

**Assessment of USAID/Nigeria's Implementation
Partners' Current Administrative System**

USAID/Nigeria

DRAFT

**Margaret Rowan
Audrey Sullivan
Veronica Tabansi**

MEDS Project

February 2002

CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Background	7
III.	Purpose And Objectives of the Assessment	7
IV.	Overview of the Current USAID PHN Portfolio	9
V.	Collaboration and Integration	14
VI.	PHN Implementing Partners	16
	A. PHN Funding Trends	16
	B. Central Offices	17
	C. JSMB	17
	D. Field Offices	22
VII.	Discussion Regarding Moving Central Offices	33
VIII.	Conclusions and Recommendations	41
IX.	Persons Contacted	43

TABLES

1.	Nigeria IP Program Matrix	12
2.	Select Data for IPs Operating in USAID/PHN Focal States	13
3.	PHN Focal States	14
4.	Office Locations for IPs in Nigeria	22
5.	Proposed Abuja Liaison Offices	28
6.	Rental Cost Comparisons of IPs	32
7.	Comparison of Estimated Costs of Moving	38
8.	Donor Funding	39

APPENDICES

A.	Implementing Partner Profiles
B.	USAID Funding for PHN Sector FY2001 and FY2002
C.	Sub-Agreement Funding for PHN Priority States
D.	USAID Funded Implementing Partners FTE Staffing by Sub-Sector
E.	Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency to Abuja (High and Low Estimates)
F.	Questions for IP Staff
G.	SOW MEDS Project Assessment

ACRONYMS

ADF	African Development Foundation
AIDS	Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
AIDSMARK	AIDS Social Marketing
APS	Annual Program Statement
ARH	Adolescent Reproductive Health
BASICS	Basic Support of Institutionalizing Child Survival
CBO	Capacity Building Organization
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
CEDPA	Center for Development and Population Activities
CPH	Community Partners for Health
CPR	Contraceptive Prevalence Rate
CS	Child Survival
D&G	Democracy and Governance
DFID	Department for International Development
EH	Engender Health
FHI	Family Health International
FMOH	Federal Ministry of Health
FP/RH	Family Planning/Reproductive Health
FTE	Full time equivalent
GDO	General Development Office
GON	Government of Nigeria
HIV	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus
IMPACT	Implementing AIDS Prevention and Control Activities
INTRAH	Innovative Technologies for Health Care Delivery
IP	Implementing Partner
IR	Intermediate Result
JHU/CCP	Johns Hopkins University/Center for Communication Program
JSMB	Joint Services Management Board
JSMBL	Joint Services Management Board Lagos
LGA	Local Government Authority
MEDS	Monitoring, Evaluation and Design Services
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NACA	National Action Committee on AIDS
NDHS	Nigerian Demographic and Health Survey
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NPI	National Program of Immunization
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PHN	Population, Health and Nutrition
PPFN	Planned Parenthood Federation of Nigeria
PSI/SFH	Population Services International/Society for Family Health
TFR	Total Fertility Rate
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Program on AIDS
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United State Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 1980s, USAID had a well-established PHN program in Nigeria working with several Implementing Partners (IPs) in the public and private sectors. USAID downsized its program in the 1990s in response to the military takeover, and suspended all support to the government. NGOs received support on a limited basis. USAID responded to the re-establishment of democracy with dramatic increases in funding: funding increased from \$7 million in 1998 to \$100 million in FY2001. USAID supported health activities have been revitalized and funding for the PHN sector totaled \$66.8 million during the last three years.

During the current USAID transition strategy period (September 1999-December 2003), the PHN program increasingly focuses on public-private partnerships in selected states along with increased interaction and technical assistance to the Federal Ministry of Health in Abuja. Ten IPs are currently supporting the implementation of the USAID PHN program. Seven have their central operations in Lagos and two have established their country headquarters in Abuja. As of February 2002, one IP had not yet established a presence in Nigeria. USAID is currently located in Abuja, having moved from Lagos in 2001.

During the downsizing of the program during the 1990s, four of the implementing agencies were housed in one facility in Lagos at the request of USAID. They continue to partner in an administrative arrangement called the Joint Services Management Board (JSMB). The other five implementing agencies operate independently and are in stand-alone facilities or housed within large office buildings.

The purpose of the assessment is to provide USAID/Nigeria and its Implementing Partners (IPs) with the objective data needed to make decisions concerning the future configuration of USAID program-related offices. The three person Team was tasked with conducting a comprehensive and thorough stocktaking of the current JSMB administrative arrangement, the location of the other IPs' central and field offices, and their relevance to the scope of the programs they support. The Team was also asked to assess the impact of a potential move by any of the IPs to Abuja with regard to cost, effect on staff and impact on the JSMB. Another objective of the assessment was to document the geographic spread of each IP in terms of where they work and with whom they work. The assessment will generate recommendations for the most cost-efficient and program-effective way forward in terms of administrative arrangements for the IPs as USAID prepares for a long-term sustainable development strategy.

The Team conducted interviews and collected data from the nine PHN IPs in Washington, DC, Lagos, Abuja, Kano and Enugu. They spoke with country directors, program and administrative staff of the IPs and USAID program and administrative staff. They assessed the current JSMB structure and its advantages and disadvantages. They reviewed current and proposed field offices and their functionality. They visited the field offices of seven IPs in Enugu and Kano.

Key Findings and Recommendations

The PHN Program

Through the 10 IPs, USAID is supporting activities in Child Survival, HIV/AIDS and Family Planning/Reproductive Health. Some of the IPs work within one sub-sector, while others operate more broadly. BASICS, for example, works exclusively in Child Survival, while JHU works across all three sub-sectors. Nearly every IP gets involved in advocacy, many are engaged in behavior change activities, and four IPs are responding to the needs of OVC. This presents a challenge to USAID as it strives to coordinate a harmonious and coherent approach in the three sub-sectors.

Child Survival activities have been focused in three states (Lagos, Abia and Kano), while FP/RH and HIV/AIDS activities have been geographically dispersed and implemented through a broad range of actors. Under the Transition Strategy, efforts have been made to focus assistance in FP/RH and HIV/AIDS to pre-defined geographic areas. In 2000, FHI, the lead HIV/AIDS IP, undertook a strategic review of its program and identified four states (Lagos, Kano, Anambra and Taraba) for expanded comprehensive programming. The FP/RH sub-sector remains the most dispersed and thinly spread of the sub-sectors, but the recently awarded Vision Project will concentrate its activities in Oyo, Enugu and Bauchi. The determination of focus states for the three PHN sub-sectors is a welcome initiative in concentrating resources and fostering inter-IP collaboration at the state level. However, opportunities are being missed to achieve integration across all three sub-sectors, as overlap is limited to two states (Kano and Lagos for Child Survival and HIV/AIDS).

IP Collaboration

The Team registered many forms of collaboration among IPs. Some work jointly with a common target group such as the Armed Forces and National Police. By virtue of its exclusive mandate for commodity distribution, PSI/SFH collaborates with every FP/RH and HIV/AIDS service delivery IP. JHU services the communications needs of the BASICS program. Many of the IPs participate in policy development and dissemination activities sponsored by Futures. There are also important synergies where IPs have enlisted the participation of previously supported facilities or organizations. For example, CEDPA has entered into sub-agreements with CPHs developed by BASICS.

The monthly-IP meeting with PHN/USAID provides an important and effective forum for collaboration and the sharing of resources and lessons learned.

These represent promising efforts, and more can be done. There is still a lack of coordination at the grantee level and the Team observed at least one case where two IPs were working in the same community in the same sub-sector, but were not collaborating in any way. It is important to note that shared office space does not bring about collaboration, rather it facilitates collaboration where it already exists as a response to common objectives or complementary programming.

Draft

As the FMOH continues to assert its leadership, the development of national level policies, standards and protocols will provide the IPs with a framework within which to harmonize approaches, messages and tools.

Public Sector Collaboration

Under USAID's Transition Strategy, initiatives to promote stronger private-public partnerships have been introduced as USAID renews its relationship with the GON. Both BASICS and FHI are taking the lead in forming concrete public-private partnerships in the implementation of Child Survival and HIV/AIDS programs. The two IPs have entered into sub-agreements with LGAs and State authorities. A similar initiative has been introduced with the Vision Project that will strengthen private-public partnerships at the three levels of government and build alliances for family planning/reproductive health service delivery. Pathfinder and EH have sub-agreements with the Armed Forces and Police Force to improve access to HIV/AIDS and FP/RH services.

JSMB

Information obtained by the Team regarding the structure and operations of the JSMB indicates that the arrangement is cumbersome and difficult to manage and operationalize. When the IPs were smaller in size and scope of operations, the mechanism had a better chance of functioning in a more efficient manner. But since all IPs have expanded their programs, and have in fact outgrown the Lagos building, adjustments need to be made immediately to address the pressing needs for additional office space and adequate transportation. In the long term, it does not appear practical, logical or efficient to have these four IPs partner again in another joint location for the following reasons:

- A lack of communication has constrained problem resolution (e.g., a delay of six months to sign the recent MOU).
- The funding mechanism and function rotation are complicated and difficult to operationalize.
- There appears to be no flexibility on budget issues when unexpected costs need to be incurred -- e.g. internet and communication problems in the Kano office.
- Cost effectiveness is distorted by the location of the Lagos property and high quality telecommunications. The Temple Road facility is located in a key commercial area with high rental cost.
- JSMB resources and management capacity are outstripped by the growing needs of the IP programs.

Since the JSMB Lagos facility is leased until May 2003 and may be extended beyond that time, the JSMB should find ways to address some of the pressing issues confronting them. The Team makes the following suggestions for improvement:

1. The JSMB Lagos should expand the membership of the monthly meeting for resolving issues from one member of each IP to at least two members to ensure representation at each meeting. Any member who attends the monthly meetings should have decision-making authority from his/her organization.

Draft

2. Because of the shortage of vehicles in Lagos and Kano, the Chairman of the JSMB should submit a request to USAID for vehicle procurement based on current inventory and projected needs. A request to USAID for disposal of inoperative vehicles should be included.
3. FHI should consider moving its Lagos field office to a separate facility to free up space in the Temple Road JSMB office.

JSMB/Kano

In Kano, the JSMB group of implementing agencies shares space with the African Development Foundation (ADF). As part of the JSMB Memorandum of Understanding, BASICS is totally responsible for the management of the office. Certain operating costs are shared with ADF as detailed in their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Team learned that ADF will be leaving the facility by December 2002. This will entail a 50% increase in the operating costs of the Kano Field Office, and a further increase can be expected at the time of lease renewal in January 2003.

The Team was told that there is a vehicle shortage and that cars had to be hired to meet the needs of the programs. This becomes very expensive and causes frustration among all of the IPs. Currently there are two telephone lines installed in the Kano office. With only two working lines for four IPs, there is major frustration among all of the staff in Kano. They expressed frustration with the inability to get better communications established.

Based on the information given to the Team by the Kano staff, the Team recommends the following actions:

1. Communicate vehicle needs to JSMB Lagos, so that this can be incorporated into a request to USAID.
2. Work out a mechanism for providing internet access for the Kano office that does not entail using one of the current telephone lines
3. To the extent possible, put concerted pressure on the local telephone provider to install at least two more telephone lines; alternatively, procure cell phones for IPs.
4. Begin financial and operational planning to address the departure of ADF from the Kano office.

If the above recommendations can be effected in a timely manner, the Team concludes that the Kano Office will operate much more effectively, happily and productively.

Placement of Field Offices

After obtaining information regarding the placement of field offices and the functions performed in the various offices, the Team has concluded that the IPs have placed the field offices in the most rational locations based on programmatic needs of the various sub-sectors. There are field offices located in all of the eight PHN focus states for CS, RH/FP and HIV/AIDS. In addition to these eight states, CEDPA has field offices in two other states – Jos and Benue. In both cases, the offices are located in government facilities to minimize operational costs. The Benue office is set up for the Orphans and Vulnerable Children component of the HIV funding CEDPA receives. In Jos, the

Draft

majority of the funding for the program there is provided by the Packard Foundation with USAID sharing the operating costs of the facility.

The IPs have grouped together when it has been practical and logical to do so. There are groupings in Kano (JSMB), Enugu (EH & JHU), Oyo (JHU & EH) and Bauchi (JHU & EH). Enugu State is the only state where USAID is funding two offices that could have potentially been one. There are, however, very good, practical reasons for ending up with two offices. CEDPA and JHU were grouped together in the Enugu office for a good period of time. When EH was awarded the Vision Project, the management of EH approached CEDPA in Enugu to see if it would be feasible to share the office. It was quite apparent that there was not enough space for EH to join JHU and CEDPA there. So EH found a new space that is adequate for their needs and will share this space with JHU, its partner in Vision. In the end EH took the most logical decision to open a new facility.

