRITISH DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (DFID)	\$12.80
Total Project Cost	\$131.20

6. Implementation

Institutional arrangements: At the three levels of government--federal, state and local government--there are para-statal offices with specific responsibilities for basic education: the National Primary Education Commission (NPEC) at federal level, the State Primary Education Boards (SPEB) at state, and Local Government Education Authorities (LGEA) at the local government level. These offices have reporting relationships, both to the education officials at that level (Minister of Education at federal, State Ministry of Education and Governor at state level, and LGA Chairman at local government level); as well as to the federal level through a vertical reporting mechanism. Horizontal and vertical coordination is often a problem, with duplicate responsibilities and poor communication between offices in some states. As part of the preparation process, institutional capacity assessments are being carried out in the participating states. Depending on the outcomes of these assessments, support for capacity strengthening and institutional development would be available to states during implementation.

Project Arrangements At the State level: Each of the 16 states would establish a state UBE Coordinating Committee for coordination of the project in the state. It is proposed for each state to set up a Project Coordinating Units (PCU), as decided by the Governor, to manage and coordinate the project's activities in the state. If the proposed project consists entirely of assistance for primary schools, the PCU can be established in the SPEB. If both primary and secondary school assistance is requested, the Bank recommends for the PCU to be in the SMOE, with a Project Management Unit (PMU) to carry out implementation in the SPEB. The PCU needs to be staffed at a minimum with: project manager, procurement unit staffed with a procurement specialist, an accountant, and adequate record-keeping arrangements, and technical specialists for implementation. The PMU needs to be staffed with a project manager, procurement specialist, and technical specialists for implementation. PCU's will be responsible for: Preparation and coordination of annual work programs and budgets, to be reviewed by Bank; Maintaining project indicators and monitoring progress; Preparation of progress reports, twice a year for submission to the Bank; Implementation of project activities; Procurement activities under the project, according to Bank guidelines; Maintenance of project and financial records.

Project Arrangements at the Federal level: At the Federal level, a national steering committee (NETCOM) would be established, to provide overall coordination and oversight. A federal-level National Project Coordinating Unit (NPCU) will be responsible for overall coordination of state-level implementation; for providing technical assistance with project management, financial management and procurement. The National Project Coordinating Unit (NCPU) is to be established, staffed with a National Project Manager, technical staff and a Procurement Officer. For other federal-level activities, institutional arrangements will need to be further described, pending decisions on the content of the activities, to be determined during Appraisal.

Financial Management A Project Accounting Section (PAS) will be established at the NPCU. The PAS will be headed by a professionally qualified Project Accountant who will be supported by appropriately qualified staff. The PAS will be responsible for the management of the credit at the Federal level. In each participating State, a Project Financial Management Unit (PFMU) will be established in the Office of the State Accountant General. The PFMU will be responsible for managing the financial affairs of all Bank-assisted projects in the State, including UBE. Specifically, the PAS and PFMU will, amongst other

