Additional Financing to General Education Quality Improvement Program for Equity for Refugees Integration - GEQIP-E AF (P168411)

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP)

JANUARY 1, 2021
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

Table of Contents

1.	Int	troduction/Project Description	1
2.	Bri	ief Summary of Previous Stakeholder Engagement Activities	4
3.	Sta	akeholder identification and analysis	4
	3.1	Affected Parties	5
3.2		Interested Parties	5
	3.1	Disadvantaged / vulnerable individuals or groups:	6
4.	Sta	akeholder Engagement Program	6
	4.1	Purpose and timing of stakeholder engagement program	6
	4.2	Proposed strategy for information disclosure and consultation process	7
	4.3	Future Phases of the project	7
5.	Re	sources and responsibilities for stakeholder engagement activities	7
	5.1	Resources	7
	5.2	Management functions and responsibilities	7
6.	Gri	ievance Mechanism	8
7.	М	onitoring and Reporting	8
		1: Different stakeholders Level of Engagement, Method of Engagement and Frequency	

1. Introduction/Project Description

The proposed GEQIP-E AF employs the PforR modality for a US\$80 million to provide incentives to Government for harmonization, integration of refugee education and innovation activities. The existing GEQIP-E, with its focus on equity and quality, provides a solid foundation from which to extend the reforms supported by the project to refugee schools through harmonized delivery structures. Therefore, three new DLIs are introduced at AF, supporting harmonization of refugee primary schools with MoE and REB services, and integration of secondary schools.

DLI 9. Harmonization of services at refugee primary schools (US\$60 million equivalent)

This DLI supports the extension of key services, identified by MoE as priorities for quality education and already supported by GEQIP-E in national schools, to refugee schools through MoE, REBs and woreda education officials. New DLRs are introduced to establish results targets specific to refugee populations outside the scope of current GEQIP-E.

DLR 9.1: Availability of Basic School Grants in refugee primary schools (US\$10 million equivalent): Basic School Grants, introduced under the original GEQIP-E, provide the primary source of non-salary income for schools. Primary schools are entitled to a Basic School Grant of ETB 50-55 (US\$1.75-1.95) per student, depending on grade, to be spent in accordance with a School Improvement Plan (SIP) developed and endorsed by school Parent, Teacher and Student Associations. At least 50 percent of Grants must be spent on SIP items relating to teaching and learning; the Grants also support a number of activities aimed at supporting and increasing participation of girls, including establishing girls' clubs, providing life skills and empowerment lessons, and providing water and sanitation facilities. School Grants are transferred from central level, via BoFEDs, to woredas, and then to schools.

Under the AF, institutional and policy frameworks will be put in place to support the payment of Basic School Grants to refugee primary schools. Under the revised arrangements, school grant allocations for refugee schools will be included in annual releases to WoFEDs for distribution to schools through similar procedures as used for REB schools. The School Grant guidelines employed under GEQIP-E will be customized for refugee schools, to bolster the support provided by Grants for laboratory materials, and for students from vulnerable or disadvantaged groups, including orphans and vulnerable children; children with special needs; and girls; and to introduce arrangements for management of school-level allocations by Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), with supervision and support from both ARRA and woreda education officials.

DLR 9.2: Improved in-service training for refugee incentive teachers (US\$10 million equivalent): GEQIP-E supports in-service training and continuous professional development for a range of teachers in national schools, particularly teachers Grades 1-2, and Grade 7-8 specifically in Mathematics. In refugee primary schools, the primary area of skills shortage is among refugee incentive teachers. Around 64 percent of teachers in refugee primary schools are incentive teachers, drawn from refugee communities and working for a small stipend. The majority of these are not qualified teachers, resulting in a severe lack of appropriately skilled teachers in refugee schools. The majority of these incentive teachers are deployed in Grades 1-4, creating particular shortages of skills in these grades.