Discussion Regarding Moving Central Offices

The Team asked all seven of the IPs currently located in Lagos to give their views regarding where the most logical location for central offices should be for implementing program activities. One agency, PSI/SFH has already made the decision to move to Abuja and is in the process of making preparations for the move. They hope to complete the move by August 2002. Pathfinder International and Engender Health said that they are remaining in Lagos. The JSMB group expressed mixed opinions. One agency is interested in moving to Abuja and the other three have mixed feelings regarding any such move. They are worried about the effect on the staff of a move to Abuja. All four agencies said that if they should move to Abuja, they would need to keep a field office in Lagos. By the same token, they also see an important need for establishing liaison offices in Abuja even if they stay in Lagos. The Team learned that the landlord of the JSMB Temple Road facility had been told last year when the latest lease was negotiated that the lease would not be renewed in May 2003 when the lease expires. If this is the case, the four IPs would have to move, either to Abuja or within Lagos.

The Team estimated the incremental costs of moving one agency within Lagos as compared to moving to Abuja. A high cost and a low cost was presented for the Abuja move to reflect the difficulty in providing cost estimates in an uncertain environment. The incremental difference in estimated cost between moving one agency with 17 staff members within Lagos as compared to Abuja ranged between 14.8 million and 30.4 million Naira.

Regardless of whether the JSMB agencies move to Abuja or within Lagos, they would have to commit to at least a two year lease in Lagos or a two to three year lease in Abuja. This commitment would mean that all four agencies would have to sign leases that would commit them until June of 2005 or 2006. This time frame is beyond the transition period of the current USAID strategy that ends in December of 2003. This fact poses a very difficult dilemma regarding any possible move by any of the JSMB four IPs. In addition, the global funding for two of the IPs ends in 2003 and 2004 respectively.

Draft

The Team does not recommend moving any IP central office to Abuja given the many uncertainties in future funding, the outcome of the national elections, and the eventual choice of implementing partner(s) for USAID's post-transition strategy. The Team recommends the following:

1. The JSMB make concerted efforts to extend the lease on the Temple Road facility for one year. This would mean that the lease would extend until May 2004, five months after the USAID Transition strategy ends.
2. Reduce costs associated with IP travel to Abuja. USAID can expect to continue to support frequent travel between Lagos and Abuja. Therefore, USAID should negotiate a good rate at one Abuja hotel for all USAID-supported organizations' staff.

Liaison Offices

All the Lagos-based IPs have expressed the need to establish liaison offices in Abuja. They have cited the need to ensure a good level of communication/responsiveness between USAID and their organizations, proximity to donors, and for those supporting national activities, proximity to the Federal Government. BASICS and Pathfinder have already established a presence in the Federal capital. BASICS has a Liaison Officer operating out of the NPI offices, and Pathfinder has temporarily housed its Liaison Officer at the Futures office. There is a strong rationale for a BASICS liaison as the IP works closely with NPI.

Liaison offices will not eliminate staff travel between Abuja and Lagos, and the Country Directors in particular will continue to be called upon to travel to Abuja for meetings. Many interviewed by the Team indicated that a good working email system effectively fills the communication gap since USAID moved to Abuja.

USAID needs to provide guidance to the IPs regarding establishing liaison offices in Abuja. The following are two possible options:

Option 1: USAID should only support an IP presence in Abuja if the IP identifies a partner which can house the Liaison Officer at minimum expense (i.e., the BASICS arrangement in Abuja). For instance, FHI could try to enter into a similar arrangement with NACA.

Option 2: One facility could be secured for FHI, Pathfinder, EH, JHU, and CEDPA, with the five IPs sharing the rent and utilities, support staff, and vehicle(s). The limitation of this option is that it might take too long for the five IPs to organize a joint liaison office in Abuja. Further, this option is only viable if none of these IPs move their central offices to Abuja in the near future as the IPs would have to commit to a two-year or possibly three-year lease.

II. BACKGROUND

Nigeria is in the midst of a difficult transition after 40 years of ineffective and often corrupt military dictatorships and civilian regimes. Decades of neglect have left the country with a dilapidated and unreliable infrastructure and a marked deterioration in health, education and other public services. Over two-thirds of the population of 120 million live below the poverty line. In 1999, the Joint United Nations Program on AIDS (UNAIDS) ranked Nigeria as the fourth-worst affected country in the world, based on the number of HIV infections. Political instability, corruption, endemic violence, and the high costs of doing business in Nigeria have discouraged private investment and public confidence.

It is against this backdrop that USAID embarked on its Transition Strategy (September 1999-December 2003) which represents USAID's largest program in sub-Saharan Africa. Overall Mission funding went from a total of \$7 million in 1998 to \$100 million in FY2001.

USAID had an important PHN program until the military coup of 1993. USAID de-certification in 1994 resulted in a significant contraction of the PHN program, and reduced the number of USAID Implementing Partners (IPs) to five. At USAID's request, four were housed in a common facility and created an operational entity known as the Joint Services Management Board (JSMB) whose role was to provide logistical and administrative support to the programs of the four IPs.

Following the democratic elections in 1998, USAID funding resumed on a larger scale. This led to an expansion in the programs of the JSMB IPs, and increased the participation of other IPs in the PHN program. Today ten IPs participate in the implementation of USAID health sector activities: BASICS, Johns Hopkins University (JHU), Family Health International (FHI), Center for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA), Pathfinder, Africare, Engender Health, Population Services International/Society for Family Health (PSI/SFH) Futures Group, and Netmark. Eight of the IPs have their central offices in Lagos, and two have established their offices in Abuja. Netmark had not yet established a presence in Nigeria at the time of this Assessment.

USAID moved its offices to Nigeria's Federal Capital, Abuja, in 2001. Other international agencies such as WHO and UNICEF are currently represented in both Lagos and Abuja, and the U.N agencies are in the process of establishing themselves in Abuja.

III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this assessment is to provide USAID/Nigeria and its Implementing Partners with the objective data needed to make decisions concerning the future

Draft

configuration of USAID program-related offices. Costs of delivering international development assistance in Nigeria are high. USAID has been concerned about how to better contain these costs as it lays the groundwork for its post-transition strategy. The Team has been tasked with conducting a comprehensive and thorough stocktaking of the current JSMB administrative arrangement, the location of the other IPs' central and field offices, and their relevance to the scope of the programs they support. The assessment will generate recommendations for the most cost-efficient and program-effective way forward in terms of administrative arrangements for the IPs as USAID prepares for a long-term sustainable development strategy to be accompanied by even more aggressive collaboration across program sectors (health, education, democracy, economic growth) and PHN sub-sectors (Reproductive Health/Family Planning, Child Survival, HIV/AIDS). (See Appendix G for a copy of the Scope of Work).

Objectives

1. To identify the most appropriate administrative model for maximizing program efficiency and impact, for all IPs implementing PHN programs
2. To document the geographic spread of each IP in terms of where they work and with whom they work
3. To determine the most appropriate field office configuration for maximum program impact and efficiency
4. To ascertain which IPs require field offices and where they should ideally be located
5. To determine the most effective location from which IPs can manage the overall implementation of their USAID-funded projects
6. To assess the impact of a move to Abuja on IP staff members if such a move is deemed advisable
7. To determine the impact on JSMB of a move to Abuja if all IPs move and if only one or two IPs move
8. To ascertain the cost to USAID of any move or reconfiguration of IP administration

Team Composition

The three-person Team is comprised of two international consultants, Margaret Rowan and Audrey Sullivan, and one local consultant, Veronica Tabansi. Together they bring to the assignment a strong mix of program, management and financial skills, years of experience working with USAID systems and procedures, and in-depth knowledge of the NGO sector and health programs in developing countries.

Methodology

Before leaving the United States, the Team met with Home Office representatives of three of the JSMB implementing agencies in Washington, D.C. to discuss the background, function, and operation of the JSMB. Over a period of five weeks in Nigeria, the Team conducted interviews and collected data from IPs in Lagos, Abuja, Kano and Enugu. (See Appendix F for a list of standard questions used by the Team in interviews). Specifically, the Team:

- Interviewed USAID program staff, GDO, and support staff
- Conducted interviews with staff from the 9 IPs, including Country Directors, program, financial, administrative and support staff.
- Assessed the current JSMB structure, its advantages and disadvantages
- Attended a USAID-IP monthly meeting
- Reviewed current and proposed field offices and their functionality
- Visited JSMB Field Offices in Kano and Enugu, the Vision Field Office in Enugu, the PSI/SFH office in Enugu and interviewed relevant staff
- Reviewed the operating procedures for each IP
- Reviewed cost data on operations and staffing
- Reviewed IP workplans

IV. OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT USAID PHN PORTFOLIO

The Population/Health/Nutrition (PHN) Unit of USAID/Nigeria is made up of three sub-sectors: Child Survival, Population/Family Planning, and HIV/AIDS. All activities funded under PHN fall under USAID Nigeria's Strategic Objective No. 4: *Increase the use of family planning/maternal and child health/child survival/HIV/STD services and preventive measures within a supportive policy environment.*

Table 1, Nigeria Program Matrix, provides an overview of each of the nine IPs program areas/interventions¹ under each of the three sub-sectors. Both FP/RH and HIV/AIDS have a large number of IPs supporting each sub-sector, compared to Child Survival which is supported by three IPs with BASICS taking the leadership role. Some of the IPs work within one sub-sector, while others operate more broadly. BASICS, for example, works exclusively in Child Survival, while JHU works across all three sub-sectors. Nearly every IP gets involved in advocacy, many are engaged in behavior change activities, and four IPs are responding to the needs of OVC. This presents a challenge to USAID as it strives to coordinate a harmonious and coherent approach in the three sub-sectors.

A. Child Survival

USAID has one major implementing partner for this sub-sector, BASICS, with JHU/PCS providing communications support. Geographic focus has been consistent in three target states (Lagos, Abia, and Kano) with a complement of national level efforts to strengthen immunization and nutrition. The BASICS program applies a community-based approach using routine immunization as an entry point into the community for other primary healthcare services. Accomplishments include the creation of Community Partners for Health (CPHs) which have evolved into independent NGOs. The current program focus is on establishing private-public partnerships in maternal health and child survival in 20 target LGAs. The BASICS program has enjoyed consistent funding levels.

At the national level, BASICS is advocating for improved nutrition in Nigeria with the introduction of PROFILES, a policy and advocacy tool. BASICS is collaborating with

¹ Listing restricted to USAID funded interventions

the FMOH and UNICEF on the Roll Back Malaria Initiative. Netmark will be joining this effort shortly to promote the use of insecticide-treated bednets.

B. HIV/AIDS

The USAID-sponsored HIV/AIDS response is being executed by seven (7) Implementing Partners: FHI, EH, Africare, CEDPA, PSI, JHU, and Futures. The number of IPs in this sub-sector has increased steadily as USAID increased funding from \$2.6 million in 1999 to \$12.3 million in 2001.

FHI/IMPACT is the largest recipient of USAID HIV/AIDS funding in Nigeria. Its program was geographically dispersed until USAID requested a program review and redesign in 2000. As a result of this exercise, the geographic scope was reduced from 13 to four states, while increasing the number of sub-agreements from 18 to 50. The current focus for expanded comprehensive programming is in Lagos, Kano, Anambra and Taraba, plus national level activities supporting NACA and the Armed Forces. Recently, efforts have promoted local public-private partnership through a community wide participatory assessment and planning process.

PSI and Futures are conducting national scale activities. Through AIDSMARK Field Support, PSI is creating demand for condoms and other HIV/AIDS preventive practices. DFID, the largest donor for HIV/AIDS in the country, funds the condoms and PSI's operational costs. Through the Policy Project, the Futures Group is building a supportive policy environment for the implementation of HIV/AIDS programs and is developing projections on OVC.

JHU is providing adolescents and young adults with confidential HIV/AIDS counseling services through a telephone hotline in Lagos state. EH is working with healthcare providers to improve infection control in the three FP/RH focal states and Plateau and Benue. Targeted programs to improve the well-being of OVCs in Benue and Rivers states are being implemented by CEDPA and Africare, with FHI planning OVC interventions linked to its care and support activities in six states. Africare's OVC project represents its only USAID funded activity and this funding ends in June 2002.

C. Family Planning/Reproductive Health

Activities funded under this sub-sector are geographically dispersed and are being implemented by six partners: EH, Pathfinder, JHU/PCS, CEDPA, PSI/SFH, and Futures Group. Funding cycles, changes in donor priorities, and USAID de-certification brought about by Nigeria's political crisis have caused great fluctuations in program scope and activity over the last decade. Given these factors, it has been difficult to achieve a more strategic focus of program activities.

The recently awarded Vision Project, being implemented by EH, JHU, INTRAH and PSI/SFH, is rectifying this by concentrating its activities in three focal states: Bauchi, Enugu and Oyo. Its objective is to develop a strategic, focused and results-oriented

Draft

program which will generate lessons learned for the next five-year USAID strategy. However, outside the scope of the Vision Project, FP/RH activities remain dispersed and thinly spread. See Table 1, the “Nigeria IP Program Matrix” and Table 2, entitled “Select Data for IPs Operating in USAID/PHN Focal States.”

