

DPEP II PREPARATION REVIEW MISSION

Aide-Memoire

Introduction

An IDA mission comprising Adriaan Verspoor (Education Adviser NDO and mission leader), Saurabh Banerjee (Civil Works Specialist, Consultant), Donna Bjerregaard, (Social Development Specialist, consultant), Roger Bonner (Civil Works Specialist, Consultant), Kevin Casey (Senior Implementation Specialist), Philip Cohen (Textbook Specialist, Consultant), Keith Hinchliffe (Senior Economist), N.K. Jangira, (Education Specialist, NDO), Hemamalini Kanugo (Operations assistant, Consultant), Sudesh Mukhopadhyay (Education Specialist, Consultant), Juan Prawda (Senior Education Specialist), Vijay Rewal (Civil Works Specialist, Consultant) and Clayton Vollan (Distance Education Specialist, Consultant) reviewed the progress of the preparation work for DPEP II with the DPEP Bureau, staff of other national institutions involved in project preparation and with representatives of the new states proposed for IDA support under DPEP II. Ms. Gita Poyck joined the mission on behalf of the Government of the Netherlands which has expressed interest in supporting the implementation of DPEP in Gujarat.

This aide-memoire summarizes the mission's findings and the understandings reached. It discusses first the progress with respect to the four central elements of appraisal (managerial capacity of DPEP Bureau, implementation progress of DPEP, program management capacity in new DPEP states, and quality of new district and state plans), it then assesses the national pre-appraisal process for the new states and summarizes the documentation needs for new districts in already participating states. The aide-memoire concludes with recommendations for action to be completed by appraisal. The Annex 1-3 summarizes the findings of state visits. Annex 4: summarizes the textbook and instructional materials issues for each state. Annex 5 suggests a format for the national state appraisal reports. Annex 6 presents some very tentative cost estimates. Annex 7 provides an updated schedule of preparation activities. The views expressed in this aide-memoire are those of the mission. They are subject to confirmation by the management of the World Bank's South Asia Department.

Project Composition

DPEP II would support the expansion of the coverage of the national District Primary Education Program into 12 districts in three new states -Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh and Orissa- and into about 35-40 districts in states that are already participating in the DPEP. The project objectives and investment components would be the same as for DPEP I, as would the guidelines for determining the eligibility of districts for participation in DPEP. The implementation would, however, be shortened to six years and a new national component would be included to develop a distance education program in support of the DPEP in-service training teacher training programs. Eligibility criteria for specific investment proposals are specified in the guidelines formulated

NIEPA DC



D10104

for DPEP I. The total project cost is estimated at approximately Rs. 1750 crore (\$500 million) and the IDA credit would be expected to be around \$425 million. The project is designed to provide program support to the DPEP and will be processed by IDA as a sector investment operation, with the DPEP Bureau operating as the national management authority which appraises state and district programs as well as state and district Annual Work Programs and Budgets. IDA will appraise and supervise the performance of the DPEP Bureau. Within this framework, on the basis of the Bureau's appraisal of the 12 district plans and 3 state plans for the new DPEP states, the IDA DPEP II appraisal mission will assess the capacity of the DPEP Bureau to appraise district plans. Plans for the "expansion" districts in states that are already participating in DPEP are expected to be appraised by the DPEP Bureau in the first two years of operation of DPEP II. The Government of the Netherlands has expressed an interest in funding the Gujarat DPEP program. Should this materialize the IDA credit could support funding for three more districts in existing states than currently anticipated.

Strengthening National Management Structure (NMS)

The assessment of capacity of the NMS to manage the preparation, appraisal and implementation of state and district programs is the key element of the appraisal of the DPEP II program. The two joint missions that so far have supervised DPEP I both emphasized the need to strengthen the staffing of the DPEP Bureau to meet the demands of accelerating implementation and expanding coverage (from 43 to about 100 districts). During the appraisal of DPEP I it was agreed that the DPEP Bureau would be headed by a full time joint secretary (JS), and comprise 6 deputy secretaries (DS) and 4 under secretaries (US) and support staff. A technical support group (TSG) would be constituted to provide the DPEP Bureau management team with the necessary technical inputs.

The joint secretary position has not yet been created and the position has so far been occupied by the joint secretary for planning as an additional charge. Similarly, two DSs were appointed with DPEP as a second charge. Furthermore, one DS was appointed full time and a second DS position has recently been created but not yet filled. All four US positions are filled. Thus, even with the recently established position the DPEP Bureau has not yet reached the agreed staffing levels for implementation of DPEP I program. These staffing shortages have, on occasion, slowed down the start up of DPEP I. The DOE should take this staffing issue up with the MOF and inform them that the mission expects that by appraisal:

- the JS position, the two DS position that are occupied by incumbents as a second charge and the position that was never established (total three DS positions) are created as separate full time positions;
- agreement is obtained to create two new DS positions to cater to the needs of the three new DPEP states.

The TSG has been established largely as agreed and is playing an increasingly important and effective role in internal planning and implementation assistance to the states and in internal appraisal and supervision. Some strengthening may be required however of the civil works cell to be able to guide the state in starting up the building design process and encourage them to

experiment and be innovative in this area. As states gain experience and the state level planning and management capacity develops, the focus of the efforts of the TSG can increasingly be on the states that have recently joined DPEP. Over time the TSG effort is therefore expected to be relatively stable and funding provided under DPEP I should be adequate to provide support to all DPEP states. This implies that DPEP II would only need to provide one year of funding for the TSG, assuming a six year implementation period. The mission recognizes the value of institutionalizing the current arrangements with EdCIL and avoiding upheavals in the technical support and capacity building assistance. For this to materialize, a number of procurement issues will need to be clarified with Bank procurement staff. GOI/DOE is requested to submit concrete proposals for the revision and extension of the EdCIL proposal to IDA for review before December 31, 1995.

The expansion of the coverage of DPEP raises two possible management scenarios for the DPEP Bureau. In one scenario, the Bureau increases its mandated tasks, and thus its staff, as a function of the expanding coverage of the program. In the second scenario, the Bureau remains a lean organization and gradually transfers some of its tasks --especially the appraisal of district AWPBs and the technical support to district planning teams-- to the states as the SPO and other state level institutions gain experience. The mission considers the second scenario as the appropriate course of action. It recommends that the DPEP management plan (updating annex 7 and 8 of DPEP I SAR) includes strategies and targets in this regard.

Accelerating Implementation of DPEP I

Good progress with the implementation of DPEP I is a key factor in securing IDA support for DPEP II. The overview paper that was presented to the mission by the DPEP Bureau provides a narrative on implementation of DPEP but it includes no quantitative information on performance indicators with regard to activities and expenditures. IDA disbursement records show that so far only one claim for disbursement has been received for Rs. 171 lakhs (\$500,000), although claims for another Rs. 524 lakhs (\$1.5 million) are in the pipeline. This is clearly unsatisfactory and does not even reflect the level of implementation activity observed by the second joint supervision mission. The DPEP Bureau should take this matter up with the states and ensure that disbursement claims are submitted promptly to IDA for processing. In addition, the DPEP Bureau should prepare prior to the appraisal mission a progress report on DPEP I implementation showing progress by state on key performance indicators. This progress report should also review achievements in respect of capacity building in the key program areas identified in the DPEP I SAR.