DLR 9.3: Provision of textbooks to refugee primary schools with REB/woreda procurement, distribution and monitoring (US\$10 million equivalent): GEQIP-E supports the development of a new integrated, online system of textbook distribution and monitoring, and improvement in the timely and complete delivery of textbooks to schools. Provision of textbooks in refugee primary schools has historically been

carried out through a parallel system to MoE schools. ARRA identifies school-level textbook needs and procures the required books from REBs. However, refugee schools are not included in REB planning and books provided for refugee schools are typically re-printed at zonal level, at greater cost and at lower quality than books printed through normal means. In addition, the distribution and monitoring of textbooks to refugee schools is carried out by ARRA in a system separate from the distribution and monitoring system employed in national schools. Under the AF, refugee schools will report their need for textbooks directly to REBs to be included in plans for textbook supply. Books for refugee schools will be procured, in the required languages for each region, and printed alongside books for MoE schools, and distributed and monitored by woreda education officials.

DLI 10. Integration of refugee secondary education (US\$14 million equivalent)

DLR 10.1: Transfer of secondary refugee schools to MoE/REB administration (US\$10 million equivalent): In the long term, full integration of refugee education into national systems of school service delivery will entail the transfer of refugee schools administered by ARRA to REB administration under MoE oversight, and to an integrated model serving both refugee and host communities in a single school. The AF will support the beginning of this process, focusing on the secondary sector. A focus on secondary is appropriate for several reasons: (i) around one-fifth of refugee camp-based students attending secondary schools attend national schools; (ii) the 13 secondary schools which are operated under ARRA oversight are not directly administered by ARRA but by NGOs; and (iii) five of these 13 schools also include large numbers of host community students.

In Year 1 of the AF, the DLR will support the preparation of a detailed plan for integration, including for the transfer of payroll to MoE, with due consideration given to career progression and the long-term sustainability of the teaching workforce in secondary schools. In Year 2, the AF will support the transfer of two refugee secondary schools to REB administration as a pilot. In Year 3, an additional six schools will be supported for transfer to REB administration. In order to ensure that refugee education is expanded on a sustainable basis, a legal covenant will commit that any additional government secondary schools opening in camps following AF effectiveness will be under REB administration with oversight of MoE.

DLR 10.2: Support to host community schools for integration of refugee students (US\$4 million equivalent): Around 1,300 refugee students enrolled in secondary schools attend REB/MoE schools in host communities. A second DLR will provide support to these schools for activities for integration and inclusion of refugees, including increasing school capacity to meet the needs of the increased enrollment. The support will be integrated with the existing School Improvement Program. Schools in areas with large refugee populations will prepare Refugee Integration Plans, as addenda to existing School Improvement Plans, and receive top-up finance as an extension of the existing Basic School Grants.

DLI 11. Innovations to address key challenges in refugee education

DLR 11.1: Support to girls' empowerment and learning (US\$9 million equivalent): Refugee girls' enrollment lags below that of boys in all five refugee-hosting regions. Barriers to girls' participation are complex and vary at regional level. Refugee girls also face an elevated risk of harassment, violence, and early marriage. Evidence from the baseline study of a recent project in Benishangul-Gumuz, implemented by the International Rescue Committee, reveals one in five girls experienced early marriage or were cohabiting with a male as if married; and a similar number expressed low expectations about the level of education a girl should complete.

The AF will support the piloting and rollout in all main refugee-hosting areas of life skills training for girls, with topics including: self-esteem and confidence; decision-making and problem-solving; management of emotions and conflict; peers, friendships, and adult support; and personal health; as well as educational and work aspirations, and prevention of SGBV, early marriage and HTP. The intervention will include discussions with parents and caregivers, and with boys and adult male community members, on respect for girls and prevention of SGBV, early marriage, and HTP. The pilot is expected to be carried out in Benishangul-Gumuz, building on the previous pilots with additional aspects to the activities, including the targeting of male peers and adult community members.

DLR 11.2: Support to self-directed learning for COVID-19 recovery (US\$7 million equivalent): Refugee schools face severe challenges to learning from shortages of qualified teachers. Host community schools also face high PTRs and large class sizes as a result of recent inflows of additional enrollment. In addition, both camp-based and host community schools include classes with a large range of ages and abilities, including in some cases language backgrounds, reflecting high rates of over-age enrollment in lower grades.