EH improves clinical training capacity within university teaching hospitals. CEDPA develops community networks through its women’s empowerment activities and supports CBD. Pathfinder strengthens quality of care of health facilities and promotes demand for services through advocacy and behavior change activities. JHU/PCS generates demand for FP services through mass media. Policy Project generates policy support at the national level, and PSI/SFH ensures the availability and access of FP commodities through social marketing activities. EH and Pathfinder are collaborating on a project to strengthen the delivery of reproductive health services within the Armed Forces and National Police.

It is important to note that other private donors are contributing to reproductive health efforts in Nigeria. The Packard Foundation is delivering support in the North of the country through Pathfinder, CEDPA, and JHU/PCS. The McArthur and Ford Foundations support the activities of Pathfinder.

Table 2, “Select Data for IPs Operating in USAID/PHN Focal States,” presents key indicators in Child Survival, FP/RH, and HIV/AIDS for the eight PHN focal states. The table provides an indication of coverage provided by each IP’s program in a given state by presenting data on the state’s population, population reached by the IP’s activities, and where applicable, number of LGAs per state, and number of LGAs covered by each IP. For example, population and LGA data indicate that BASICS coverage in Lagos and Kano states is more significant than in Abia state. Data compiled indicates that Lagos state is served by the largest number of IPs in all of the three sub-sectors, while Taraba has the least number of “supporting actors.” PSI is present in all states due to the national coverage of its FP/RH and HIV/AIDS behavior change and commodity distribution activities. It is also important to note that some level of FP/RH activity is present in every state, regardless of whether it is a designated FP/RH focal state.

Table 2. Select Data for IPs Operating in USAID/PHN Focal States

PHN focal state	Population (in millions) 2001 project.	Fully immunized children (%) ²	CPR (%) ³	HIV prevalence (%) ⁴	No. of LGAs	PHN sub-sector	IP	No. of selected LGAs	Coverage ⁵
LAGOS (CS, HIV/AIDS)	7.6	28.6	15.5	3.5	20	CS	BASICS/JHU	9	3,900,000
						HIV/AIDS	FHI	3	3,569,476
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	2,933,600 ⁶
						FP/RH	Pathfinder/EH	N/A	129,000 ⁷
						FP/RH	CEDPA	2	421,885 ⁸
						FP/RH	JHU	N/A	2,576,400 ⁹
						HIV/AIDS	JHU	N/A	1,000,000
ABIA (CS)	3.1	24.9	9.1	3.1	17	CS	BASICS/JHU	2	667,779
						FP/RH	Pathfinder	N/A	750,000
						FP/RH	EH	N/A	1,196,600
						HIV/AIDS	FHI	N/A	1,050,900
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	
						FP/RH	JHU	N/A	
KANO (CS, HIV/AIDS)	7.7	7.5	2.2	3.8	44	CS	BASICS/JHU	9	2,100,000
						HIV/AIDS	FHI	3	3,200,000
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	2,972,200
						FP/RH	Pathfinder	N/A	350,000
						FP/RH	EH	1	404,000
						FP/RH	CEDPA		145,736
BAUCHI (FP/RH)	3.8	7.5	2.2	2.9	20	FP/RH	VISION	5	1,070,000
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	1,466,800
						FP/RH	JHU	N/A	1,288,200
OYO (FP/RH)	4.6	28.6	15.5	3.5	33	FP/RH	VISION	5	762,042
						FP/RH	CEDPA	2	208,208
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	1,775,600
						FP/RH	JHU	N/A	1,559,400
ENUGU (FP/RH)	2.8	24.9	9.1	5.2	17	FP/RH	VISION	5	871,042
						FP/RH	CEDPA	5	178,621
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	1,080,800
						FP/RH	JHU	N/A	949,200
TARABA (HIV/AIDS)	1.98	19.6	10.9	5.5	16	HIV/AIDS	FHI	3	718,351
						FP/HIV	PSI	N/A	764,280
ANAMBRA (HIV/AIDS)	3.7	24.9	9.1	6.5	21	HIV/AIDS	FHI	3	2,500,000
						FP/RH	EH	2	3,100,000 ¹⁰
						FP/RH	CEDPA	N/A	1,428,200
						FP/HIV	PSI		

² 1999 NDHS, regional data³ Married women using modern methods by region, 1999 NDHS⁴ FMOH 2001 Sero-surveillance survey⁵ Coverage = total population in selected LGAs, unless stated otherwise⁶ Men and women (15-35) exposed to media messages or 38.6% of state population⁷ Police only; breakdown for Armed Forces not available⁸ CEDPA supported activities do not cover entire LGA population⁹ Men and women (15-30) exposed to media messages or 33.9% of state population¹⁰ Figure reflects estimate of market population

V. COLLABORATION AND INTEGRATION

The determination of focus states for the three PHN sub-sectors is a welcome initiative in concentrating resources and fostering inter-IP collaboration at the state level. However, opportunities are being missed to achieve integration across all three sub-sectors. Currently, there is overlap between Child Survival and HIV/AIDS in two states, Kano and Lagos, whereas FP/RH stands alone in the three other focal states.

Table 3. PHN Focal States

	CS	HIV/AIDS	FP/RH
Lagos	X	X	
Abia	X		
Kano	X	X	
Bauchi			X
Oyo			X
Enugu			X
Taraba		X	
Anambra		X	

In assessing the programs of the IPs, the Team found many forms of inter-IP collaboration. It is important to note that IPs stated that shared office space does not necessarily promote collaboration; rather it facilitates collaboration and logistics where it already exists. Joint objectives and complementary program input ensure collaboration and this requires USAID facilitation.

One example of USAID-directed collaboration is the programming with the Armed Forces and National Police in FP/RH and HIV/AIDS. Pathfinder and EH support the clinical component of the FP/RH program, with EH supporting the promotion and availability of long-term methods. Jointly they assist with advocacy, behavior change communications and outreach activities, with commodities being supplied by PSI/SFH. Annual workplan development is conducted jointly between the Armed Forces and National Police and Pathfinder and EH. FHI is building the capacity of the HIV/AIDS programs within the Armed Forces and National Police.

IP staff interviewed confirmed that the monthly-IP meeting with PHN/USAID provides an important and effective forum for collaboration and the sharing of resources and lessons learned.

In the first quarter of 2001, USAID held a collaboration workshop for PHN IPs. At the outset of the meeting, an advisory committee on collaboration was created. This committee has met twice since its inception but has not put forward any concrete proposals for collaboration at this time. It must be added that momentum for inter-IP collaboration was interrupted when USAID issued the FP/RH APS. This pitted the IPs against one another as they competed for the new project.

Draft

The Team found that PSI/SFH partners with every service delivery supported project in the FP/RH and HIV/AIDS sub-sectors. This comes as no surprise as PSI/SFH has the exclusive mandate for commodity distribution. PSI/SFH collaboration is valued by IPs because of its commercial orientation and large distribution network. Further, PSI/SFH FP and condom demand promotion activities help sustain the FP/RH and HIV/AIDS agenda nationwide. IPs supporting service delivery should make efforts to link with PSI demand promotion activities.

Within the CS sub-sector, USAID tasked JHU with servicing the communications component of the BASICS program. JHU and CEDPA have conducted joint training programs in interpersonal communications and counseling. CEDPA assisted the Policy Project in disseminating the NDHS.

The Team found important synergies where IPs have enlisted the participation of previously supported facilities or organizations. For instance, CEDPA has sub-agreements with five CPHs developed under BASICS. In FP/RH, CEDPA is linking with EH trained sites to meet the demand generated for VSC services. Virtually all the IPs participate in Futures policy development activities as stakeholders or technical resources.

The newly approved Vision Project, being implemented by EH, JHU/PCS, PSI/SFH and INTRAH, represents a new approach to promoting inter-IP collaboration. The project launch will bring together all stakeholders in the three target states in a strategic planning session.

These represent promising efforts, and more can be done. There is still a lack of coordination at the grantee level and the Team observed at least one case where two IPs were working in the same community in the same sub-sector, but were not collaborating in any way.

As the FMOH continues to assert its leadership, the development of national level policies, standards and tools will provide the IPs with a framework within which to harmonize approaches, messages and tools. A promising initiative has been taken by the FMOH to bring together all donors working in FP/RH in the northern states once every quarter to coordinate activities.

Appendix A, “Implementing Partner Profiles,” lists each IP’s implementation collaborators, and identifies collaborative activities with other IPs.

Collaboration with the Public Sector

During the period of military rule in Nigeria, USAID maintained a presence in country but withdrew its assistance from the Government. The Mission directed the IPs to work with the private sector, i.e., non-profit, indigenous NGOs and CBOs. To date, there is no bilateral agreement with the GON. Under USAID’s Transition Strategy, initiatives to promote stronger private-public partnerships have been introduced as USAID renews its relationship with the GON.

Both BASICS and FHI are taking the lead in forming concrete public-private partnerships in the implementation of Child Survival and HIV/AIDS programs. The two IPs have entered into sub-agreements with LGAs and State authorities. A similar initiative has been introduced with the Vision Project that will strengthen private-public partnerships at the three levels of government and build alliances for family planning/reproductive health service delivery. Pathfinder and EH have sub-agreements with the Armed Forces and Police Force to improve access to HIV/AIDS and FP/RH services. Both BASICS and CEDPA have secured government facilities to house select field offices (in Lagos for BASICS and in Benue for CEDPA). CEDPA benefits from a strong contribution from the Benue LGA in the form of land, seed, office space, and staff secondment. CEDPA staff attribute the genesis of this partnership to their advocacy work and their selection of the LGA based on its motivation to participate in the OVC project. This is a key factor in establishing successful public-private partnerships that cannot be overlooked.

See Appendix A for details on public sector collaboration for each IP.

VI. PHN IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

A. PHN Funding Trends

USAID de-certification in 1994 resulted in a significant contraction of the PHN program. Following the democratic elections in 1998, USAID funding resumed on a larger scale. In addition to reviving the FP/RH sector, USAID also put a large share of its support behind the HIV/AIDS program to respond to the alarming dimensions of the pandemic in Nigeria. This followed Nigeria's designation by both the USAID Global and Africa bureaus as a priority country for HIV/AIDS. Funding was increased from \$2.7 million in FY 1999 to \$11.775 million in FY 2001. Today, the dominant and largest sub-sector is HIV/AIDS, with FHI taking the leadership implementation role. Funding for FP/RH has gone from \$4 million in FY 2000 to \$11.8 million in FY 2002. Funding for Child Survival in FY 2002 is \$8.75 million. Appendix B details the funding allocated to each implementing agency in the three sub-sectors in FY 2001 and FY 2002. Over the last three years, funding for the PHN sector amounted to \$66.8 million. (FP/RH- \$20 million, HIV/AIDS-\$24.4 million, CS- \$22.3 million).

The IPs enter into sub-agreements with NGOs to implement program activities. In an effort to determine the amount of financial resources allocated to each focal state, this report presents a table detailing IP sub-agreement commitments for each sub-sector in Appendix C. Since BASICS does not award sub-agreements, it was not possible to list amounts for Child Survival activities. Also, sub-agreements with national NGOs such as PPFN, are not reflected as the funds are not broken down by state.

B. Central Offices

The Team visited the central offices of the nine IPs operating in the PHN sector in Nigeria. The Policy Project and Africare are located in stand-alone facilities in Abuja. Pathfinder International and PSI/SFH operate out of stand-alone facilities in Lagos. Engender Health occupies an office in a large commercial building in Ikeja, Lagos. The four other IPs, CEDPA, FHI, JHU/PCS, and BASICS, are located in one facility on Temple Road in Lagos. They share an administrative arrangement called the Joint Services Management Board. Five out of the nine IPs are registered as international NGOs in Nigeria: Pathfinder, CEDPA, Africare, Society for Family Health, and Engender Health.

C. JSMB

The context in which the four IPs operate today is far different from the environment in which the JSMB was created. USAID de-certification in 1994 resulted in a significant contraction of the PHN program, and given the uncertain political context it made sense to put the IPs under “one roof” both physically and administratively. This brought about economies of scale in terms of indirect costs, ensured a better level of security, and eased the management burden on a downsized USAID Mission. Within a sensitive political environment, this umbrella configuration also gave the four IPs a stronger unified voice.

Five IPs remained in Nigeria after de-certification: BASICS, JHU, FHI, CEDPA, and Pathfinder. At that time, they were located in the same building as USAID. In 1999, USAID supported the move of four of the IPs (JSMB) to the current location on Temple Road in Lagos. The cost to USAID for this move was approximately \$800,000. Pathfinder moved to a stand-alone facility on Victoria Island.

Under the Family Health Project, the administrative function was contracted out to an independent organization. The Team was told that this logistics support organization became too powerful and was eventually dismissed following procurement irregularities. It is for this reason that the IPs will not consider contracting out the administrative and logistics support function. Therefore, they share the funding and execution of administrative and logistics functions under the current JSMB arrangement. Some of the original employees of the contract agency are still working in JSMB today.