Developing the State and District Implementation Capacity

States have made good progress toward the creation of state implementation societies. The Implementation Society of Gujarat has already been constituted and registered, and a bank account opened. In Himachal Pradesh the SIS has been created and in Orissa the SIS will be registered within four weeks. State Project Directors have been identified in the three states and would be employed, on deputation, before the appraisal mission scheduled for next February. Preparation funds should be transferred to the SISs as soon as the bank accounts are opened. By appraisal, the mission would expect a full time state project director to be in place and key

staff (disbursement, procurement, civil works, and training officers) to be appointed at the state level. District level management structures have not yet been formally constituted as DPEP implementation units. To ensure a rapid start-up of implementation, a core group comprising a full time project coordinator and qualified accounts and procurement officer will have to be identified and employed before February 1996. By effectiveness (expected around August 1996) the SPOs and DPOs should be fully staffed and key implementation staff trained. An important challenge that all SPOs will face is ensuring the coherence of the different DPEP components and the coordination of the inputs from various institutions and agencies. Of particular importance is the early training of staff in accounting and procurement issues and in micro planning techniques. State plans should include a management development plan that identifies staff development needs and capacity building strategies.

The mission found a mixed situation concerning the Village Education Committees (VEC). In Orissa they have been constituted, whereas in Himachal Pradesh and Gujarat, this has not yet taken place. The mission recommends that early implementation priority be given to the constitution and/or activation of VECs.

Progress of Project Preparation to Date

The mission reviewed three State and 12 District DPEP Plans. These documents are a valuable basis for the work to be carried-out in the forthcoming months. The mission commends all the central, state, and district teams that have been involved in their preparation for the impressive volume of work accomplished in about eight weeks. However, the mission concurs with the DPEP preappraisal mission that present drafts still require substantial work before the appraisal mission. In the following section the status of preparation documents is reviewed in more detail.

State and District plans

Four general observations can be made with regard to district and state plans:

- Issues need to be described more specifically. Revised drafts need to provide a more thorough analysis of the issues. In this context, it seems important that the issue be, if possible, quantified not only at the aggregate district level but also broken down by sub-region, and/or school grade, and/or type of population. Some issues that may be important in certain settings are not discussed in the first draft. Examples include the projected need for teachers in the district 10 to 15 years hence, or teacher staffing patterns, teacher vacancies, the role of supervisors, late entry to elementary school, or non-homogeneous age-specific students in a particular setting. The mission considers important that the school mapping (micro-planning) exercises in each district are undertaken in order for the participating Districts to better assess their educational needs.
- Proposals need to be described in more operational terms. The revised plans need to clearly describe how the proposals would translate into strategies and concrete actions with precise physical targets at least for the first year. The technical description of these actions should typically comprise: **how** they are going to be carried out; **by whom**; **where**; **when**; **who** is going to design them; **how long** will the designing and trialing process take; and **how** are they going to be implemented, monitored, and sustained during the DPEP implementation cycle. Actions should be sequenced in a timetable. The updated plans should define the

requirements of personnel skills, and the physical and financial resources needed for their implementation. To focus implementation, the rather large list of objectives in the current versions need to be prioritized and reduced. A key element of such a strategic planning exercise is to pair issues with proposals in the updated versions. Finally, all of the actions have to be translated into a costing frame which reflects clearly the recurrent and investment expenditures needed during the DPEP implementation cycle.

- **The revised plans should be cost-effective.** In keeping with the DPEP guidelines a cost-effective rationale should underline the entire redrafting exercise. For example, proposals that all the schools should have at least five teachers for five classes regardless of school enrollment, or that a classroom should operate with two teachers, regardless of the class size, or that any new school should have at least 3 classrooms, should be analyzed in the context of their cost-effectiveness, and the exploration of other cost-effective pedagogical alternatives (like Escuela Nueva in Colombia for multi-grade teaching).
- **The revised plans should specify convergent strategies.** The revised drafts should propose strategies convergent with other programs in the Districts such as: the Kalyan Village (an innovative approach for sustainable development); Joyful Learning; Early Childhood Education (ECE); Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS); Total Literacy Campaign (TLC). For example, it would be desirable to illustrate in the revised DPEP Plan draft how innovative in-service teacher training schemes currently under implementation, such as Joyful Learning, could enhance student-teacher interaction, student creativity and spontaneity, and could be used as effective means to enhance the learning process of the existing elementary school syllabus.
- **Improved learning strategies are important.** The mission noticed that in many district plans, civil works and staffing requirements prevail as the main strategies. The mission considers it important that the DPEP Bureau, in its facilitation and technical support role, ensures throughout the revised DPEP planning process that improved learning strategies are also included in the updated drafts. Finally, it would be desirable that before District Plans are submitted to the State, a peer review exercise by interested stakeholders be carried out.

Distance Education for Teacher Training

In choosing to select IGNOU as the lead organization, in collaboration with NCERT, to prepare and execute this project component the GOI has selected very capable and experienced distance education organizations. The draft proposal contains plans for many of the activities recommended as a result of the Identification Mission in May, 1995. Some preparation activities have already been carried out. For example, a group of key persons from the States active in DPEP were assembled in Delhi (18-20 November) to begin the process of clarifying DPEP distance education needs. Also in keeping with earlier discussions, the distance education component is proposed to begin modestly in two or three states that have already made a good beginning in DPEP I. The proposal shows that from the onset this component is clearly linked to the philosophy and goals of the DPEP and is planned to be decentralized in approach so as to function as a service to the States and the Districts taking part in DPEP.

Thus, although the proposal is still in a very early stage, it sets out to create a project that will use distance education to serve the needs of the rural school teachers rather than "laying on" a prescribed course for teachers decided in Delhi. Most activities suggested in the proposal can be connected to the issues or problems which they are intended to address. For instance, the efforts proposed to ensure that DIETs, and eventually BRCs, are equipped with audio visual equipment, including TV sets, VCRs and small satellite receiving dishes, are supported by the proposition that the only practical venue for actually delivering in-service teacher training are the BRCs. While providing basic audio visual equipment to active teacher training sites probably can be justified by more detailed training plans, the cost-effectiveness of using satellite delivered training programs for teacher training needs to be analyzed very carefully. Moreover, the activities planned in the project do not support the need expressed in the proposal to fund the establishment of four regional satellite up-link facilities. Finally, proposals should be reviewed in the light of available evidence on the cost-effectiveness of specific interventions.

The proposal still deals mainly in generalities which will need to become more specific in the next version. For example, the time schedule presented in the proposal needs to take into better account the work needed to prepare materials for the launch of the pilot phase. The mission feels that the proposal should be better connected with the in-service teacher training strategies, so that the links between the problem in the primary school classroom, the activity planned and the outcome expected for evaluation are constantly strengthened. Using this disciplined approach, the staff carrying out the planning for the distance education component have a good opportunity to promote the systematic instructional development model in the proposal and in all of their future project work.

The mission is aware that activities resulting from the first few months work in establishing the collaborative process with the States and Districts cannot be totally specified at this time. A list of eligible activities should be developed, a model program costed and the processes that will be used to reach that point should be planned systematically and spelled out in greater detail.

Finally in completing the costing portion of the proposal, costs need to clearly connect with activities that can be linked in prioritized fashion to the objective of improved learning for more children in rural primary schools.

Pedagogical Improvement and Teacher Training

DPEP aims at developing primary schools which ensure achievement of minimum levels of learning (MLLs) for all children. To achieve this goal, teachers are required to respond to diversity in the classroom arising from multi-age children with varying socio-cultural background in predominantly multilevel / multigrade teaching contexts. In turn, DPEP faces the challenging task of transforming the existing teacher dominated pedagogy to child centered active learning based pedagogy. Continuous teacher development activities using 'whole school' approach backed by professional on site support is essential

to bring about this transformation. This approach should inform the state component and district plans.