things, be responsible for preparing budgets, monthly reports, quarterly financial monitoring reports, annual financial Statements and progress reports respectively for the Federal and State components. PAS and PFMU will also be responsible for ensuring compliance with the financial management requirements of the Bank and the government, including forwarding the quarterly financial monitoring reports and annual financial statements to IDA. At NPCU, a qualified internal auditor will be appointed to perform internal audit activities for the project. Similarly, at the State level project activities will be reviewed and subjected to internal audit by the Inspectorate Unit of the Office of the Accountant-General for the State (OAGS). Regular internal audit reports will be submitted to project coordinators/officers, responsible ministries and the Accountant General for the State. When the credit becomes effective, the project will use the transaction-based disbursement procedures (i.e. direct payment, reimbursement, and special commitments) described in the World Bank Disbursement Handbook. If the borrower requests conversion to report-based disbursements during project implementation, a review will be undertaken by the Task Team to determine if the project is eligible. With respect to banking arrangements and funds flow, IDA will disburse the credit through Special accounts (SAs) consisting (a) one SA for the federal component; (b) one SA for each State that has established its PFMU in the manner described in Annex 6 (B), and (c) one SA for all the States that have not yet established their PFMUs - the SA will be managed by NPCU on behalf of the States. The participating States that have established their PFMUs and NPCU will each maintain a SA in US Dollars to which the initial deposit and replenishments from IDA will be lodged. Additionally, the participating States and NPCU will each maintain (a) a Current (Draw-down) Account in Naira to which draw-downs from the Special Account will be credited once or twice per month in respect of incurred eligible expenditures; and (b) a Current (Project) Account in Naira to which Counterpart Funds will be deposited. NPCU and the participating States will each prepare and submit to IDA Audited Project Financial Statements within six months after year end. By Credit Effectiveness, NPCU and PFMUs will each appoint relevantly qualified external auditors on Terms of Reference acceptable to the Bank. The auditors will audit the project accounts and financial statements in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (ISAs). The audit reports will include opinion paragraphs on the Audited Project Financial Statements, and the accuracy and propriety of expenditures made under the SOE procedures and the extent to which these can be relied upon as a basis for loan disbursements. Regarding each Special Account, the auditor will also be expected to form an opinion on the degree of compliance with IDA procedures and the balance at the year-end for each individual special account. The overall conclusion of the financial management assessments is that, provided the conditions outlined in Section G are met by NPCU, and the OAGS prior to credit effectiveness, the Bank's financial management requirements will be satisfied.

7. Sustainability

Nigeria has embarked on a ten-year program to implement UBE, of which Bank support represents a modest addition to the overall program. For the country as a whole, and for each state, the intention of this upgrading is that it will remain in place for the future. Long-term maintenance of the program and its sustainability, therefore, must be key features of the implementation process.

8. Lessons learned from past operations in the country/sector
Working with states and local governments will require a different model of project design and engagement between the borrower and the Bank. Basic education is the responsibility of states and local governments. Implementation of the program will, therefore, need to be at those levels. With 36 states and 774 local governments, there is likely to be wide variation in capacity and in commitment to achieving UBE. Local conditions are also very different in different areas of the country and the needs for improvement are varying. Bank support will need to be flexible, adaptive to local conditions, and addressing capacity needs where they are required. States will be able to come into the program of Bank support, depending on when they are ready, and will be able to request capacity strengthening support, if they want. Involvement of parents and communities are essential in achieving UBE. Previous projects in primary education have piloted a "self-help" approach to rehabilitation and improvements of primary schools, where parents and communities use small amounts of funds and contribute their own labor or other resources. This approach has been very successful and would be implemented on a larger scale in this project for all school renovation and rehabilitation programs. Achieving quality improvements requires a substantial amount of time and are hard to implement. During the previous primary education project, gains in quality improvement were negligible. These were largely implemented at the federal level, and handed down to the states and local governments. Because of the wide variations in capabilities and existing conditions in basic education, their effectiveness was not good. In the proposed project, a substantial amount of attention will be given to developing the best mechanisms to improve the quality of the school system. Importance of capacity building issues. A project's major contribution should be to assist government to carry out its responsibilities more effectively and more efficiently, with its own resources. These capacity building inputs are an essential element in the project design. Expenditure reviews, showing equitable and sustainable use of resources, and monitoring of outcomes would be used as indicators of increased capacity.

9. Program of Targeted Intervention (PTI) N

10. Environment Aspects (including any public consultation)

Issues : While the annual state plans will include school construction and rehabilitation, these activities will be financed under a related Community and Local Government Development Project.

11. Contact Point:

Task Manager
Brigitte Duces
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20433
Telephone:

12. For information on other project related documents contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-5454
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: [http:// www.worldbank.org/infoshop](http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop)

Note: This is information on an evolving project. Certain components may not be necessarily included in the final project.

This PID was processed by the InfoShop during the week ending July 26, 2002.