The following describes the structure and operations of JSMB in Lagos and Kano:

- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was developed in October 1999 and is to be reviewed/revised annually. It describes the methods of operation and staffing, communications and reporting functions, delineation of IP responsibilities and method for resolution of issues. The most recent MOU was developed in May 2001 and covers the period from June 1, 2001 to May 31, 2003.
- The IPs share resources and divide responsibility for:
 - a. Lagos motor pool (BASICS)

Draft

- b. Kano field office management (BASICS)
 - c. Rent for Lagos facility (CEDPA and JHU)
 - d. Lagos building and office management (FHI)
 - e. Lagos Support Services (communications) (FHI)
 - f. Staff insurance scheme and vehicle insurance (JHU)
 - g. Joint Publication and Dissemination Services (JHU)
- Joint Services Management Board Lagos (JSMBL) is comprised of the Country Director of each of the four IPs. This board meets monthly to review issues concerning the management of the joint logistics services. Resolution of issues is reached through board consensus. Any unresolved issues are forwarded in writing to the Home Office JSMB.
 - A JSMB Home Office group exists and is comprised of a staff person from each of the four Collaborating Agencies who support their Nigeria country programs.
 - The chairmanship of the JSMBL rotates each year to the next-in-line Country Director of one of the four IP's. The current chairman is the director of BASICS.
 - Financial responsibilities associated with program administration have been allocated proportionately according to the amount each IP receives from USAID. For example, the JSMB developed a budget for a two year period from June 2001-May 2003. Based on the share of funding each IP receives from USAID, the four IPs share the costs of the JSMB for the two year period based on the following percentages: BASICS-36%, FHI-30%, JHU-19% and CEDPA-15%.
 - Although the Joint Services staff is assigned on a full-time basis to attend to JSMB managed activities, all these staff are employees of one or another of the four IPs. It is the employing IP that has the responsibility to recruit (and terminate), supervise, and pay the Joint Services staff that work in the IP's respective JSMB functional areas.
 - When new MOU's are developed for the JSMB, responsibility for functions within the JSMB may shift from one IP to another. This often occurs when one IP's funding from USAID increases or decreases. For example, in the current MOU, BASICS took over the responsibility for managing the Kano field office from CEDPA. FHI took over the responsibility for building maintenance for the Lagos facility from BASICS.
 - When the IPs rotate functions, the JSMB staff performing these functions move accordingly (e.g. building maintenance staff remain the same, but the staff shift employment to the IP taking over this function).
 - The Team was told that problems may occur when staff are transferred between IPs. Some IPs do not want to employ the transferred staff and are under no obligation to do so. Although all four IPs use the same salary scale, if the employee is transferred

Draft

to a new IP and is due to be promoted within a short time after the transfer, the next “employer” is under no obligation to honor the promotion or salary increase.

- Motor pool costs for travel within Lagos are borne by the IP running the pool. If an IP goes outside of Lagos, they must pay for the fuel and per diem of the driver.
- If IPs not associated with the JSMB (e.g. Policy Project) use the Lagos motor pool, they are billed for: 1) an amount for each mile/kilo driven (set rate); 2) salaries of the drivers and expeditors (regular rates and/or overtime rates); 3) plus a 20% administrative charge on the total of items 1 and 2.

The Team interviewed staff representatives from all four IPs as well as the Home Office staff in Washington, DC and heard the following positive and negative comments regarding the JSMB arrangement:

Positive Comments

- JSMB is cost effective.
- The arrangement has more positives than negatives.
- During the early years of the JSMB, it was more useful – everyone was small.
- Having joint internet and computer services is good.
- For security reasons, it is good to be together.
- Getting together with other JSMB members for collaboration is easier as they are in one location, but this could be facilitated through the current monthly meetings in which all IPs meet.
- JSMB provides a good support system.

Positive Comments from Home Office staff in DC

- This arrangement has been very good for security. It is not easy or cheap to find space in Lagos that is secure
- All four IP's are in one place and this has contributed to program collaboration, e.g., Basics and JHU.
- Having one motor pool is efficient. It would be more costly and difficult for each IP to run its own motor pool.

Negative comments

- Slow response at times to needs of certain IPs.
- Insufficient vehicles in Lagos and for the field. Currently, there are only 12 functioning vehicles. Ten other vehicles are on site but are not functioning; some could be repaired and sent to field offices.
- Joint Services staff salaries are not rectified as stated above.
- The space at the JSMB facility is maxed out and some IPs are still growing.
- Property is located in a commercial area and commands a high rent. USAID resources are wasted in this location.
- JSMB structure becomes paralyzed, as country directors are not available to deal with issues. When country directors meet to solve issues, a key person is usually

Draft

- missing so the issue cannot get resolved. (There is no overall structure of the JSMB. Each country director deals with own function. For a time, they tried to have one person overseeing all JSMB staff, but this wasn't effective. It sounds like the person had the responsibility of managing the functions, but no authority over the various JSMB staff because they would only respond to the IP that was employing them.)
- One IP stated that they are not interested in harmonizing salaries, per diems etc. (this makes things difficult if some people doing the same type of work get paid different amounts for salary, travel, per diem, etc.)
 - One IP said that the operational costs of the JSMB arrangement are enormous and he didn't think that they would spend as much if they were on their own. Another IP concurred with this opinion and said that the assumption that the arrangement has saved money may not be a valid one. The IP cited Pathfinder's stand-alone operation as being not as expensive.
 - It took six months to sign the most recent MOU for the JSMB. In the meantime, each IP retained the function assigned under the previous MOU. Now at the end of six months, they must reimburse the other IP for the function. (e.g. FHI took over building maintenance from BASICS and now needs to pay BASICS for six months of building maintenance costs).
 - One IP said that the Kano JSMB arrangement was "falling apart".
 - The JSMB group does not use standardized approaches. There are no standard policies and procedures.

Negative Comments from Home Office Staff in DC

- The physical space is currently not big enough. They are "maxed out" for space and the programs are growing.
- Since space is so tight, the conference room has been turned into office space, so any fair sized meetings need to be conducted in local hotels and that costs more.
- The chairmanship of the JSMB rotates each year and all three representatives at the meeting felt that the administrative burdens were too great and detracted from the time that needed to be spent on programmatic issues. We pointed out that there would be administrative burdens if they were all separate, but they said that the JSMB arrangement was complicated and required more time.

The IPs made the following suggestions for improving JSMB:

- One IP said that if they could get rid of irritating problems, they could stay together.
- JSMB members need to cooperate more if they are to have future JSMB-like arrangements.
- The staff should have special knowledge of the function they are performing – e.g. staff in charge of building maintenance should have a specialist's knowledge of building maintenance.
- Each IP should be allowed to perform the function with which they feel most comfortable.
- There should be some sort of incentive for grouping in a JSMB type arrangement.

Draft

When the Team asked the IPs if they would consider grouping again in a JSMB-type of arrangement, they stated the following:

- One IP said that it would be cumbersome to have the four together again.
- One IP said that the IPs here are corporate entities, not functional entities, and therefore do not naturally group.
- If they considered relocating again together, there would have to be a more compelling reason beyond the JSMB.
- One IP said that if the JSMB in Lagos dissolved, there would be no JSMB in Kano.

Comments on the JSMB Arrangement

It is apparent from the information obtained by the Team regarding the structure of the JSMB and the advantages and disadvantages, the arrangement is cumbersome and difficult to manage and operationalize. When the IPs were smaller in size and scope of operations, the mechanism had a better chance of functioning. But since all IPs have grown considerably, they are seriously under resourced in terms of office space and transportation. Adjustments need to be made in the short term to alleviate the pressures on office space and the motor pool. In the long term, it doesn't appear practical, logical or efficient to have these four IPs partner again in another joint location for the following reasons:

- They have difficulty resolving problems
- There appears to be a lack of communication (e.g. taking six months to have MOU signed). The arrangement does not necessarily promote collaboration and occasionally generates ill will.
- The funding mechanism and function rotation are complicated and difficult to operationalize.
- There appears to be no flexibility on budget issues when unexpected costs need to be incurred -e.g. internet and communication problems in the Kano office.
- Cost effectiveness is distorted by the location of the Lagos property and high quality telecommunications. The Temple Road facility is in a commercial area with high rental cost. The Team compared the rental costs of stand-alone IPs such as Pathfinder and EH with the JSMB rent. We concluded that the potential total rental costs for the four JSMB implementing agencies in stand-alone facilities would more than likely be less than the rent being paid on the Temple Road office. Assuming a potential rent of 1,500,000 Naira per year for each of the four IPs, this would mean a total of 6,000,000 Naira as opposed to the current rent on the Temple Road office of 14,000,000. See Table 6, Rent Cost Comparison on page 32.
- JSMB resources and management capacity are outstripped by the growing needs of the IP programs.

Since the JSMB facility is leased until May 2003 and may be extended beyond that time, the JSMB arrangement should find ways to address some of the pressing issues confronting them. The Team makes the following suggestions for improvement:

1. The JSMB Lagos should expand the membership of the monthly meeting for resolving issues from one member of each IP to at least two members to ensure

- representation at each meeting. Any member who attends the monthly meetings should have decision-making authority from their organization.
2. Because of the shortage of vehicles in Lagos and Kano, the Chairman of the JSMB should submit a request to USAID for additional vehicle needs based on current inventory and projected needs. There should also be a request to USAID for disposal of inoperative vehicles.
 3. FHI should be asked to move their Lagos field office to a stand-alone facility thereby freeing up space in the Temple Road JSMB office.

D. Field Offices

The Team was able to visit two field locations in Nigeria-Enugu and Kano. These visits are described below along with descriptions of the other field offices in 10 other states. Please refer to the table below for a visual presentation of the location of all IP offices.

**Table 4. Office Locations for IPs in Nigeria
(Funded by USAID)**

IPs	Lagos	Abuja	Kano	Abia	Enugu	Ibadan	Anambra	Taraba	Bauchi	Port Harcourt	Benue	Jos
Basics II	✓	✕	□	□								
JHU/CCP	✓		□		□	□			□			
FHI	✓□		□				□	□				
CEDPA	✓		□		□						□	□
Futures		✓										
AfriCare		✓								□		
Engender	✓				□	□			□			
PSI/SFH*	✓											
Pathfinder**	✓	✕										
NetMark												
USAID		✓										

(✓ = central office) (□ = field office) (✕ = liaison office)

*PSI/SFH has 12 offices throughout Nigeria. They are located in the following states: Abia, Abuja, Edo, Cross River, Enugu, Oyo, Plateau, Kano, Lagos, Borno, Benue and Sokoto. The operating costs for these offices are funded by DFID.

**Pathfinder has a field office in Kaduna that is funded by the Packard Foundation.

Enugu

USAID/PHN currently supports two field offices in Enugu. The Team was able to visit both offices. In addition, the Team visited the PSI/SFH regional office that is funded by DFID.

Draft

1. CEDPA has been in the current facility for more than five years. JHU has one staff housed here also, working in the D&G sector. For a time, until 1999, CDC was also housed there. CEDPA funds are used for all operating costs of the facility. CEDPA with a staff of seven, monitors program activities in six states including 8 sub agreements with various NGO's in the sectors of RH, D&G and HIV/AIDS (Orphans and Vulnerable Children). The Program Manager oversees the program activities in the Benue office, but once the budget has been approved for the Benue Office, all financial oversight is accomplished from the Lagos Central Office. CEDPA field offices operate in a decentralized fashion with funds for local activities sent to the field office bank account from the Lagos Central Office and disbursed by the local staff to relevant NGO's and for other program activities. The CEDPA office has 3 vehicles assigned there, one Toyota Land Cruiser that is currently being repaired and two "problematic" Jeep Cherokees. The Program Manager told the Team that CEDPA offers support to IPs coming to the area for program activities and specifically cited assisting FHI from time to time.
2. Engender Health (EH) recently established a field office in Enugu, one of the focus states for the Vision Project. The EH Program Director had approached CEDPA's Program Manager in Enugu to explore the possibility of sharing space in the same facility, but the CEDPA facility was too small. EH has found adequate office space and is now negotiating with its Vision partner, JHU, to have them in the new space. If/when JHU joins them, the costs will either be shared, or JHU will pay for the entire space in either Ibadan or Bauchi where the other Vision offices will be located and EH will pay for the entire space in Enugu. Since JHU will no longer be working with CEDPA on D&G activities and will be partnering with EH on the Vision Project, it is logical for JHU to leave the CEDPA office and join EH in the new Vision office.

The new office was in the process of being renovated when the Team visited. The office occupies one half of a twin duplex. The facility will eventually have a staff of seven, six EH and one JHU. One vehicle will be shipped from the US for this office. The rental for the office (350,000 N/year) is comparable to the rent paid by CEDPA as the sizes of the two facilities are similar.

The EH program director stated that EH would be willing to provide support/space to other IPs who come to the area for program activities on an occasional basis.