The state component and the district plans do not yet present a coherent approach to teacher development strategies. The listing of training activities is not linked to school improvement and improvement of student learning. For example, the match between MLL based curriculum, textbooks and training is not spelled out. The difference between teacher training programs for focused groups like tribals and children with special needs and general courses is not visible. The plans do not specify the tasks and describe: Who will do them? Where? When? In what sequence? Furthermore, the delivery mechanism and sources of professional support are not presented in sufficient detail. The DPEP Bureau has assisted the DPEP I states to work out these operational details. The mission recommends that TSG and NCERT provide assistance to the new DPEP states to operationalise pedagogy and teacher training plans for appraisal.

The training component in the state plan should include explicit plans for:

- Establishing a core team for pedagogy and training (4 - 5 professionals) in SCERT.
- Making DIETs fully functional by negotiations.
- Setting up BRCs and CRCs with roles, functions and staffing.
- Establishing a training needs assessment process.
- Development of trialed training material.
- Training of the core team, trainers of trainers, master trainers, cluster resource teachers, head teacher and teachers.
- Concurrent and external evaluation.

Textbook/Instructional materials

As part of the preparation process for DPEP I two studies were carried out relating to textbooks and learning materials. The first concentrated on textbook design, production and distribution and the second on the cost of textbook provision. Orissa was the only one of the new three DPEP II states to take part in these studies. The information that they provided for the first study was incomplete and that for the second has yet to be processed. To appraise the cost-effectiveness of proposals to support the development of textbooks and instructional materials, basic information on the design, production, distribution and cost of the textbooks and other instructional materials should be available for each of the three states. The previous questionnaires with some revision could be used to collect the information provided they are completed by December 31, 1995. A suggested format was made available to the DPEP Bureau in October 1995. A summary of the findings should be prepared for review to the national and the IDA appraisal mission. Himachal Pradesh proposed to develop for the first time its own textbooks and printed instructional materials. Gujarat has not proposed any investment in the development of supplementary materials. The mission suggests that the availability of such materials through other schemes be reviewed and if needed the state proposal be amended to include support in this area. Orissa proposes major investments in printing

ment and storage space. The cost-effectiveness of these proposals should be reviewed by a specialist consultant as an input to the appraisal.

Civil works

In general, progress on the development of civil works plans was found to be lagging. In light of this, some reconsideration of achievable goals is thought to be necessary at this stage for both the February appraisal mission, as well as for the overall civil works activities during the first year of the project. The mission is particularly concerned that the civil works program be viewed as an integral part of the educational program and strategy which will require a new partnership arrangement between the educators and engineering staffs. Past practices for construction of classrooms and support facilities should be critically examined and abandoned in favor of new methods if they do not complement good instructional practice or foster innovative, cost effective solutions for the civil works requirements under DPEP.

By appraisal the following should be accomplished: (i) identification of the responsible staff at the state and district levels for the planning and conduct of the civil works program, (ii) formulation of specific strategies and procedures for the design, construction, and supervision efforts, which would include a plan for funds flow as well as a definition of the roles and responsibilities at all levels from the state cell down to the VEC; (iii) involvement of the educational community in the design development activities for classrooms, BRCs, Cluster Resource Centers and specialized facilities such as SIEMTs; (iv) initiation of a micro-planning and school mapping exercise which will largely determine the scope of the construction activities¹ during the entire project period; (v) prioritization of work efforts; and formulation of the specific program of construction for the first year of the project, and (vi) preparation of a budget plan and construction manual for any works to be undertaken during the first year of the project.

With regard to the construction program during the first year of the project, it is the mission's strong recommendation that such activities be largely confined to BRC construction and other resource facilities that will be needed early on to support the teacher training aspects of the project. The first year might also be best used to pilot the construction of a few classrooms using alternative designs and innovative building methods or techniques designed to maximize cost effectiveness while still insuring quality. This time would also be used to develop comprehensive classroom construction manuals based on the lessons of the pilots. The manuals would contain simple drawings, diagrams, photographs and step by step instructions that would be suitable for use by VECs or NGOs as well as construction crews from the Works Departments. The mission recommends that widespread construction of classrooms not commence until construction manuals have been prepared, most likely by the beginning of year two of the project

¹ Consider the INCREMENTAL needs that the project would need to satisfy - DPEP would only fund shortfalls beyond the present school construction programs.

Base Line Studies

Baseline studies are in progress in all the three states and data collection is expected to be completed in Himachal Pradesh and Gujarat by the end of December. There is, however, slippage in Orissa where data collection is yet to start. The mission is concerned about the ability of the states to analyze the data at an acceptable level of quality. To meet the deadlines of the preparation schedule and ensure the validity of the analysis, the DPEP Bureau will need to:

- ensure that NCERT technical support to Orissa is expedited and progress of data collection and analysis is closely monitored;
- provide a common framework for data management and analysis (variable coding plan, SPSS data base and software, guidelines for data scrutiny and cleaning of the data) to all three states

Social Assessment(SA)

The mission reviewed the progress in completing the SA studies. All states have identified research institutes to conduct the study. In Himachal Pradesh, the Tribal Welfare Institute proposes to have data by the end of January. Neither the SA study nor the district plans include the SC population as a distinct disadvantaged group although they constitute a large segment of the inhabitants and distinct strategies for access and enrollment are clearly needed. If not included in the SA, these strategies should be presented in the district plans where appropriate. In Gujarat, the Sardar Patel Institute of Social and Economic Growth expects to have the study completed by appraisal. Orissa has assigned the study to the Navakrushna Chaudhury Institute for Development Studies which to date has initiated only limited action. In order to accomplish the task in the short period of time remaining, it is proposed by the mission that the social assessment concentrate on only two districts per state prior to appraisal and complete the other districts after appraisal (but prior to negotiations).

Generally the district plans presented little evidence that the SAs are taken into account in the design of their strategic plans. In addition, time constraints prevented launching the process of eliciting views of the stakeholders at a desirable scale. In those few districts where discussions took place with VECs or other representative bodies, the outcome was limited to documentation of the feedback. The linking of stated problems, for example adjusting school timings either on a daily or seasonal basis, developing tribal relevant educational material, sensitizing teachers to tribal culture or hiring educated tribals to assist in teaching, with strategic activities, remains to be done. Issues related to gender, SCs, STs, migratory groups and children with special needs such as physical and intellectual disabilities, where included, were limited to monetary or incentive schemes or enrollment and retention targets.

The mission recommends that further training programs for state and district planning teams include modules on the design and implementation of participative processes to ensure that:

- the operationalization social assessments and the linkage with the planning process are understood,
- a method for eliciting views in an open and facilitative manner is adopted.

- the views of all stakeholders: SCs, STs, women, NGOs, the disabled or their representatives, teachers and training faculties are included in the consultative process;
- educational quality as well as physical facilities are discussed;
- feedback from the district teams to the stakeholders is included in the process;
- responsibility for incorporating SAs and consultative meetings into the strategic planning process is defined.

This process of training and consultation would be expected to extend beyond the preparation phase of the project and be continued throughout the implementation period. The appraisal mission will need to be able to review a social assessment and participation report that will contain the following elements:

- a summary of the education and social context in each district;
- a description of education programs targeted at disadvantaged groups that are currently ongoing in each district;
- a description of programs of special emphasis that are being planned in each district to address the needs of different social groups;
- a description of the consultation process that has taken place;
- a plan for further consultation with beneficiaries and ways to include their feedback in the AWPB process.