Under the AF, support will be provided to the piloting and rollout of similar ICT-based interventions for self-directed learning in the major refugee-hosting regions. Highly qualified local NGOs and community organizations will be commissioned to provide low-cost ICT interventions to enable students to develop a self-directed program of learning, at their own pace, to fill gaps and support catching-up to minimum grade competencies. In order to support students at crucial points of transition to upper primary and to secondary education, it is expected that the interventions will target students in Grades 6 and 8. The interventions will be available to both refugee and host community students. Intervention sites will be within host communities, selected in consultation between MoE and ARRA to ensure access to activities by refugee students.

In addition to DLIs, the AF will scale up the existing IPF component with an additional US\$20 million equivalent to support capacity building activities. The IPF has two components within the AF are:

IPF Component 1: National and Regional Refugee Integration Facilities (US\$9.8 million equivalent)

Under the MoE and REB, there remains no dedicated capacity within MoE, or REBs, for coordination and management of services in refugee schools for refugee education. In order to develop capacity within MoE for refugee education, the IPF Component will support the establishment of a National Refugee Integration Facility within MoE, with staff to administer and oversee MoE's responsibilities under the MoU and under the AF. The Facility will (i) identify and produce costed implementation plans for capacity building activities to be supported under the IPF, for review and approval by the National Refugee Education Steering Committee; (ii) oversee development of policy and institutional frameworks and costed implementation plans for harmonization and integration activities as supported by foundational targets of DLRs; (iii) oversee overall implementation of program activities; and (iv) ensure integration of refugee issues in MoE planning and annual budgets.

In order to ensure the necessary collaboration to enable delivery of harmonized activities to refugee schools, there is also a need for dedicated capacity for refugee education within REBs, to provide technical and strategic leadership and to lead coordination between REBs and ARRA, UNHCR, NGOs, and other key stakeholders. Under the IPF component, Regional Refugee Integration Facilities will be established within REBs in the five main refugee-hosting regions: Afar, Benishangul-Gumuz, Somali, Gambella and Tigray. These regional offices will carry out day-to-day management of the Program at the regional level,

coordinate oversight of woreda-level activities, and provide necessary technical and advisory support to REBs and Woredas in taking up new activities and responsibilities to manage refugee education. In addition, they will conduct communication and community support activities around integration of refugees; prepare region-specific proposals for capacity building under the IPF; and directly liaise with communities, ARRA and other stakeholders to create a conducive environment for the required reforms to take root. Each Regional Facility will include: (1) a Regional Coordinating Officer; (2) a Communication Specialist; (3) a Refugee education specialist; and (4) a Gender specialist. Regions with larger refugee populations, such as Gambella and Somali, may additionally require dedicated Procurement and Financial Management Specialists, while Gambella and Benishangul-Gumuz will also require dedicated Environmental and Social Safeguards specialists.

IPF Component 2: Enhanced capacity for harmonization and integration (US\$10.2 million equivalent)

This IPF component will provide capacity building at national level to support (i) improved coordination and planning of refugee education activities and deepening of relevant expertise in government ministries and agencies; (ii) improved service delivery at the regional and woreda level to refugee schools; (iii) improved support by ARRA at zonal level to MoE and REBs for delivery of services to refugee schools and protection of refugees; and (iv) integration of secondary refugee schools to REB administration.

2. Brief Summary of Previous Stakeholder Engagement Activities

Consultation was conducted with refugee and host community representatives. Consultations were made with host and refugee communities, Refugee Central Committee members (RCCs), representatives of the refugee communities, in all visited refugee camps to create awareness about the proposed GEQIP-E AF program and to capture the concerns, views and opinions. The host and refugee communities' discussions were conducted with representatives composed of elders, women, youths, and adults to hear their opinions and capture their concerns about the proposed program and environmental and social risks and impacts. Additionally, discussions were held with: (a) refugee hosting WEO experts as relevant; and (b) refugee camp and host community teachers and students in refugee host woredas.

A range of representatives of relevant institutions including MoE, ARRA, and their regional and woreda levels counterparts were consulted. In addition, consultation with the teachers and students both in refugee and host community secondary and primary schools was conducted in the five refugee hosting regions, namely Afar, Gambella, Benishangul-Gumuz, Somali, and Tigray regions from December 27, 2018 – January 28, 2019.