3. The Team also visited the office of PSI/SFH in Enugu. Although DFID supports the operating costs of the 12 PSI/SFH offices, USAID funding supports demand creation activities for HIV/AIDS and family planning. The number of staff in a typical office is three with an additional person from the National Youth Service Corps. There are two, two member Teams that operate out of each office. The teams cover three states (in Enugu they cover Enugu, Anambra and Ebonyi) and use interpersonal education for youth and high risk groups. The interpersonal education is characterized by small group discussion of 50-100 people in

Draft

“informal” or unplanned events in markets, truck stops, brothels and places where high risk audiences can be found. The SFH Teams travel with megaphones, flipcharts and provide focused talks on key elements of HIV prevention. The Teams also work in more formal settings such as schools. A small percentage of the staffs’ time is spent on managing the sales of contraceptives of wholesale distributors to vendors.

Ibadan

Currently there is one field office in Ibadan, co-shared by JHU and EH. Several years ago, the office was part of the JSMB arrangement, but the other IPs pulled out for programmatic reasons leaving JHU as the only occupant. Oyo has been selected as a focus state for the Vision Project, and therefore EH and JHU will share the field office in Ibadan. When the office is fully staffed there will be 7 Vision staff and approximately 4 JHU field support staff. JHU stated that they will pay the majority of the operating expenses, with EH paying 25% of the rent.

Currently there are two vehicles assigned to the Ibadan office with a third to be procured from the US for the Vision Project. JHU will work with EH on the Vision project out of this office and continue to conduct program activities funded through field support funds.

Bauchi

JHU recently opened this new office for the Vision project. This space will be shared with EH. When this office is fully staffed, there will be four JHU staff and one EH FP/RH coordinator. JHU and EH are currently negotiating the sharing of costs for this facility as well as the Vision offices in Enugu and Ibadan. A vehicle for this office will be procured from the US by EH.

Kano

All four JSMB IPs share space in the Kano facility with the African Development Foundation (ADF). As part of the JSMB Memorandum of Understanding, BASICS has responsibility for the management of the office which includes administrative and support staff, the motor pool, local procurement of supplies and services, as well as payment of all basic operating costs. Certain operating costs are shared with the ADF as defined by the BASICS-ADF Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The following costs are split on a 50/50 basis:

1. Rent
2. General repairs
3. Compound maintenance
4. Generator maintenance and fuel
5. Water
6. Security

The estimated share of these costs for the current MOU for BASICS is 2,959,184 Naira. This is for a one year period ending December 31, 2002. Although cost sharing is on a 50/50 split, ADF’s share of the office space is only about 25% (half of the 3rd floor plus sharing of the conference room on the first floor) while the four IPs have 75% of the

Draft

space. While discussing the MOU, the Team learned that ADF is almost certain to leave the facility by the end of this calendar year. Therefore it is important for the JSMB to begin planning for this eventuality. The BASICS staff told the Team that they thought that the JSMB group should remain in the current facility even though they would have to assume the entire cost of the rent and operating expenses. They said the landlord was reasonable and the cost of rent was much less compared to other potential sites. They estimated that the rent would be 2-3 times more expensive at another site. They also stated that the lease is up for renewal in September. They estimated that 25-30% of the rent amount would have to be paid for legal fees associated with the lease since BASICS/JSMB would negotiate with the landlord instead of ADF. They also expect that the rent will be increased.

There are three stories in the Kano office. Currently the ground floor houses JHU offices including two for Packard funded employees, a large conference room that is shared with ADF and three empty rooms that allow for expansion of the staff. The first floor is occupied by BASICS and CEDPA, and the second floor contains offices for FHI and ADF. The Team observed that the space is more than adequate for the current staffing pattern and is also large enough for the staff to increase even with ADF occupying 25% of the space.

There is a total of 8 project vehicles assigned to the Kano Field Office, and yet only half are road worthy. Three are working, one is “limping” and is only used within a limited perimeter, and four are “dead.” The Team was told that IP staff frequently have to hire car services as the current motor pool does not meet their needs. This becomes very expensive and is a major source of frustration among the IPs. All four IP’s interviewed by the Team expressed the vehicle problem as one of the major frustrations with the JSMB arrangement in Kano.

Currently there are two telephone lines installed in the Kano office. When BASICS took over the management of the office this past year, there were no lines operating. They managed to reinstate the two telephone lines and are trying to get two more lines installed so there would be a total of 4 lines. With only two working lines for 4 IPs, there is major frustration among all of the staff in Kano. Staff resort to going outside the facility to use telephones and the internet. Individual staff have purchased their own cell phones and are negotiating with their central office in Lagos to get reimbursed for official calls. Even some of the drivers have purchased their own cell phones. BASICS staff related to the Team that they have spoken with a local wireless internet provider regarding linking up the Kano office to the internet. They expressed frustration with the inability to get better communications established. Resolving the communication issues with regard to telephone lines and internet connections is another major problem that needs urgently to be addressed with the help of the Lagos central office.

BASICS/Kano

Kano is one of the focus states for the Child Survival (CS) program activity in Nigeria. BASICS staff told the Team that they need a presence in Kano to: 1) give the CS program legitimacy; 2) collaborate with the public sector; and 3) work with the LGAs

Draft

and NGOs as partners. BASICS funds many local program activities in partnership with nine LGAs and five community partners for health. Along with monitoring program activities, an important function of the Kano office is to disburse funds for these various activities. BASICS arranges for the payments to be made to the relevant entities providing the services. Once activities are approved, a check is written in the Lagos central office and sent to the Kano office. The checks are cashed at the local bank and then the expenses associated with the program activities are paid by BASICS staff. BASICS does not have a local bank account in Kano. According to the Director of BASICS in Lagos, the home office in the US has made the determination that only one bank account should be opened in Nigeria. The one bank account is in Lagos and is controlled by the central office. The staff pays for operating expenses with an impressed petty cash fund of 100,000 Naira. There are a total of 15 BASICS staff working in the Kano office with 7 of the 15 designated as JSMB personnel.

CEDPA/Kano

CEDPA staff told the Team that Kano is the regional office for all CEDPA activities in the northern states. There are currently two CEDPA program staff located there. One is responsible for the RH/FP sector and one is responsible for D&G activities. The RH/FP program officer monitors 4 USAID funded sub-agreements and 8 Packard funded sub-agreements in Kano and Gombe states. CEDPA is recruiting a finance and administration staff person to manage all financial transactions. CEDPA operates in a very decentralized manner in all of the field offices. CEDPA has a local bank account in Kano and the two program officers have signatory authority on the account. Both must sign each check. Once program activities have been approved under the sub-agreements, Lagos central office wires money to the Kano bank account and checks are written locally for the expenses of program activities. Some money is wired directly into the organizations' bank accounts with whom CEDPA has sub-agreements. This money is related to any salaries paid to staff within the organizations.

The program officer was very positive regarding the JSMB arrangement in Kano. She did express some frustration regarding the vehicle shortage problem and the lack of enough telephone lines.

FHI/Kano

Kano is a focus state for the HIV/AIDS sector. FHI currently has two staff located there. One is a program manager along with an office assistant. FHI is recruiting for two more program staff and a financial manager. Nine sub-agreements in Kano and Katsina States are being monitored and funded out of the Kano office with 4 more sub-agreements in progress. Eventually the funding for the sub-agreements will be decentralized in all of the FHI offices with the office in Taraba being the pilot facility. Currently in Kano, money is wired to a local bank (there is no bank account currently set up) and the program manager has the authority to use the money for planned and approved activities.

The program manager expressed a great deal of frustration with the JSMB arrangement in Kano. He stated that FHI has major field activities and is hampered because of the lack of vehicles for going out in the field. FHI ends up hiring cars and paying for them in

Draft

order to carry out field activities. He also cited the lack of an adequate number of phone lines to carry out business. He said he is forced to go out and use commercial phones and internet facilities in order to communicate. This is time consuming and inefficient. Recently, he was given a cell phone by the central office and will be reimbursed for official calls. This has helped alleviate the situation.

On the positive side, he stated that having the four IPs in one location has fostered collaboration among the IPs at the field level. The IPs carry out joint activities with BASICS doing training, JHU providing media coverage and FHI doing mass mobilization. He also stated that the security aspect of being together is positive. He said that the staff in Kano are like “one big family” and that if the vehicle and telecommunications problems could be solved then the JSMB arrangement should be kept. He said that part of the problem is the fact that there is no flexibility on the budget. The Team agrees with this assessment regarding the lack of flexibility. Because of the way the JSMB funding is set up, with each IP contributing to operating costs based on their percentage of USAID funding, once a budget is agreed upon, it is difficult or almost impossible to amend it. There currently appears no mechanism to change it. Because of this constraint, the budgeting process is crucial to overall implementation of the arrangement. If items fail to make it into the budget (e.g. adequate funds for internet link-up) or unexpected expenses materialize, who pays for the expense? There appears to be no policy within the JSMB to deal with this issue.

JHU/PCS Kano

Currently JHU has one program officer in Kano funded by USAID and three staff funded by the Packard Foundation. The three Packard staff occupy two offices on the ground floor. Since BASICS pays for all operating costs of the Kano office, this means that USAID funds are subsidizing Packard activities in the north. The Team was not able to speak with the one program officer assigned to Kano. She was out in the field conducting program activities. Her time is split among three sub-sectors, CS, RH/FP and D&G. We were able to meet all three of the Packard staff and they were able to tell us about some of the activities of the USAID funded program officer. JHU is working in 6 northern states on RH demand creation activities in collaboration with the PPFN.

The JHU staff reinforced the standard opinion that communications were difficult from the Kano office and that hiring cars was sometimes essential to conducting field activities. It was the Team’s understanding that the JSMB does not provide transport for the Packard staff. Packard staff hire cars to take them to the field.

Comments on the JSMB Arrangement in Kano

Based on the information given to the Team by the Kano staff, we would recommend the following actions:

1. Work to resolve the situation regarding the inadequate number of vehicles available for program activities of the four IPs
2. Work out a mechanism for providing internet access for the Kano office that does not entail using one of the current telephone lines

Draft

3. To the extent possible, put concerted pressure on the local telephone provider to install at least two more telephone lines
4. Begin the planning process for determining what should be done regarding the departure of the African Development Foundation from the Kano office. Take into consideration the following:
 - Currently the rent is very economical for the amount of space being occupied even if the JSMB must pay the entire amount of the rent after ADF leaves (See Table 6 on page 32 comparing rents of IP offices).
 - The building is in good shape and its location within a compound appears to allow for adequate security.
 - The landlord is easy to deal with according to BASICS staff.
 - The security costs are high. The total yearly amount is currently 3,000,000 Naira. This is the same amount that the JSMB pays for security on the Temple Road facility in Lagos.

If the above recommendations can be effected in a timely manner, the Team concludes that the Kano Office will operate much more effectively, happily and productively.

Proposed Abuja Liaison Offices

Table 5

Implementing Agency	Program Staff	Support Staff	Total Proposed Staff
FHI	3	4	7
JHU/PCS	2	5	7
CEDPA	?	?	?
Engender Health	1	0	1
Pathfinder	1	0	1
Total	7	9	16

Abuja

- BASICS has a liaison office in Abuja within the government office on immunization – National Program of Immunization (NPI). One program staff is here along with an office assistant. BASICS pays no rent but has incurred costs for installation of a new telephone line and pays for office supplies, the telephone bill and courier services.
- FHI has plans to open a field/liason office as they are interacting more with various agencies at the national government. The estimated number of staff may be approximately 7 with an Associate Director heading the office.
- JHU sees a need for a liaison office. Staff may consist of a Program Manager, Program Assistant and 5 support staff (secretary, office assistant, driver, security personnel).
- EH plans to establish a liaison office in Abuja with one program staff member.
- CEDPA indicated that they plan to open a liaison office in Abuja but did not indicate how many staff may be located there.

Draft

- Pathfinder currently has a liaison office in Abuja. One program officer is there in space provided by the Policy Project-Futures Group at no cost to Pathfinder. The person will be there on a temporary basis for 3-6 months until Pathfinder finds office space in Abuja.

Abia

- BASICS office there was originally shared with FHI. FHI left and BASICS found new office space. Abia is a focus state for Child Survival. With a total of eight staff, BASICS works with five community partners for health and 2 LGAs out of this office.

Anambra and Taraba

- FHI has established offices in these two focus states for HIV/AIDS. When fully staffed, they will each have approximately 6 staff members, three program staff, two general and administrative staff including a financial manager and one driver. FHI plans to decentralize field operations including financial oversight of the sub-agreements with local organizations. There will be 9 sub-agreements monitored out of the Anambra office and 10 monitored out of Taraba. FHI intends to pilot the decentralization procedures beginning in Taraba, then roll out them out to the other FHI field offices.

Benue

- CEDPA's office in Benue is located in an LGA facility. CEDPA pays for utilities only. This office oversees CEDPA's program activities regarding Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC). CEDPA has received considerable support from the LGA and local governor for this program. The LGA has contributed resources such as land, piglets, and palm oil seedlings for the income generation aspect of the program. Some of the staff of the LGA are seconded to work full time on the OVC program. CEDPA staff there number four and monitor 2 sub-agreements from this office. The program manager in Benue is supervised by the program manager of the Enugu office, but the financial operations in Benue are monitored from the Lagos Central Office.