Finance Studies

Progress has been less than expected and significant work remains to be done. In Gujarat the study has not yet begun. In Himachal Pradesh a good start has been made and there is an awareness of the remaining gaps. In Orissa work has only just begun. Copies of the Uttar Pradesh study (perhaps also the Andhra Pradesh study) should be made available to the state teams. All three states need reminding that (i) expenditures on education made by departments other than Education (e.g. Tribal Welfare, Social Welfare, Women and Child Department) should be included; and that (ii) a commentary on the data is required. Moreover, several financial issues that have not yet been covered will require attention during the revision of the plans.

- The state government and district project proposals need to provide more details of past and on-going programs in primary education in both physical and financial terms. This is required for the planning teams to help clarify all the existing and potential sources of assistance and to identify the additional requirements to be requested under DPEP. It is also needed for future monitoring of the project and to assure the Bureau and IDA that the principle of additionality will be adhered to. District sub projects should include data from 1990/91 on teachers - sanctioned, in-post, annual additions by source of funding (OB, state government), schools and classrooms - numbers and additions by source of funding, other inputs - particularly from the wide variety of centrally sponsored schemes e.g. for learning materials, and DIETs. Planned increases should be provided for each component to the end of the Eighth plan and where possible beyond. The state proposal should include similar data for the state as a

whole. (Planned increases in teachers and classrooms beyond the end of the Eighth Plan may be available for the state from their submission to the 10th Finance Commission). For the districts, the above information should be included in the project proposals. For the state, it may be useful to incorporate the information in the "Finance Study" as well as in the project proposal.

- Some districts (e.g. Banaskantha, Gujarat and Kalahandi, Orissa) have provided good estimations in their proposals of the primary level age group, the net enrollment ratio and the number of school places required to attain UPE. It is recommended that a similar exercise be carried out by each of the three states (taking as alternative objectives, UPE in 2000 and 2005), the results costed for both the revenue and capital budgets and compared to expenditures in 1994/95. Again, this analysis might be incorporated in the Finance Study as well as in the state project proposal.
- The appraisal team will need to verify that the appropriate committee of each state government is aware of and has accepted the financial implications of the project - the 15 percent contribution to the Society, the commitment to maintain expenditures on primary education at least at the 95/96 level during each of the years of the project implementation in each of the project districts and for the state as a whole, and the total recurrent cost burden at the end of the project.

There are very large numbers of unfilled vacancies for teachers in Gujarat and Orissa, including in several of the proposed project districts. In Gujarat there has been a freeze on sanctioned posts. All districts are proposing additional teachers for the project. The Mission requests that clarification be given to the appraisal team regarding state plans to fill the vacancies and the criteria to be adopted for the funding of teachers under the project.

Cost Base

While the individual district proposals have provided a generally comprehensive detailing of costs for their respective plans, there has been no consolidation of costs at the state or project level, nor have the costs been codified and computerized in a common database format as had been agreed in previous missions. Prior to the time of appraisal, all costs will need to be re-worked in light of the findings of the pre-appraisal teams, with appropriate purging of costs that are not supported in the revisions of state and district plans. For efficient processing and analysis of the cost base, the IDA mission has requested that all cost data be computerized in the database formats that have already been established under DPEP I. The DPEP Bureau has agreed to provide software and training support at the state sites to complete this data entry process, and to provide IDA with the revised and consolidated cost proposal in FOXBASE format not later than the first week in January.

For the purposes of the appraisal, detailed cost proposals will not be required for the new project districts in the existing DPEP I states. Cost estimates for such districts should be computed based upon average costs for existing DPEP I districts, factored for

new district size, and adjusted for inflation costs since the time of the DPEP I estimates. Annex 6.1 includes a tentative breakdown of project cost based on DPEP I parameters.

Procurement

The Procurement Plans have yet to be developed, and will be required by the time of appraisal. The Procurement Plan is essentially a listing of each procurement contract that is anticipated to be tendered as a part of DPEP II over the period of the project, but for the purposes of appraisal, the focus will be on the detailed plan for each and every contract expected to be tendered during the first year of the project. Descriptive information for each category contract would include the type of goods or services that are intended to be purchased, the procurement office or agency responsible for conducting the procurement, the procurement method selected (i.e. International Competitive Bidding (ICB), National Competitive Bidding (NCB), international or local shopping, direct contracting, etc.), the estimated value of the contract, and the timeline depicting tendering period, bid review, delivery time, etc. If desired, the New Delhi office of the World Bank can arrange training for state level staff in the preparation of a procurement plan as well as on general matters relating to standard bidding documents and World Bank procurement guidelines. Annex 6.2 presents a draft procurement table based on the DPEP I parameters.

In addition to the detailed Procurement Plan described above, the IDA appraisal team will also need descriptive lists for each of the commonly used items to be purchased on the project such as teaching materials, supplementary reading materials and classroom aids such as globes and charts. More detailed technical specifications will also be required for the "high cost" items planned for purchase through competitive bidding processes during the first year of the project - such as audio visual equipment, computers, vehicles and fax machines. For consistency and standardization, it is suggested that all such specifications be coordinated at the State level for use in their own NCB tenders as well as for any purchases initiated at the District levels.

Assessment of Preappraisal

An important first step toward full program lending was the preappraisal of the district and state plans by the TSG on behalf of the DPEP Bureau. The mission wants to commend the national preappraisal teams on the quality of their work. The gaps in the district and state plans were well identified and the recommendations to the states can be endorsed by the mission. Sustaining and further developing this process of collaboration between the TSG and the state planning teams will be a key element in building up the capacity of the states for planning, managing and implementing the DPEP program. Of particular importance will be providing guidance to the state and district teams with respect to (i) deeper analysis of key issues; (ii) methodologies for the analysis of the cost-effectiveness of alternative solutions; (iii) formulating strategies for the implementation of key program components, (iv) procedures for the operationalization of the strategies, and (v) the experience of other DPEP states. Effective facilitation of the planning process will require that adequate time is allocated for the TSG missions for planning support and interaction with all district planning teams.

Documentation for Expansion Districts

DPEP II will fund the expansion of the coverage of the DPEP program into about 35-40 districts in existing states. The DPEP Bureau will appraise proposals by states for the funding of expansion districts on the basis of standard eligibility criteria for DPEP districts. States request for funding in expansion districts should include:

- baseline survey;
- social assessment study and participation report;
- finance study;
- district plan;
- evidence of good implementation progress in DPEP I districts.

Studies and plans should be prepared following existing DPEP guidelines. All proposals are expected to be submitted to the DPEP Bureau for appraisal in the first one or two years of the implementation of DPEP II. IDA will conduct a field review of first one or two districts appraisals in each state conducted by the DPEP Bureau to confirm eligibility for IDA funding. Assuming these reviews provide evidence of the continued effectiveness of the DPEP Bureau appraisal process, IDA will conduct only *ex-post* field reviews of the DPEP appraisal of district proposals for about 20% of the remaining districts. These reviews will be conducted outside the established joint supervision process.

For the finance study some information not specified in the DPEP guidelines will be required to establish the eligibility of states to propose expansion districts. The aide memoire of the identification mission (May 18 1995), provided a brief specification of the financial analysis required of any already participating DPEP state which requests support for additional districts. The first item required an update to 1995/96 of the state's initial Finance Study. The second item focused on a projection of the expenditure required to achieve UPE by the year 2000 or 2005 using the (enhanced) unit cost at the end of the project. The specification suggested use of age-group projections by Mehta. These are however somewhat outdated and the mission now recommends that the studies utilize projections made by the states' Bureau of Statistics or similar organization.