On the draft updated ESSA, national consultation with the relevant stakeholders was made following the guidelines of the Bank Policy on Information Access on April 02, 2019; attendees were from MoE, ARRA, REBs, Zone ARRA Mangers/education specialists, MoEFC, MoLSA, WB, Regional Environmental Authorities, DPs, and beneficiary representatives (for detailed national level consultation summary and list of consultation participants Refer annex 5 and Annex 5 of the Updated ESSA).

3. Stakeholder identification and analysis

Stakeholder analysis identifies and determines the likely relationship between the project and the different stakeholders. Stakeholders are directly or indirectly affected by a project, as well as those who

may have interests in a project and/or the ability to influence its outcome, either positively or negatively. This SEP is prepared based on the preliminary stakeholder identification and will be updated to ensure localized stakeholders are included during pilot site specific risk assessments.

Stakeholder analysis helps to know the perceptions, interests, need, and influence of actors on the project. Identifying the appropriate consultation methodology for each stakeholder throughout the project lifecycle is necessary. In order to meet best practice approaches, the project will apply the following principles for stakeholder engagement:

- Openness and life-cycle approach: public consultations for the project will continue during the whole project lifecycle from preparation through implementation. Stakeholder engagement will be free of manipulation, interface, coercion, and intimidation;
- Informed participation and feedback: information will be provided and widely distributed among all stakeholders in an appropriate format; conducted based on timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information related to the project; opportunities provided to raise concerns and assure that stakeholder feedback is taken into consideration during decision making;
- Inclusiveness and sensitivity: stakeholder identification is undertaken to support better communications and building effective relationships. The participation process for the projects is inclusive. All stakeholders are always encouraged to be involved in the consultation process. Equal access to information is provided to all stakeholders. Sensitivity to stakeholders' needs is the key principle underlying the selection of engagement methods. Special attention is given to vulnerable groups, particularly women headed households, youth, elderly and the cultural sensitivities of diverse ethnic groups.

The identified project stakeholders include individuals, groups or other entities who:

- (i) Are impacted or likely to be impacted directly or indirectly, positively or adversely, by the Project (affected parties); and,
- (ii) May have an interest in the Project ('interested parties'). They include individuals or groups whose interests may be affected by the Project and who have the potential to influence the Project outcomes in any way.

3.1 Affected Parties

These are stakeholders that are directly or indirectly affected by the project, positively or negatively. This include host and refugee community members, refugee and host community teachers, students, Parent-Teacher-Associations, MoE, ARRA, National and Regional Refugee Integration Facilities, REBs, Woreda Education Offices, ARRA Zonal Offices, Ministry of Finance, and BoFED.

3.2 Interested Parties

They include individuals or groups whose interests may be affected by the Project and who have the potential to influence the Project outcomes. The identified interested parties include Academia, Ethiopian society, CSOs/NGOs working on refugee and host community education, CSOs to be contracted for work, Teachers Union and workers union, etc.

3.1 Disadvantaged / vulnerable individuals or groups:

These are those who often do not have a voice to express their concerns or understand the impacts of a project. In the project areas and the parent GEQIP-E program the following category of people are identified as vulnerable groups that shall be targeted in the GEQIP-E AF: female Students, students with disability, economically weak parent's students, HIV victim students, shoe shiner students, and house head students.

In addition, vulnerable groups in the refugee and host community, among others include elderly, Female headed households, people with disabilities, poor people, and uneducated youth.

Awareness raising and stakeholder engagement with disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups on the project must consider such group's or individuals' sensitivities, concerns and cultural differences to ensure a full understanding of project activities and benefits. Engagement with these vulnerable groups and individuals often requires the application of specific measures and assistance aimed at the facilitation of their participation in the project related decision making so that their awareness of and input to the overall process are commensurate to those of the other stakeholders.

Vulnerable groups within the communities affected by the project will be further confirmed and consulted during site-specific risk assessments prior to subproject implementation through dedicated means, as appropriate.