Jos

- CEDPA is located in a government office, so there is no rent to pay. CEDPA pays for utilities, maintenance and supplies. USAID funds (Core funds) and Packard Foundation funds are used to pay for the operating expenses on a shared basis. USAID funds a total of 3.5 FTE staff and Packard funds 2.5 FTE staff. CEDPA monitors 1 USAID funded sub-agreement with the Church of Christ in Nigeria from the Jos office.

Lagos

- FHI has a Lagos field office currently housed in the JSMB complex on Temple Road. FHI currently has one program manager and is recruiting for two more program staff

Draft

and two support staff. FHI will monitor 12 sub-agreements out of the Lagos field office.

- BASICS is setting up a field office in the Primary Health Care Center in Lagos. There will be no operating expenses, only the staff salaries. BASICS is paying for minor renovations and air conditioners. BASICS plans to house six staff in the field office, three program staff and three administrative staff.

Port Harcourt

- Africare is a sub grantee of CEDPA's conducting program activities for Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Rivers State. Africare monitors two sub-agreements with local NGOs on program activities. The Port Harcourt office was set up by Africare with funds from the sub grant agreement with CEDPA. There is one program officer here along with 3 support staff. Funding for this activity will end in June and Africare plans to retain this office with funds from other donors for operating expenses.

Discussion Regarding Placement of Field Offices

After obtaining information regarding the placement of field offices and the functions performed in the various offices, the Team has concluded that the IPs have placed the field offices in the most rational locations based on programmatic needs of the various sub-sectors. There are field offices located in all of the eight focus states for CS, RH/FP and HIV/AIDS. In addition to these 8 states, CEDPA has field offices in two other states – Jos and Benue. In both cases the offices are located in government facilities, so costs are reduced. The Benue office is set up for the Orphans and Vulnerable Children component of the HIV funding CEDPA receives. In Jos, the majority of the funding for the program there is provided by the Packard Foundation with USAID sharing the operating costs of the facility.

The IPs have grouped together when it has been practical and logical to do so. There are groupings in Kano (JSMB), Enugu (EH & JHU), Oyo (JHU & EH) and Bauchi (JHU & EH). Enugu State is the only state where USAID is funding two offices that could have potentially been one. There are, however, very good, practical reasons for ending up with two offices. CEDPA and JHU were grouped together in the Enugu office for a good period of time. When EH was awarded the Vision Project, the management of EH approached CEDPA in Enugu to see if it would be feasible to share the office. It was quite apparent that there was not enough space for EH to join JHU and CEDPA there. So EH found a new space that is adequate for their needs and will share this space with JHU, its partner in Vision. Any alternative to this new office would have presented several difficulties. In order to have only one office the following constraints would have to be addressed:

1. New, much larger office space would have had to be found to accommodate all three IPs
2. CEDPA had already paid the rent on the space they were occupying and would have had trouble breaking the lease
3. Since larger space would have to be found, the rent would be higher and maybe in the end the cost of the rent potentially could have doubled

Draft

4. The whole process would have taken some time and it was important for EH to begin setting up the office to start program activities

In the end EH took the most logical decision to open a new facility.

With the start of the new Vision Project, EH and JHU have taken the opportunity to partner in three locations. In Oyo, JHU already had an office, there was space for EH, so they will share that office. In Bauchi, a new focus state for Vision, JHU and EH are setting up a new office together. Likewise, they will be together in Enugu as discussed in the previous paragraph.

All of the IPs the Team talked with expressed the willingness to provide space and support to other IPs who are occasionally on field trips in the states where field offices exist. This shows a real spirit of cooperation and collaboration.

Operating Costs Associated with Field Offices

Costs associated with field offices are surprisingly similar. The majority of offices have been placed in residential facilities that are similar in size and consequently have similar operating expenses. As you can see from the following Table 6, entitled “Rent Cost Comparisons Among IPs Central Offices and Field Offices”, the offices in Enugu, Ibadan, Bauchi, Abia, Anambra and Taraba average around 350,000 Naira per year. In addition, the Team received general operating cost information from CEDPA for the Enugu office and from BASICS for the Abia office. The actual costs for these two offices are very similar, around 3.6 million Naira a year excluding any salary expenses.

Table 6
Rental Cost Comparisons Among IPs
Central Offices and Field Offices
(Naira)

Implementing Agency	Location	Rent per annum	Total square meters	Cost per square meter	Number of staff in office	Cost per staff member
Central Offices						
JSMB-Lagos	Lagos	14,000,000	1,288	10,870	102	137,255
Engender Health	Lagos	1,158,376	622	1,862	16	72,399
Pathfinder	Lagos	1,000,000	678	1,475	17	58,824
Policy-Futures	Abuja	3,000,000	308	9,740	9	333,333
Africare	Abuja	3,000,000	space larger than Policy		9	333,333
Field Offices						
CEDPA/JHU	Enugu	360,000			9	40,000
Engender/JHU	Enugu	350,000			7	50,000
JHU/Engender	Ibadan	250,000			10	25,000
JHU/Engender	Bauchi	300,000			5	60,000
BASICS	Abia	343,500	287	1,197	8	42,938
FHI	Anambra	350,000			6	58,333
FHI	Taraba	350,000			6	58,333
CEDPA	Jos	no rent-located in government office			6	
CEDPA	Benue	no rent-located in LGA facility			4	
JSMB*	Kano	569,250	751	758	27	21,083
JSMB**	Kano	1,138,500	886	1,285	27	42,167
BASICS	Lagos	no rent-in Primary Health Care Center			6	
Liaison Office						
BASICS	Abuja	no rent-in Natl. Program of Immunization			1	
Pathfinder	Abuja	no rent-located with Policy-temporary			1	

*JSMB in Kano occupies 75% of space, but only pays 50% of the rent.

**If JSMB occupied all of the space and paid all of the rent, these would be the figures.

UNICEF Zonal Offices

The Scope of Work for this assignment included obtaining information regarding the UNICEF Zonal offices in order to determine if this configuration could be relevant to the placement of USAID funded IP field offices. The Team was able to speak with the administrative assistant to the person at UNICEF in Abuja that is responsible for managing the Zonal offices. We obtained the following information:

- UNICEF has zonal offices located in four “old” geopolitical areas in Nigeria.
 - Lagos office covers 8 states in the delta.
 - Enugu office covers 10 states in the SE.
 - Kaduna office covers the states in the north central.
 - Bauchi office covers the states in the northeast.

Draft

- Each office is staffed by 20+ employees of UNICEF.
- Each office has a project officer and staff who work in education, environment, health, HIV/AIDS and EPI.
- The UNICEF structure is very decentralized with funds flowing to local government entities, and NGO counterpart organizations through the field offices.
- Programs are planned with the collaboration of Nigerian counterpart agencies and monitored through the field offices.

The Team determined that it would be difficult for USAID to replicate the UNICEF model for the following reasons:

1. UNICEF employs all of the staff in the zonal offices and pays for all operating costs. UNICEF staff plan, monitor and fund program activities. UNICEF is not funding implementing agencies in the same way as USAID.
2. USAID funds implementing agencies who in turn plan, monitor and fund program activities. USAID maintains a small staff in the Mission to oversee the program activities of the implementing agencies.
3. UNICEF, therefore, is implementing program activities through their own staff.
4. In order for USAID to replicate the UNICEF model, USAID would have to have a much larger staff presence in Nigeria and not fund IP agencies the way they do now.

Basically, the USAID organizational structure is quite different from the structure of UNICEF. Therefore, field operations must be set up differently.

Staffing of Implementing Partners Funded by USAID

The staffing chart in Appendix D details the number of full time equivalent (FTE) staff employed by each of the nine implementing agencies funded by USAID in the PHN sector. Staff is categorized as program staff by sub-sector, general administration, transport (drivers), JSMB and staff funded by other donors. The JSMB staff include staff designated by the four IPs to manage and perform the functions in the administrative arrangement of the JSMB. The staff include financial personnel, secretaries, office assistants, maintenance personnel, transport officers, expeditors and drivers. Of the 26.15 FTE staff at the JSMB in Lagos, 15 are employed by BASICS for the operation of the fleet of vehicles. Of the total number of FTE staff (33.15) designated as JSMB for Lagos and Kano, 19 are employed for the operation of the fleet of vehicles.

Note that the grand total of all staff employed by the nine implementing agencies is 342. Of the 342 staff, 224.6 FTE staff are funded by USAID. (342-117.4).

VII. DISCUSSION REGARDING MOVING CENTRAL OFFICES

The Team asked all seven IPs with central office locations in Lagos the following question:

- What are your views regarding having your central office located in Lagos? Is this the most logical location for you, given your current and future program operations,

Draft

collaboration with other IPs, access to USAID and access to government agencies with whom you need to interact? Would Abuja be more logical?

The following are the responses from the IPs questioned:

CEDPA

CEDPA told the Team that the landlord has already been told that the JSMB will not be renewing the lease on the Temple Road office when it expires in May 2003. The country director said that she is not sure if USAID would even allow them to renew the rent because of the high cost of the Temple Road Office. If this is the case, all of the IPs would have to leave the Temple Road facility by May 2003.

CEDPA plans to begin the process of planning for the move out of the Temple Road facility next month (March 2002) as time is needed to make the transition. The country director gave the indication that CEDPA was leaning towards relocating to Abuja. She said that guidance from USAID will determine the move. As an interim solution, they will establish a liaison office there. If/when the central office moves to Abuja, a field office will need to be maintained in Lagos to cover the SW part of the country. She cited several reasons for making the move to Abuja: 1) the need for being close to USAID; 2) many of the other international donors are relocating there and CEDPA would like to diversify its funding; 3) the environment is no longer stable in Lagos (riots etc); and 4) Abuja is more stable.

CEDPA actually conducted a cost analysis regarding a possible move to Abuja in 2000. They plan to send another search Team to Abuja to get current costs for space for an office, housing costs for employees etc. A committee will be formed to discuss the move and the type of relocation package CEDPA should provide for the employees. The country director estimated that 15-17 staff members would probably make the move.

FHI

The FHI country director thinks that Lagos is the best place for the central office for the following reasons: 1) Lagos with a population of 12-13 million and the SW of Nigeria are the prime areas where FHI's program is focused; 2) communication is better in Lagos than in other parts of the country; 3) when program activities require a quick deployment, being located in Lagos is better as transportation is more convenient; and 4) he is concerned about losing staff if FHI should move to Abuja.

He also stated that discussions would have to occur with FHI home office and USAID before any decisions could be taken regarding moving. He stated that any possible move to Abuja by the central office would necessitate establishing a stand-alone field office in Lagos. The country director also stated that FHI is looking into establishing a liaison office in Abuja.

JHU/PCS

The country director was not aware that the landlord had been told that the lease would not be renewed in 2003. He appears to be conflicted regarding whether JHU should move the central office to Abuja. JHU Home Office staff in the Washington, DC meeting stated that Lagos is most convenient for interacting with their field offices. The ad agencies they work with are in Lagos and also the NGO's. It is not good access to AID and they therefore end up traveling a lot to Abuja to meet with staff there. If they moved to Abuja, they would have to keep a presence in Lagos. JHU plans to open a liaison office in Abuja, and the country director said that he thought that it was inevitable that JHU would have to make a major move there eventually. He felt that if this happened, approximately 70% of the staff would go. He is very concerned also about losing staff and also ensuring that the staff reflects the different geographical areas of Nigeria so that the program can be effective.

BASICS

The Team met with the BASICS staff in Lagos separately from the country director who was interviewed in Abuja towards the end of the assessment. The question of whether it is more logical to have the central office of BASICS in Lagos or Abuja elicited conflicting views. The country director thought that there is a good case to be made for either location. Certain Child Survival activities such as improved nutrition and the Roll Back Malaria Initiative have a national focus so it is important to collaborate with federal government agencies in Abuja. On the other hand, two of the three focal states for Child Survival activities are Lagos and Abia in the south and these areas are best served from Lagos. In addition, BASICS works with UNICEF and WHO and the main offices for these UN organizations are located in Lagos.

The BASICS staff and country director are very concerned about the effect on BASICS staff if the decision were made to move to Abuja. There would be potential loss of staff and/or break-up of families as a result. The funding for this move would be extensive and cannot come out of the program funds currently budgeted. In addition, BASICS Global funding ends in June of 2004. BASICS already has a liaison office in Abuja in the National Program of Immunization and is currently addressing some of the issues regarding the federal focus of CS activities.

The Team asked the country director, who is currently the chairperson of the JSMB, about the situation with the landlord of the Temple Road facility. The country director said that relations between the landlord and JSMB had soured during the negotiations last year (2001) when the lease had been renewed. At that time the JSMB informed the landlord and USAID that the lease would not be renewed in June of 2003.