To be eligible for DPEP II support for expansion districts, existing states will have to provide evidence they have met the requirement to provide 15 percent of project expenditures, and that the resources provided through DPEP since 1994 have resulted in a level of resources for primary education beyond those previously provided; both in the project districts and across the states. To help the planning process and to further establish the principle of additionality, the existing states will also need to document additions to teachers, classrooms and materials, by source, for the state and the additional districts in these states proposed for DPEP support.

The DPEP Bureau should be prepared to clarify to the appraisal mission (i) which states, if any, beyond the states covered currently in DPEP I, would be eligible to propose expansion districts; and (ii) mechanisms for targeting especially the most educationally disadvantaged districts.

Action to be completed prior to IDA appraisal of DPEP II

An updated schedule for the completion of the project preparation process is provided in Annex 7. Central elements are: (i) revision of the district and state plans; (ii); completing the special studies; (iii) finalizing the preparation report of national components; and (iv) appraising state proposals.

Revising State and District plans

The revised versions of the state and district plans will need to ensure:

- **Compliance with DPEP guidelines**: in several instances the district and state plans do not meet DPEP guidelines. The preappraisal missions have identified most of these cases. In a few instances deviations from the guidelines may be allowed where alternative solutions are demonstrably more cost-effective or where pilots are being proposed to test the cost-effectiveness of innovative approaches.
- **Responsiveness to feedback of beneficiaries and local implementors**: district plans have been discussed only in a few instances with district project committees, district and block level education staff, teachers and community representatives. The participation and awareness building will need to be intensified and comments incorporated in the revised plans.
- **Convergence with the programs of other agencies**. In many districts NGOs, international agencies and other government agencies are implementing programs that have similar objectives and target groups to those of DPEP. DPEP interventions will need to be designed to complement, reinforce and build on these programs to ensure that available resources are deployed in the most cost-effective way.
- **Explicit discussion of the strategies and implementation processes**. The revised plans should not only specify the objectives to be achieved by the different components of the program but also how they are to be achieved and what mechanisms will be used to steer the implementation process and incorporate lessons from experience as they become available. For interventions of uncertain effectiveness, strategies should include piloting, testing and careful evaluation, prior to large scale application.
- **Specification of a coherent set of implementation priorities for the first year of implementation**. As was done for DPEP I, the first year plan should probably emphasize capacity building and establishing the physical and human infrastructure for project implementation as well the piloting and testing of innovations rather than attempting immediate large scale implementation of classroom construction and teacher training programs.

Completing the special studies

Draft social assessment studies and participation reports should be available for review by the mission at appraisal. Where a state has difficulty meeting this requirement every effort should be made to ensure the process of social assessment, consultation and participation in project design is fully implemented in at least two districts in every state, so the process of social assessment and participation can be appraised. Baseline studies should be available at negotiations. Progress in Orissa will require special monitoring. Finance studies will need to be completed at the time of appraisal. The proposal for the

distance education component should be ready for a detailed appraisal by IDA. Support for national capacity building programs, innovative programs and research proposals beyond that already provided under DPEP I is not anticipated, but the status of these components should be discussed in the DPEP I progress report.

Appraising state proposals

DPEP/TSG teams are expected to appraise the state and district plans of each new DPEP state. The results of their appraisal report should be presented in three national state appraisal reports (NSAR). The IDA appraisal mission will review the appraisal process and these NSARs with the state authorities and identify further information that may be required to complete the appraisal process. The national appraisal process should assess the justification, technical feasibility, cost-effectiveness, economic sustainability, social and institutional viability of the proposed investment. The NSAR should provide a summary description of the proposed investment against the background of the social, economic and institutional environment of each state, present cost estimates and implementation strategies. The main text should not exceed 30 pages. Where necessary explanatory detail can be provided in annexes. These will typically include tables on key education indicators, a detailed descriptions of project components, (following the structure of the IDA DPEP I SAR, cost (excluding price and physical contingencies) and procurement data, a detailed implementation schedule for the first year and a broad implementation plan for the remainder of the implementation period. A suggested format for the NSAR is proposed in annex 5.

Subject to confirmation by the management of the Bank's South Asia Department, the IDA appraisal mission is proposed for February 19 to March 8, 1996. The mission will visit each state capital for about 2 days. The mission will review state plans and selected district plans and discuss the NSAR with state authorities, district education staff and other stakeholders. No visits to project districts are anticipated. The precise proposed appraisal dates, the expectations for institutional strengthening, implementation progress of DPEP I and the required documentation for DPEP II will be confirmed in January to DOE by IDA, following a review of the findings of the preparation review mission.

Conclusion.

Much has been achieved in a short time, but much remains to be done. Given the commitment of the states to the objective of DPEP the mission is, however, confident that the deadlines for processing the project can be met. The first priority is to further develop the institutions responsible for project management and implementation at the national, state and district level. The second priority is to strengthen the analytical focus of the state and district proposals, review the cost-effectiveness of the proposed investment in the context of the social and economic situation of the states and the districts. Given the volume of work already accomplished and the demonstrated capacity of the TSG to provide the necessary planning assistance to the states and appraise state and district plans effectively, the mission will recommend to bank management to proceed with appraisal as scheduled.

State Reprt -Gujarat

Members of the mission visited Gujarat between November 28 and December 2. Discussions were initially held in Ahmedabad attended by the Secretary for Education, state officers involved in the preparation of DPEP and representatives from the proposed project districts of Dang, Panchmahal and Banaskantha. Visits were subsequently made to the latter two districts where further meetings were held with district planning teams and field visits were made to schools, anganwadis and DIETs. A final meeting was held in Ahmedabad with state and district officials and representatives of various resource institutions. The mission wishes to record its appreciation of the representatives of the Government of Gujarat for their warm welcome and for the efforts made to allow its members to gain greater understanding of the issues being considered in the preparation of DPEP. Mission members were helped considerably by the pre-appraisal report provided by the DEP Bureau. The following paragraphs summarize the key impressions gained by the mission members.

State.

Experience indicates that a solid management structure is essential. A State Implementation Society has been established and a bank account opened. A full time state project director has been identified and will be in position by January. To assist the director, full time deputy director has already been appointed. The committees and management team (to be staffed on deputation) have been proposed. The project office has been located (in Gandhinagar). It requires some renovation. Over the next two months the state will need to take steps to identify and place more staff in the project office.

The state government is responsible for the studies. The multi-purpose baseline survey is being organized by the GCERT and is currently being administered. A chance field visit allowed mission members to assess the quality of the survey work, which was high. The survey will be completed by mid December. It is important that an analysis plan including coding instructions and the software be drawn up immediately and communicated to the state. The social assessment study has not yet begun. A new resource institution has now been briefed and contracted. The finance study is yet to begin. Both studies need to be given priority.

Village education committees have not yet been constituted in the state. The preparation of a resolution to establish these is in process. Care needs to be taken to ensure that the composition of the committees follows GOI guidelines, they should in particular include females and parents of girls.

The project components in the state proposal will require more attention. At present the only component is a strengthening of GCERT. A number of the items of this component are either eligible for funding under the centrally sponsored scheme or are difficult to justify on the basis of directly increasing the quality of primary education. The state government may wish to consider strengthening other activities - such as materials

production - which will enable project districts (and others) to more effectively reach their objectives.