4. Stakeholder Engagement Program

4.1 Purpose and timing of stakeholder engagement program

The stakeholder consultations shall be conducted throughout the project lifecycle. It was conducted during the preparation of ESSA and will be conducted throughout program implementation. The stakeholder consultations shall be conducted with relevant institutions to ensure the proper identification of environmental and social risks and propose appropriate recommendation measures over the program period. In addition, the stakeholder consultations are required to understand the concerns, views, and opinions of the different stakeholders including the needs of the vulnerable groups to address in the specific subproject activities.

The project includes considerable resources to implement the above actions. The details will be prepared as part of the site-specific risk assessment and prior to commencement of the subproject activities depending on the local context. The site-specific risk assessment, including mapping of stakeholders, engagement and integration of voices is linked to the ESCP. This SEP will be updated to outline specific community consultation and time for the different areas to be funded by the Project. Consultations will be done on when ESMPs prepared as required.

The Level of Engagement, Method of Engagement, and frequency of engagement for the different stakeholder identified is presented annexed in this SEP (See annex 1).

4.2 Proposed strategy for information disclosure and consultation process

The strategy for information disclosure and consultation may vary depending on the regional and local context. However, it will be important that the different activities are inclusive and culturally sensitive, thereby ensuring vulnerable groups outlined above will have the chance to participate in the Project benefits and contained from potential pesticide risks. This can include, among others, household-outreach activities, use of national and regional radio and television channels of different languages, group discussion, and the use of verbal communication or pictures, etc. While country-wide awareness campaigns will be established using national medias.

Stakeholder engagement is an ongoing process. The client will conduct proper consultation with the community members, vulnerable groups, and other concerned stakeholders throughout program implementation using appropriate communication channels outlined above. The draft and final SEP will be disclosed prior to formal consultations.

The approaches taken will thereby ensure that information is meaningful, timely, and accessible to all affected stakeholders, use of different local languages including addressing cultural sensitivities, as well as challenges deriving from illiteracy or disabilities, tailored to the differences in geography and way of life. The project will also ensure the establishment of a Grievance Redress Mechanism.

4.3 Future Phases of the project

Stakeholders will be kept informed as the project develops, including reporting on project environmental and social performance and implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan and grievance mechanism. This will be important for the wider public, but specifically critical for the directly impacted community members.

5. Resources and responsibilities for stakeholder engagement activities

5.1 Resources

The MoE will be responsible for the implementation of the activities in this SEP. The GEQIP-E AF will allocate adequate resource for the implementation of the SEP. The allocated resource/financing will be further used for producing communication materials, access to national media including local radio, and traditional information sharing channels for effective information sharing with host and refugee communities throughout program implementation. The detail cost required for the SEP will be included during updating the SEP in six months of program effectiveness.

5.2 Management functions and responsibilities

Day-to-day management of the Program will be carried out by the National Refugee Integration Facility, established within MoE as part of the GEQIP-E PCO. GEQIP-E PCO has hired one E&S specialist that will be responsible also for GEQIP-E AF environmental and social issues including SEP until a new E&S specialist is on board at MoE. The National Facility will have responsibility for management of the Pfork Program, including SEP and other reporting of environmental and social implementations. At regional level, implementation of the program including the SEP will be overseen by the Regional Refugee Integration Facilities that have its own E&S risk management specialist in Tigray and Somali regions hired

for GEQIP-E whereas E&S risk management specialists will be hired for Gambella and Benishngul-Gumuz as indicated in the ESCP.

The stakeholder engagement activities will be documented through quarterly and annual progress reports and shared with the World Bank.

6. Grievance Mechanism

The main objective of a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is to assist resolve complaints in a timely, effective and efficient manner. Project-level GRMs can provide the most effective way for people to raise issues and concerns about project that affect them. The project-level GRM will be culturally appropriate, effective, accessible and should be known to the affected population. MoE will conduct awareness raising for the affected communities about the presence of the GRM and inform their right to file any concerns, complaints and issues they have related to the GEQIP-E AF.