Engender Health

The country director told the Team that Lagos is the most logical place for central operations to be located. He said the location is very convenient. It is near the domestic airport, which makes it easy to fly to field office locations and Abuja. He stated that it is easier for agencies with whom they have sub-agreements to come to see them in Lagos rather than if they were located in Abuja. The office is located on the road towards

Draft

Ibadan where they have a new field office for the Vision Project. EH has been able to obtain additional space in the current building for the Vision staff. The Team observed that the office is located in a building that has security, appears to be well constructed and maintained and the space is adequate for EH's needs.

Pathfinder International

Pathfinder staff told the Team that they intend to maintain their central office in Lagos. They stated that they are expanding and are considering finding a new location because of traffic congestion in the area that makes it sometimes difficult to get to the domestic airport for internal flights. Pathfinder stated that they had at one time been located in the Elephant Cement House with Engender Health before moving to the current location on Victoria Island. They also told the Team that BASICS located in the current office with them when BASICS first started operations in Nigeria. When BASICS expanded, they moved to the Temple Road Office and became part of the JSMB.

PSI/SFH

PSI/SFH program activities have a national focus. PSI/SFH collaborates with the national government on HIV/AIDS and their major funding agencies, USAID and DFID, are both based in Abuja. The staff told the Team that they spend a great deal of time traveling to Abuja regarding their program activities. Therefore, PSI/SFH have already made the decision to relocate their central operations to Abuja. They have staff looking for office space and have set a deadline for finding a facility by March 15th. They want to complete the move by August 15th so that families are in place in Abuja in time for the start of the school year. They are setting up a committee to deal with all aspects of the move. The committee will work out a plan for a relocation package for the employees. They plan to give all employees the option to move. For those who do not want to move, PSI/SFH will offer a severance package. They estimate that 35-40 staff will make the move to Abuja. They plan to have a separate salary structure in place in Abuja to reflect the higher cost of living for the staff. The main warehouse facility will remain in Lagos as well as a field office to handle program activities in Lagos state. The staff described the move as a "necessary evil".

JSMB Agencies

It is questionable whether the JSMB lease can be renewed next year when the lease expires in May 2003. If it can't be renewed, it is crucial that all four agencies begin the process of planning for the eventual move as soon as possible. They potentially could move within Lagos, or if USAID would agree, they could move to Abuja. It seems certain that they would not move together and partner again in a similar JSMB arrangement for the reasons stated in Section VI-C. Perhaps two might move together into the same facility, but that arrangement would have to be a very "loose" grouping in order to address some of the frustrations expressed to the Team during the assessment. The Team is not making a recommendation that any two agencies partner, but if two are willing and determined to do so, they could explore the possibility in the near future during the planning stages for the move.

Draft

Whether the JSMB agencies move within Lagos or move to Abuja, many similar costs would potentially be incurred. The types of expenses to be incurred that will most likely cost the same, regardless of where they locate, are the following:

1. Renovation expenses- the amount will depend on the type of facility chosen.
2. Purchase of telephone lines
3. Purchase of computer server, networking costs and a link up with an internet provider
4. Purchase of a back-up generator, if the agency determines it is necessary
5. Potential need to purchase additional furniture and office equipment

Some costs will definitely be incurred only if the agency moves to Abuja. The following Table 7, entitled "Comparison of Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency Either Within Lagos or to Abuja" lists these costs and an estimate is made regarding the amount for each expense category. The Table compares the incremental costs associated with moving to Abuja with a move within Lagos. Two scenarios are presented in order to give a range regarding the estimated amounts. One scenario estimates the Abuja move using relatively high costs and one scenario estimates lower costs. Both scenarios assume a move of 17 staff members relocating to Abuja for one generic agency. The cost estimates were made using data from USAID regarding the costs of relocating staff in 2001 and data provided by CEDPA from their estimate in 2000 regarding a potential move to Abuja. Tables detailing the estimates can be found in Appendix E. The estimate for a move within Lagos is based on a slightly higher rent than the two stand-alone agencies, Pathfinder and Engender Health, are paying for rent in Lagos. (See Table 6, "Rent Cost Comparison" on page 32). Also included in the cost estimates is the fact that if the agencies move central operations to Abuja, they all express a need to have a field office in Lagos. Likewise, if they keep central operations in Lagos, they want to have a liaison office in Abuja. Therefore, a cost estimate was made for rent and fees associated with having a field office in Lagos for the Abuja move estimates, and likewise, a cost estimate for having a liaison office in Abuja was made for the move within Lagos scenario.

Table 7
Comparison of Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency
Either Within Lagos or to Abuja
(17 staff moving)

Expense Category	Abuja-High	Lagos	Difference	Abuja-Low	Lagos	Difference
Rent	6,003,000	1,500,000	4,503,000	4,139,500	1,500,000	2,639,500
Agency Fees	600,300	150,000	450,300	413,950	150,000	263,950
Legal Fees	300,150	75,000	225,150	206,975	75,000	131,975
Move Coordination	520,800		520,800	420,600		420,600
Staff Relocation	24,543,216		24,543,216	11,732,677		11,732,677
Office furnishings Shipment	646,000	200,000	446,000	300,000	200,000	100,000
Lagos Field Office						
Rent + Fees	575,000		575,000	400,000		400,000
Abuja Liaison Office						
Rent + Fees		862,500	(862,500)		862,500	(862,500)
GRAND TOTAL (Naira)	33,188,466	2,787,500	30,400,966	17,613,702	2,787,500	14,826,202
US Dollars (116N=\$1)	286,107		262,077	151,842		127,812

Using the Abuja-High estimate of cost as compared to a move within Lagos, the difference is 30,400,966 Naira or \$262,077. Using the Abuja-Low estimate of cost compared to a move within Lagos yields a difference of 14,826,202 Naira or \$127,812.

Regardless of whether the JSMB agencies move to Abuja or within Lagos, they would have to commit to at least a two year lease in Lagos or a three year lease in Abuja. This commitment would mean that all four agencies would have to sign leases that would commit them until June of 2005 or 2006. This time frame is beyond the transition period of the current USAID strategy which ends in December of 2003. This fact poses a very difficult dilemma regarding any possible move by any of the JSMB four IPs. In addition to the transition period ending, the following Table 8 called "Donor Funding" highlights the constraints even more.

CEDPA, that is 67% dependent on USAID funding, only has ENABLE funding until Feb. 2003 and D&G funding until June 2002. BASICS II, that is 100% USAID funded, ends in June of 2004.

**Table 8
DONOR FUNDING**

Implementing Agency	USAID Funding Percentage	Current USAID Funding End date	Other Donor Funding Percentage	Notes
Engender Health	100%	Vision funding until 9/04 Field Support 2003	None	
JHU/PCS	85-90%	Vision funding until 9/04 Field Support 2002	10-15%- Packard	3 Packard staff are in Kano office-no contribution to overhead by Packard
FHI	91.6%	IMPACT Funding until 2007	8.4%-DFID	DFID-\$588,000 FY 2002
CEDPA	67%	ENABLE Funding until Feb. 2003; D&G funding until June 2002	33%-Packard	Jos Field Office -Packard funds and USAID core funds are used for utilities and maintenance costs. Rent is free as office is in a gov't facility.
BASICS	100%	BASICS II ends June 2004	None	
Pathfinder	30%	July 2003 Bilateral Agree.	40%-Packard 30%-Ford	Packard funds pay all costs in Kaduna office
PSI/SFH	30%	AIDSMARK Field Support ends 9/2002	70%-DFID	DFID funds all operating costs of all offices
Policy-Futures	100%	Global Policy II ends July 2005	None	
Africare	Less than 10%	No cost extension until June 2002	90+%	Foundations –Ford, Soros, McArthur, Seattle, Donner. Shell, UNDP

Constraints Regarding a Move to Abuja

To gather information on living and working conditions in Abuja, the Team interviewed staff from USAID, Africare, and Futures who have recently settled in Abuja, and studied a CEDPA report which investigated the move to Abuja in 2000. The Team also consulted PSI which was organizing its own move from Lagos at the time of this Assessment.

Abuja has a tough real estate market, and securing both office accommodation and staff lodging is difficult and expensive. Properties are in high demand as Government, donors, diplomatic missions, and public and private enterprises seek to establish a presence in the Federal capital. There are few office buildings available, and five-bedroom houses are

Draft

the most common stand-alone facilities on the market. Both Futures and Africare have moved into residential properties which house them comfortably and give them room for growth. Securing telephone lines can be difficult depending on where you settle in Abuja. Water is not universally available, and some have to purchase truckloads for their cisterns. All IPs interviewed indicated that the market is extremely competitive and it is not unusual for landlords to discard one offer in favor of a subsequent more lucrative one. All require two years' rent up front, and in some cases, the lessor may have to offer three or four years to secure the lease.

In securing office space, the IPs gave the following advice: "Have prior approval from your headquarters to make your offer and be prepared to move very quickly if you identify a suitable property."

The high cost of accommodation drives up the cost of living in Abuja. Africare increased its salaries by 25% when it moved its staff from Lagos. Quite a few of the organizations which have settled in Abuja have sought to reduce costs by housing some of their staff, local and expatriate, on the office premises.

Staff interviewed had mixed feelings about life in Abuja. The majority maintain households in Lagos and commute on week-ends, or less frequently depending on their means. The high cost of accommodation means that lower level staff have to secure lodging outside the city limits and commute. Security has been an issue in some of these "satellite communities" and some USAID staff were robbed. Apart from these very unfortunate incidents, staff interviewed in Lagos and Abuja feel Abuja provides a safer and less stressful environment than Lagos. Any commute in Abuja is still preferable to the congested traffic conditions faced by commuters in Lagos. One driver interviewed by the Team indicated that he wakes for work in Abuja at 7 a.m., whereas he had to start his day at 4:30 a.m. to negotiate the work commute in Lagos.

The hub for domestic air travel still remains in Lagos. So at this point in time, Abuja does not provide easy air access to all of Nigeria's regions, but this is changing slowly as independent airlines introduce new flights out of Abuja.

Conclusions Regarding a Move to Abuja of Central Offices

The Team does not recommend moving any IP central office to Abuja given the many uncertainties in future funding, the outcome of the national elections, and the eventual choice of implementing partner(s) for USAID's post-transition strategy. The Team recommends that the JSMB make concerted efforts to extend the lease on the Temple Road facility for one year. This would mean that the lease would extend until May 2004, five months after the USAID Transition strategy ends.

Liaison offices

All the Lagos-based IPs have expressed the need to establish liaison offices in Abuja. (See Table 5 on page 28). They have cited the need to ensure a good level of communication/responsiveness between USAID and their organizations, proximity to donors, and for those supporting national activities, proximity to the Federal Government. BASICS and Pathfinder have already established a presence in the Federal capital. BASICS has a Liaison Officer operating out of the NPI offices, and Pathfinder has temporarily housed its Liaison Officer at the Futures office. There is a strong rationale for a BASICS liaison as the IP works closely with NPI.

These liaison offices, as perceived by the IPs, generally require one professional staff (although one IP stated its liaison office would require up to 7 people), plus support staff (administrative and drivers). Liaison offices will not eliminate staff travel between Abuja and Lagos, and the Country Directors in particular will continue to be called upon to travel to Abuja for meetings. Many interviewed by the Team indicated that a good working email system effectively fills the communication gap since USAID moved to Abuja

USAID needs to provide guidance immediately to the IPs on this question as they are actively pursuing plans for an Abuja presence.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team makes the following recommendations:

1. The Team does not recommend moving any IPs to Abuja given the many uncertainties in future funding, the outcome of the national elections, and the eventual choice of implementing partner(s) for USAID's post-transition strategy.
2. JSMB should attempt to extend its current lease to May 2004.
3. FHI should consider moving their Lagos field office to a stand-alone facility to free up space in the Temple Road JSMB office.
4. JSMB resources and management capacity are severely strained by the growing needs of IP programs. To improve problem solving, JSMBL should expand membership from one to (at least) two members from each IP to ensure representation at each meeting. Any member who attends JSMB meetings must have decision-making authority from their organization.
5. The JSMB motor pool is in crisis. Because of the shortage of vehicles in Lagos and Kano, the Chairman of the JSMB should submit a request to USAID for additional vehicles based on current inventory and projected needs. This should include a request to USAID for disposal of inoperative vehicles.

Draft

6. ADF is pulling out of the Kano JSMB Field Office in December 2002. Explore possibility of getting in another IP. Resolve issues regarding motor pool and communications, and plan for transfer of ADF generator to BASICS.
7. Provide guidance to IPs on the establishment of liaison offices in Abuja.
 - Option 1: USAID should only support an IP presence in Abuja if the IP identifies a partner which can house the Liaison Officer at minimum expense (i.e., the BASICS arrangement in Abuja). For instance, FHI could try to enter into a similar arrangement with NACA.
 - Option 2: One facility could be secured for FHI, Pathfinder, EH, JHU, and CEDPA, with the five IPs sharing the rent and utilities, support staff, and vehicle(s). The limitation of this option is that it might take too long for the five IPs to organize a joint liaison office in Abuja. Further, this option is only viable if none of these IPs move their central offices to Abuja in the near future as the IPs would have to commit to a 2-year lease.
8. Reduce costs associated with IP travel to Abuja. USAID can expect to continue to support frequent travel between Lagos and Abuja. Therefore, USAID should negotiate a good rate at one Abuja hotel for all USAID-supported organizations' staff.