While most civil works will be undertaken in the districts, some actions and decisions are required at the state level - for instance, will there be standard designs, and who will prepare the construction manual, the criteria for site selection, the guidelines for school mapping and a set of unit costs?. Designs should be based on an initial consideration of the educational function of buildings which will require consultations between education and engineering officers.

Districts

District plans show strengths and weaknesses. They are stronger on describing the situation, problems and issues than on explaining in detail how the proposed interventions will be carried out and how exactly they will impact on primary school retention and quality. A large number of sub projects has been proposed but further effort is necessary to define the specific problems of specific groups and to then prepare specific interventions. There will be a need to prioritize these. The plans have been prepared in a short period of time and without the advantage of a social assessment study. Consultation has largely focused on the various layers of education department officials and to some extent, elected council members. Increased participation over the next two months will need to focus more on departments other than education - e.g. Tribal and Social Welfare - and on parents, particularly of socially disadvantaged children. In each district, the education of tribal children and of migratory parents is identified as a major problem. Discussion with these communities would help to fill the gaps in specific interventions which currently exists.

Once specific strategies have been more clearly refined, there will be a need to consider the details, timing and sequencing of activities and who will carry them out and where. By the end of January a detailed work program for the first year of the project will be needed for each activity. While a basis has been established for project costing, more is required and the differences in unit costs which exist at present between districts will have to be removed or justified. There is still a large amount of work to be done in preparation for civil works and for in-service teacher training proposals. The various proposals for increasing teaching-learning materials in schools require rationalizing.

Funds for several components across the districts are available outside of DPEP. A systematic consideration of all the sources of funding for education in the district - including from outside the Education Department - will help strengthen priority setting and identify those inputs and activities which require DPEP funds.

State Report - Himachal Pradesh

A pre-appraisal review mission consisting of Philip Cohen, Roger Bonner and Sudesh Mukhopadhyay went to Himachal Pradesh between November 28 and December 2. The team visited Shimla, Solan (SCERT), Kullu (Kullu District) and Nahan (Sirmour District). The mission was accompanied by Mr. Tarun Kapoor who is Director of Primary Education, State Project Director, Joint Secretary Technical Education and Director Adult Education. He gave team members invaluable help throughout. Mission members would like to thank him, the District Commissioners of Kullu and Sirmour districts, the Director of the SCERT at Solan, the Principal of the DIET at Nahan, members of the state and district planning teams and all those headteachers, teachers and education department staff who made the mission so profitable.

Himachal Pradesh is a relatively small state both in area and population with a predominantly rural population. It differs radically from most other parts of India in both terrain and climate. For instance, two of the project districts are inaccessible except by helicopter for about eight months each year. Although the introductions to state and district proposals make these points plain, the mission felt that insufficient emphasis was put on them as the rationale behind specific project components. Where radical changes are envisaged it would be wiser to include them under the heading of 'innovation' and to trial them on a relatively small scale.

Scheduled Castes account for 1/4 of the population and Scheduled Tribes for 1/25. In spite of comparatively high literacy rates, gaps between male and female literacy are significant and so is the Male/Female ratio. High enrollment at primary stage is accompanied by dropout and retention rates about which the state is concerned. It is too early to comment on primary education quality.

The mission was impressed with the effort that had clearly been put in to the development and revision of state and district plans. Although there had been a certain amount of consultation at block level and below, the mission felt that the district proposals were perhaps too 'top down' in their approach. This is no doubt a reflection of the speed with which they have had to be prepared. Further consultation and the baseline studies when they are complete will make it easier to address village and block level needs more precisely. However the limited data already available needs to be analyzed more critically to give directions to the strategies and interventions for pedagogical improvement and other components.

It is essential that full time project posts should be filled without delay. This will facilitate the readiness of both state and districts for appraisal.

The civil works components of the state and district plans give outline targets. These have a degree of flexibility to make allowance for further consultation and a

summary of specific requirements at local level. Before appraisal the civil works cell responsibility at state and district levels needs to be enhanced with a clear definition of roles and responsibilities. Detailed plans, specifications and costings for all types of buildings should be prepared by educationalists, engineers and architects. Also, a comprehensive construction manual has to be prepared that will help VECs and the engineers in their supervision and monitoring duties. A detailed action plan should be prepared to cover one-off repairs and regular building maintenance.

Substantial human resources will be required to implement the various activities under DPEP. The state and district project teams will need to identify the skills required for implementation and to match them with the human resources available within the state. For the missing resources it may be necessary to share the experiences and practices in DPEP I states and to develop strategies for staff development in the first year of the project. The state should also look for sources of help and advice from individuals and institutions in neighboring states

The proposals contain several components which relate to improved pedagogy. These include, for example, teacher training, the development of new materials, the design and construction of new classrooms and the building and staffing of Block Resource Centers. It is not clear from the proposals that the linkages between these components have been given enough thought. Priorities need to be set and a timetable of activities established for the first year of the project.

The mission had access to the report of the pre appraisal mission of the GOI and found it a very helpful document. It had only just been made available to the state authorities but project teams were already revising their proposals in the light of discussions held with the visiting team.

In the view of the mission the state will be ready for appraisal early in 1996 if it uses the findings of the baseline studies to sharpen some of the strategies indicated in the plans. It will also be essential to develop an Annual Work Plan and Budget for the first year of the project.

State Report - Orissa

Introduction.

A mission comprised of Adriaan Verspoor (educational advisor), Juan Prawda (senior education specialist), Vijay Rewal and Donna Bjerregaard (consultants) visited the State of Orissa from November 28 to the 30th, 1995. Jyotsna Jha from the Technical Support Group of the DPEP Bureau joined the mission. The objective of the mission was to: (i) appraise the appraisal carried out in all the Districts of Orissa by the DPEP Technical Support Group (TSG) from the 10th to the 19th of November 1995; and (ii) on the basis of its findings, identify work that needs to be completed and recommend actions that need to be taken by the State and the participating Districts prior to the Bank's appraisal.

The mission team met and held discussions with the State Education Secretary, State Project Director cum Director (Elementary Education), Director and officials of SCERT, the District Magistrates of Bolangir and Dhenkanal, the DPEP Planning Committees of Bolangir and Dhenkanal, and several Village Education Committees (VEC) in the above-mentioned Districts. The mission visited: (i) primary schools; (ii) Early Education Centers (EEC); (iii) joyful learning experiences; (iv) joyful learning training activities for master trainers; (v) other integrated village community development programs (such as the Kalyans in Bolangir); and the DITs. The District Magistrate of Bolangir joined the mission during the field visits. The mission team wishes to thank State and District authorities for the assistance and hospitality without which this pre-appraisal task would not have been feasible.

State and District Management Structures.

The legal process to constitute the State Implementation Society is progressing well, and it is expected that in the following five weeks it will be registered and an account will be opened in a State bank. The Director of Elementary Education has been identified as the DPEP project Director, and will be employed on a full-time basis by the time of the appraisal mission scheduled for next February. He will be supported by a core group comprised of qualified Disbursement, Procurement, Civil Works, and Teacher Training officers. They are also expected to be in place by February 1996. Physical space for the SIS has been also identified.

The district level management structures in the state have not yet been formally constituted as implementation units of the soon to be registered SIS. The District School Insector will be the district project director. He will be assisted by a small core of full-time staff appointed on deputation. Other district staff involved in primary education will support and contribute to project implementation. At the district level a core group, comprised of a full time project coordinator and a qualified disbursement officer would be identified and employed by February 1996. Several districts have already identified the physical facilities for the district offices

Funds for project preparation have been fully used and GOO will need to make available additional funds to maintain the preparation momentum until the SIS has been established and a bank account opened.