The GRM provides a transparent and credible process for fair, effective and lasting outcome. It also builds trust and cooperation as an integral component of broader community consultation that facilitates corrective actions. Specifically, the GRM:

- Provides affected people with avenues for making a complaint or resolving any dispute that may arise during the project implementation;
- Ensures that appropriate and mutually acceptable redress actions are identified and implemented to the satisfaction of complainants; and
- Avoids the need to resort to judicial proceedings.

Grievance redress committee will be established at refugee hosting Woreda and/or regions and schools composed of the host and refugee communities to ensure accessibility and transparency of the GRM. If an effective and functional grievance redress committee exists at refuge hosting Woredas or regions as well as refugee hosting schools, the exiting GRM will serve as a location addressing grievances related to the project with provision of appropriate training for the committee members regarding the requirement in the project.

MoE will develop and implement GRM guideline that details the procedure, timing, indicative committee members, etc. Resources will be allocated for the GRM in the project. The complaints recorded, resolved and referred will be reported quarterly and annually together with the environmental and social risk management performance report.

7. Monitoring and Reporting

The SEP will be periodically updated throughout project implementation, as necessary, consistent with the requirements of ESS10, in a manner acceptable to the Bank. Any major changes to the project related activities and to its schedule will be duly reflected in the SEP. MoE will prepare and submit to the Bank quarterly and annual SEP implementation reports and other environment and social instruments of the Project, including the grievance mechanism. The quarterly summaries will provide a mechanism for assessing both the number and the nature of complaints and requests for information, along with the Project's ability to address those in a timely and effective manner.

Annex 1: Different stakeholders Level of Engagement, Method of Engagement and Frequency of Engagement

The stakeholders presented in the following table are identified during the preparation of the Program and ESSA update.

Stakeholder	Type of	Level of	Method of Engagement	Frequency of
	Stakeholder	Engagement	,	Engagement
MoE	IA	Federal	/	1
ARRA	IA	Federal	/	/
National and	IA	Regional	/	/
Regional Refugee				
Integration Facilities				
REB	IA	Regional	/	/
Woreda Education Offices	IA	Woreda	/	/
ARRA Zonal Offices	IA	Regional	/	/
Ministry of Finance	IA	Federal	Progress Reporting	Quarterly
BoFED	IA	Regional		
World Bank	Funding	Federal	Progress Reporting and	Quarterly resp.
			Implementation Support	6-monthly
			Missions	
UNHCR	Partner	Federal	Progress Reporting by ARRA	Quarterly
Academia	Interested P.	Federal	TBD	TBD
Ethiopian society	Interested P.	Federal	TBD	TBD
CSOs/NGOs	Interested P.	Federal	TBD	TBD
Contracted CSOs	Contractor	Federal/Local	Contractual / Progress	At least monthly
			Reporting	
Regional societies	Interested P.	Regional	TBD	TBD
Woredas and	LGUs	Local	Regional Refugee	Regular Meetings
Kebeles			Integration Facilities	(At least quarterly)
Schools	Direct	Local	See the ESCP above for the	At least quarterly
			site-specific plan as part of	
			the site-specific risk	
			assessment (community	
			consultations, FGD) by	
			Woreda and/or Regional	
			Refugee Integration	
			Facilities	
Host communities	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan	At least monthly
			(community consultations,	
			FGD) by Woreda and/or	
			Regional Refugee	
			Integration Facilities	

Stakeholder	Type of Stakeholder	Level of Engagement	Method of Engagement	Frequency of Engagement
Refugees	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
Female Students	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
Vulnerable Students	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan which will have to identify appropriate techniques to reach these students. Through student only consultations through appropriate mechanisms, such as FGD and individual interviews (community consultations as appropriate) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
Host community teachers	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
National Refugee School teachers	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
Incentive Refugee teachers	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly
Parent-Teacher- Association	Direct	Local	See site-specific plan (community consultations, FGD) by Woreda and/or Regional Refugee Integration Facilities	At least monthly

Stakeholder	Type of Stakeholder	Level of Engagement	Method of Engagement	Frequency of Engagement
Teacher Union (if any)	Direct	Local / Regional / Federal	See LMP	At least monthly