Districts and State Plans.

The mission reviewed all the five DPEP district plans of Orissa and visited two districts (Bolangir and Dhenkanal). These documents will provide a valuable basis for the work to be carried-out in the coming months. Participation in the development of district and state plans has however been limited largely to education officials. It is important that as part of the redrafting of the plan other government agencies and NGOs involved in education are consulted as well as special interest groups (including parents and teachers). Village Education Committees (VEC) have been constituted and are starting to get involved in DPEP planning process, although for the time being only in a limited way. Clearly, these drafts still require further work before the appraisal mission scheduled for next February.

Studies.

Preparation of the base line studies, social assessment and participation reports, as well as the financial studies is still in the early stages. Data is being gathered for the base line study following the DPEP guidelines, and a first draft of the study will be made available in beginning of February, 1996. Social assessment has been slow to take off, and the mission agreed that social assessment should be carried out in only two districts before the appraisal mission next February, and the remaining ones be done afterwards but prior to negotiations. Data collection for the financial studies has only just begun but is expected to be completed by the end of December, 1995.

Pedagogical improvement

The SCERT had just finished a first draft of the proposed in-service teacher training to be carried out under DPEP in the State. The mission recommends that a national reputable in-service teacher training institution reviews, through the DPEP Bureau, this proposal before it is implemented statewide. The DIETs have not yet been adequately informed of DPEP and are ill-prepared to carry out the in-service teacher training based on the new pedagogy. Most of the DIETs are staffed with secondary education teachers that are not very familiar with elementary education issues, they are understaffed and in precarious physical conditions. None of the districts in the State has, so far, invested time to think through the establishment and functioning of their Block and Cluster Resource Centers. To change current teacher and school practices and induce improved learning, training programs will need to be designed in some detail, including a strategy for the use of DIETs, BRCs and CRCs. GOO has expressed interest in launching a distance education program to support in-service teacher training drawing on the considerable experience of the State Institute of Science and Technology. Such a program should be integrated in the national distance education component.

Civil Works

The civil works program in the State is in the initial conceptualization stage. They have approximate cost estimates and are in the process of sketching their construction plans. The State is also in the process of identifying and selecting the design team of architects, the construction agency, as well as the technical supervision agency. This process should be accelerated. To make rapid progress priorities for civil works in the first year need to be identified so that design staff and education specialists can jointly determine the specifications of the buildings to be constructed in the first year.

Textbook/instructional materials studies

As part of the preparation process for DPEP I two studies were carried out relating to textbooks and learning materials. The first concentrated on textbook design, production and distribution and the second on the cost of textbook provision. Orissa was the only one of the three DPEP II states to take part in these studies. The information that they provided for the first was incomplete and that for the second has yet to be processed. The previous questionnaires will need to be revised before NCERT can send these to the states with a request that they should be completed by December 31, 1995. A summary of the findings should be prepared in advance of appraisal.

Himachal Pradesh

Until now Himachal has used NCERT's textbooks almost unchanged. Printing and distribution are under the control of the Board of Secondary Education at Dharamsala. Within DPEP it is planned that the state should develop its own materials and this will take place at state level and below. The program includes not only new state specific core textbooks, but also supplementary materials, teachers handbooks and audio and video cassettes. The SCERT is to play a major role in the preparation and trailing of these but at present it does not have staff with the necessary skills.

Himachal Pradesh is successful in providing children with low cost textbooks that are normally available to all at the start of the school year. Paper, printing and binding are, however, poor and books have a severely reduced life span. For higher standards of primary schooling consideration should be given to producing books to better standards and experimenting with book re-use.

State authorities need specialist advice on all aspects of publishing. They need also to consider the way in which the tasks of developing and producing new materials will be shared between the SCERT and the BSE. It is recommended that the DPEP should provide both institutions with support in the form of appropriate equipment, additional staff and training.

Orissa

The state level proposal includes a component for the strengthening of the Institute of Textbook Production and Marketing at Bhubaneswar. It aims to streamline the production of textbooks and the distribution system by the procurement of new machines to increase production capacity and the appointment of skilled personnel. A total of 147 staff would be employed at a total cost of Rupees 129.25 lakhs throughout the project period. Two offset machine would be purchased at a total cost of Rupees 160 lakhs.

Orissa's state level plan also envisages the development and production of revised primers, the preparation of 125 titles of children's literature and the preparation of a handbook for administrators at a total cost of Rupees 1290.20 lakhs throughout the

project period. There is also mention in the text of the need for teachers' handbooks, but the cost has not been included in the overall budget. The state project team should consider whether existing staff are capable of taking on this additional workload and whether additional training and equipment might be needed.

Before expenditure as proposed could be justified it would be essential to employ skilled consultants to review the plant's operating costs, its production methods and the quality of its output. Experience elsewhere in India tends to show that state owned plants are rarely as cost efficient as private sector plants. However, the consultants may be able to prove that Orissa's plant is an exception. Should it eventually not prove possible to provide support for the plant through DPEP, the state would have appropriate information to enable it decide whether to fund the proposed improvements itself.

Gujarat

The state level proposal for Gujarat does not include any funding for the development of new or revised materials. There is no provision either for any new personnel or for skills upgrading of existing personnel. The GOG may wish to consider however to include the development of instructional materials, complementing the textbooks in the state plan.

Proposed Format For State Appraisal Report

I. State Background and Issues.

Contains a brief and general description of the educational (formal and non-formal) profile of the state's participating Districts (no more than one page). It analyzes in some detail the relevant educational issues of the participating states.

II. Project Concept and Composition.

Contains the general objectives of the proposed project, demonstrating congruence of state and district project objectives with the national DPEP objectives. Describes in operational terms all the proposed project components and pairs them with the relevant issues. It contains the components' physical targets. This chapter describes in great detail the first year of project operation in the state, and sketches the operation for future years.

III. Project Costs and Procurement .

Contains and discusses three tables. The first one shows the project cost by component; the second one presents the costs by agreed category of expenditure (grouped into investment and recurrent costs); and the third one presents the procurement plans showing the procurement arrangements for each agreed category of expenditure.

IV. Project Implementation and Monitoring.

Describes the project management and implementation responsibility for each component. It describes the supervision plans, presents key performance indicators and indicates how the implementation process for each component is will be monitored.

Annexes

Normally include detailed cost tables, implementation schedules, summary findings of baseline studies, social assessment and participation studies and financial studies.

INDIA: District Primary Education Program II

Expenditure Accounts by Project Components (Costs in US\$ Million)

Expenditure Accounts	Improve Quality & Access in Primary Education							
	Build State Institutional Capacity	Build District Institutional Capacity	Improve Retention	Increase Access	Improve Learning Achievements	Total	Physical Contingencies	
							%	Amount
Investment Costs								
Civil Works	1.1	0.1	21.3	79.6	14.0	116.1	10%	11.6
Furniture	0.1	0.4	5.8	6.6	2.6	15.5	10%	1.6
Equipment	1.0	2.7	1.1	4.4	6.5	15.7	10%	1.6
Vehicles	0.1	0.9	-	-	1.4	2.4	10%	0.2
Books & Libraries	0.6	0.1	10.6	1.1	12.5	24.9	10%	2.5
Local Consultants	1.3	9.0	-	0.0	0.2	10.6	5%	0.5
Sports Equipment & Amenities	-	-	2.0	0.9	-	2.9	10%	0.3
Training Costs (Incl TA/DA)	1.0	3.0	19.5	0.5	19.8	43.7	10%	4.4
Workshops & Seminars	0.7	0.0	2.6	-	1.6	4.9	10%	0.5
Awareness Campaign Expenses	0.0	-	6.1	-	-	6.1	5%	0.3
Total Investment Costs	5.9	16.2	68.9	93.2	58.6	242.8	10%	23.4
Recurrent Costs								
Salaries of Additional Staff	2.7	8.4	7.1	78.1	30.3	126.7	5%	6.3
Consumables (office expenses, etc)	1.5	1.0	2.0	0.7	1.0	6.2	10%	0.6
Teaching Materials	1.0	0.1	6.1	1.7	34.5	43.4	10%	4.3
Contingency at District/BRC/School	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.6	9.0	11.1	10%	1.1
Vehicle Operation and Maint	0.1	0.3	-	-	-	0.3	5%	0.0
Equipment Operation and Maint	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	-	0.4	5%	0.0
Civil Works Maint	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	1.3	5%	0.1
Honorarium	0.5	-	2.1	10.1	0.7	13.5	5%	0.7
Total Recurrent Costs	6.0	10.8	18.9	91.4	75.8	202.8	7%	13.2
Total BASELINE COSTS	11.9	27.0	87.8	184.5	134.4	445.7	8%	36.6
Physical Contingencies	1.0	1.8	8.0	14.0	11.9	36.6	0%	-
Price Contingencies	0.9	1.9	6.4	13.3	9.7	32.2	8%	2.4
Total PROJECT COSTS	13.7	30.7	102.2	211.9	156.0	514.5	8%	39.1
Taxes	0.4	0.5	3.9	7.8	6.4	19.1	9%	1.7
Foreign Exchange	0.6	1.2	3.4	10.0	5.1	20.3	9%	1.8

INDIA: District Primary Education Program II**Project Components by Financiers
(Total Costs in US\$ Million)**

	GOI		IDA		TOTAL		For. Exch.	Local (Excl. Taxes)	Duties & Taxes
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%			
Build State Institutional Capacity	2.4	17%	11.3	83%	13.7	3%	0.6	12.7	0.4
Improve Quality & Access in Primary Education									
Build District Institutional Capacity	4.1	13%	26.6	87%	30.7	6%	1.2	29.0	0.5
Improve Retention	11.7	11%	90.5	89%	102.2	20%	3.4	95.0	3.9
Increase Access	41.4	20%	170.5	80%	211.9	41%	10.0	194.1	7.8
Improve Learning Achievements	30.3	19%	125.7	81%	156.0	30%	5.1	144.5	6.4
Total Disbursement	89.9	18%	424.6	83%	514.5	100%	20.3	475.1	19.1

INDIA: District Primary Education Program

Procurement Arrangments (Total Costs in US\$ Million)

	Procurement Method							Total	
	International	Local		Local Shopping	Consulting Services	Force Account	Direct Contracting		Community Construction Program
	Competitive Bidding	Competitive Bidding							
CIVIL WORKS									
Civil Works	-	69.5 (62.4)				29.2 (26.2)		39.0 (35.0)	137.8 (123.7)
GOODS									
Furniture	-	5.5 (4.9)	12.8 (11.5)						18.2 (16.4)
Equipment	-	5.5 (5.0)	12.9 (11.6)						18.5 (16.6)
Vehicles	2.1 (1.9)	-	0.6 (0.5)						2.7 (2.4)
Books	-	8.8 (7.9)	20.5 (18.4)						29.3 (26.3)
Consumables & Teaching Materials	-	17.0 (11.9)	57.7 (40.5)						74.6 (52.4)
TRAINING AND CONSULTANTS									
Project Prep & Implementation Support	-	-	-						-
Institutional Development (includes local Consultants, awareness campaign, local training, workshops and fellowships)	-	-	-		18.7 (18.7)		57.1 (57.1)		75.7 (75.7)
MISCELLANEOUS									
Salaries of Additional Staff	-	-	-				141.8 (99.8)		141.8 (99.8)
Honorarium	-	-	-				15.1 (10.6)		15.1 (10.6)
Vehicle Operation & Maint	-	-	-				0.3 (0.2)		0.3 (0.2)
Equipment Operation & Maint	-	-	-				0.5 (0.3)		0.5 (0.3)
Total	2.1 (1.9)	106.3 (92.1)	104.4 (82.5)		18.7 (18.7)	29.2 (26.2)	214.7 (168.1)	39.0 (35.0)	514.5 (424.6)

Note: Figures in parenthesis are the respective amounts financed by IDA

INDIA: District Primary Education Project II
FORECAST OF EXPENDITURES AND DISBURSEMENTS

IDA Fiscal Year	Expenditures		Disbursements /b		Cumulative as % of Total	Semester From Appraisal Date
	Semester	Cumulative	Semester	Cumulative /c		
----- SUS Million -----						
FY97						
1st (Jul 96 - Dec 96) /a	20.3	20.3	10.0	10.0	2%	1
2nd (Jan 97 - Jun 97)	20.3	40.5	18.6	28.6	7%	2
FY98						
1st (Jul 97 - Dec 97)	31.1	71.6	17.3	45.9	11%	3
2nd (Jan 98 - Jun 98)	31.1	102.7	24.8	70.8	17%	4
FY99						
1st (Jul 98 - Dec 98)	46.6	149.3	24.8	95.6	23%	5
2nd (Jan 99 - Jun 99)	46.6	195.9	38.4	134.0	32%	6
FY2000						
1st (Jul 99 - Dec 99)	66.4	262.3	38.4	172.3	41%	7
2nd (Jan 2000 - Jun 2000)	66.4	328.6	55.9	228.2	54%	8
FY2001						
1st (Jul 2000 - Dec 2000)	57.7	386.3	55.9	284.1	67%	9
2nd (Jan 2001 - Jun 2001)	57.7	444.0	44.3	328.5	77%	10
FY2001						
1st (Jul 2000 - Dec 2000)	35.3	479.2	45.6	374.0	88%	9
2nd (Jan 2001 - Jun 2001)	35.3	514.5	25.3	399.3	94%	10
FY2002						
1st (Jul 2001 - Dec 2001)		514.5	25.3	424.6	100%	11

Closing Date: December 30, 2002

a/: Including Special Account and Retroactive Financing

b/: Figures may not appear to add due to rounding

c/: Disbursement projections take into account the Regional Profiles for similar type projects

APPRAISAL

February 19 - March 8, 1996

Activities to be completed as specified in May 15 aide-memoire

Participation and social assessment reports, including
report on participation, completed and available for at least two districts in each state.

State and district plans completed and available

Plans for national component, including management plan for NMS available

Finance studies completed and discussed with states by DPEP Bureau

Plan for distance education component available

Civil works plans, construction manuals and designs
completed and available for works to be implemented in the first year

Procurement plans completed and available

Cost data base completed and available

Additional activities expected to be completed as discussed with post-identification review mission:

DPEP Bureau appraisal report of state and district plans available

Draft report on instructional materials/textbooks available

Summary Progress report on DPEP I implementation available

NEGOTIATIONS

April 16-18, 1996

Baseline assessment studies completed and reports available

BOARD PRESENTATION

May 26, 1996

NIEPA DC



D10104

LIBRARY & DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration,
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg,
New Delhi-110016
DOC. No. D-10104
Date 05-05-99