IX. Persons Contacted

USAID

Thomas Hobgood, Mission Director
Lynn Gorton, General Development Officer
Floyd Spears, Executive Officer
Michael Iwuchukwu, Deputy EXO
Shelagh O'Rourke, Senior CS & AIDS Advisor
Liane Adams, Child Survival Advisor
Bunmi Dosumu, Senior Program Manager, POP/RH
Melinda Taylor, Basic Education Advisor
Sandy Ojikutu, Senior Education Advisor
Temitayo Odusote, Program Manager, HIV/AIDS
Kayode Morenikeji, Program Assistant
Patra Emordi, Admin. Assistant

BASICS

Andrew Agle, Director
Bob Lennox, Country Program Officer, Home Office
Chavanne Peercy, Admin. Officer, Home Office
Olu Ayodele, Country Advisor
Carl Hasselblad, Integration/EPI Advisor
Awuese Oku, Operations Manager
Sam Orisasona, SPO (Field Support Operations)
Kayode Adewale, Finance/Admin. Manager
Gregory Osubor, Senior Program Officer
Faruk Danjuma, Admin. Officer
Dr. Aisha Ahmed, Team Leader, Kano
Harry Audu, Finance/Admin. Officer, Kano
Omole Joseph, Transport Officer
Innocent Chukwu, Expediter
Udo Imyang, Driver
Romanus Ojagbor, Mechanic/Driver

FHI

Dr. Olufemi Oke, Country Director
Ken Sklaw, Senior Program Officer, Home Office
Olaniyi Aridegbe, Senior Accountant
Funke Olugbekan, Support Service Supervisor
Biodun Adetoro, Program Manager, Lagos
Adamu Imam, Program Manager, Kano

CEDPA

Dr. Enyantu Ifenne, Country Director
Maisha Strozier, Deputy Country Director
Dr. Folarin Olowu, Senior Program Officer

Draft

Joseph Majiyagbe, Senior Finance/Administrative Officer
Dr. Nneka Ndiomu, Program Officer
Lola Payne, Senior Regional R/H Advisor
Aisha S. Abubakar, Program Officer, Kano
Chinweoke Onumonu, Program Officer/Field Office Manager, Enugu
U.S.A. Nnanta, Administrative Officer, Enugu

JHU/CCP

Bola Kusemiju, Country Director
Rebecca Holmes, Program Officer, Home Office
Moses O. Ayanwusi, Assistant Finance Manager
Jossey Ogbuanoh, Documentation and Records Officer
Goddy Akhaluola, Finance Assistant
Hadiza Baba Yaro, Program Officer, Kano (Packard)
Fatima Bello Aliyu, Program Assistant, Kano (Packard)

Engender Health

Dr. Ademola A. Adetunji, Country Representative
Mofoluke Shobowale, Senior Program Officer
Clement Akinlembola, Accountant
Dr. Linus Onoh, Field Office Manager, Enugu

Pathfinder International

Michael Egboh, Country Representative
Bisi Tugbobo, Senior Program Officer
Gbenga Peters, Finance and Admin. Officer
Francis Eremutha, Program Officer
Femi Awoyinfa, Program Assistant

PSI/SFH

Bright Ekweremadu, General Manager (Programs)
Augustine Ankomah, Behaviour change Communication Specialist
Joe Odogwu, General Manager (Finance & Admin)
Zacch Akinyemi, Research & Evaluation Manager
Wale Adedeji, National Operations Manager
Alex Ogundipe, External Relations Manager
Obi Oluigbo, Operations Manager (South)
Charles Akaka, Regional Coordinator, Enugu

POLICY PROJECT/Futures Group

Dr. Jerome Mafeni, Country Representative
Charity Ibeawuchi, Senior Program Officer
Reginald Chima, Health Economist
Theresa Effa, Advocacy Advisor
Babatunde Afuwape, Administrative Officer
Theresa Ochu, Accounts/Documentation Officer

Draft

Mary Arigo, Admin. Assistant

Africare

Dr. Chinwe A. Effiong, Country Representative

Dr. Chinedu Chugbo, Program/Admin. Manager

Abayomi Efundipo, Accountant

UNICEF

Amaka Chude-Onwurah, Administrative Assistant

Draft

Appendix A

Implementing Partner Profiles

Draft

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER PROFILES

FAMILY HEALTH INTERNATIONAL/IMPACT

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: ¹¹ 8 program 13 support ¹²	Field Offices: Lagos Anambra Kano Taraba	Staffing: 3 program; 2 support 3 program; 3 support 3 program; 2 support 3 program; 3 support
Project states:	Focal states: Anambra, Kano, Lagos, Taraba, Secondary states: Abia, Enugu, Ebonyi, Katsina, Osun, Ondo		
Implementation collaborators:	NGOs, associations, labour unions, CBOs, faith-based organizations		
Public sector collaboration:	NACA, states AIDS control agencies (SACAs), local AIDS control agencies (LACAs), FMOH, MOH at the state level, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Defense		
Target groups:	High risk groups, adolescents, OVC, PWLHA		
National activities:	TA to NACA and NASCP, Armed Forces and National Police		
Collaborations with other IPs:	PSI/SFH for condom distribution Policy Project/Futures and PSI/SFH on Armed Forces Project		

BASICS

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: 12 program 24 support	Field Offices: Lagos (housed in Primary Healthcare Devpt. Agency) Aba Kano	Staffing: 3 program; 3 support
Liaison office: Abuja	1 program; 1 support		4 program; 4 support 5 program; 10 support
Project states:	Lagos, Abia, Kano		
Implementation collaborators:	CBOs, schools, NGOs, associations		
Public sector collaboration:	LGAs, National Programme on Immunization, FMOH, SMOH, National Primary Health Care Development Agency		
Target groups:	Children 0-5 years, pregnant women, WRA		
National activities:	Polio eradication campaign, training for immunization service providers, nutrition survey, Roll Back Malaria Initiative		
Collaborations with other IPs:	CEDPA (jointly implemented programs in Kano and Lagos) JHU for promotion of immunization in 20 CS target LGAs		

¹¹ Reflects staff funded by USAID only

¹² Includes admin, financial, clerical staff and drivers

Draft

JHU/PCS

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: 13 program; 6 support	Field Offices: Kano Enugu Ibadan Bauchi	Staffing: 1 program 2 program 2 program; 2 support 1 program; 3 support
Project states:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lagos, Abia and Kano for CS ▪ Lagos for HIV/AIDS hotline ▪ Sokoto, Niger, Kaduna, Bauchi, Gombe, Adamawa, Enugu, Abia, Rivers, Edo, Ondo, Oyo, Lagos for FP/RH promotion ▪ Oyo, Bauchi, and Enugu for Vision Project 		
Implementation collaborators:	Youth-serving NGOs, PPFN, advertising and research agencies		
Public sector collaboration:	MOI, MOH, National Program on Immunization, NPC		
Target groups:	Adolescents and young adults (15-24), parents & child-minders, opinion leaders		
National activities:	FP/RH mass media campaigns, social mobilization for routine immunization,		
Collaborations with other IPs:	TA in IEC to BASICS, Pathfinder and CEDPA Promotion of IMCI with BASICS		

CEDPA

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: 15 program; 6 support	Field Offices: Kano Enugu Benue (using local govt. facility) Jos (Packard funded)	Staffing: 2 program; 1 support 2 program; 5 support 1 program; 3 support
Project states:	Lagos, Oyo, Plateau, Ondo, Ekiti, Anambra, Osun, Enugu, Gombe, Kano, Benue		
Implementation collaborators:	PPFN, women and youth groups, faith-based organizations, community stakeholders (religious leaders, elected officials, etc.)		
Public sector collaboration:	LGAs		
Target groups:	Men and women of reproductive age, adolescents, OVC and care providers		
National activities:	None		
Collaborations with other IPs:	PSI/SFH for commodity social marketing, logistics management training and FP promotion; JHU/PCS for IEC; Vision Project		

Draft

ENGENDER HEALTH

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: 6 program; 10 support	Field Offices: Ibadan Enugu Bauchi	Staffing: 2 program; 4 support 2 program; 4 support 1 program
Project states:	Oyo, Bauchi, Enugu (Vision focal states) Cross Rivers, Ekiti, Benue, Kano, Kaduna, Plateau, Ogun, Abia, Anambra		
Implementation collaborators:	University teaching hospitals, public and private healthcare facilities, commercial healthcare facilities		
Public sector collaboration:	FMOH		
Target groups:	Armed Forces, national police, healthcare providers, men & women of reproductive age		
National activities:	FP/RH for armed forces and national police		
Collaborations with other IPs:	JHU/PCS for counseling training; Pathfinder on armed forces project; JHU/PCS, PSI/SFH and INTRAH for the Vision Project.		

POLICY PROJECT/FUTURES GROUP

Central Office: Abuja	Staffing: 3 program; 5 support	Field Offices: None	Staffing:
Project states:	N/A		
Implementation collaborators:	Civil society networks and coalitions, NGOs		
Public sector collaboration:	Federal institutions such as NPC, NACA, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Women's Affairs and Youth Development		
Target groups:	Policy making bodies		
National activities:	Development of national population policy, development of interim HIV/AIDS strategy, development of OVC strategy		
Collaborations with other IPs:	FHI and CEDPA in development of national policies on RH and HIV/AIDS		

Draft

PATHFINDER

Central Office: Lagos	Staffing: 2 program; 1.5 support	Field Offices: Kaduna (Packard funded)	Staffing:
Liaison office in Abuja (temp. co-shared with Futures)	1 program (funded by other donor)		
Project states:	Armed forces and Police in Lagos, Ojo, and Kano. Ondo, Abia and Delta Benue,		
Implementation collaborators:	Religious leaders, market women, Patani LGA, CPH, PPFN, Armed Forces Reproductive Health Committee, Officers' Wives Association, public and private hospitals		
Public sector collaboration:	State MOH, State MOE, National Primary Healthcare Development Agency		
Target groups:	Youth, men and women of reproductive age		
National activities:			
Collaborations with other IPs:	Joint project activities with EH for Armed Forces and National Police PSI/SFH and PPFN on contraceptive supply JHU, FHI on IEC materials development for armed forces JHU, EH, FHI and CEDPA on increasing integration of FP & HIV/AIDS at the community level		

POPULATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL/SOCIETY FOR FAMILY HEALTH

Central Office: Abuja (projected 8/15/02)	Staffing: 41 (funded by DfID)	Regional Offices: Lagos, Aba, Abuja, Benin, Calabar, Enugu, Ibadan, Jos, Kano, Maiduguri, Makurdi, Sokoto	Staffing: 4 professional staff/office, +1 driver (funded by DfID)
Project states:	National coverage		
Implementation collaborators:	Group Africa and other artistic groups, ad agencies, National Youth Service Corps, research & marketing agencies, wholesale distributors, pharmacies		
Public sector collaboration:	Federal: NACA, NASCP, Dept. of Communications, FMOI, MOE, Women's Affairs & Youth, State: SACA, MOE, MOI Local: LACA		
Target groups:	Men and women of reproductive age, youth		
National activities:	Mass media, mid-media, inter-personal communications to increase demand for FP and HIV prevention.		
Collaborations with other IPs:	JHU, CEDPA, & FHI contributed to development of radio drama Commodity supply and logistics management to all Ips.		

Draft

AFRICARE

Central Office: Abuja	Staffing: 2 program; 5 support (funded by other donors)	Field Offices: Port Harcourt	Staffing: 4
Project states:	Rivers		
Implementation collaborators:	Forward Africa, Ogoni Youth Project		
Public sector collaboration:	SMOH		
Target groups:	OVC and caregivers		
National activities:			
Collaborations with other IPs:	CEDPA		

Draft

Appendix B

USAID Funding for PHN Sector

Draft

**USAID Funding for PHN Sector
FY2001
(US\$)**

Implementing Partner	Child Survival	RH/FP	HIV/AIDS	Totals
BASICS II				
Supplemental Immuniz.	1,500,000			
Routine Immunization	1,400,000			
Nutrition	500,000			
Malaria	500,000			
Subtotal	3,900,000			3,900,000
JHU/CCP	1,000,000	600,000	500,000	2,100,000
NetMark	1,600,000			1,600,000
Harvard IID (Research)	600,000			600,000
PSI/SFH		600,000	2,000,000	2,600,000
CEDPA*		800,000	600,000	1,400,000
Engender Health		990,000	100,000	1,090,000
Pathfinder		565,000		565,000
Futures-Policy		500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000
MEASURE	40,000	200,000	125,000	365,000
FHI			6,000,000	6,000,000
USAID (contraceptives)		2,150,000		2,150,000
DELIVER		100,000	50,000	150,000
Totals	7,140,000	6,505,000	10,375,000	24,020,000

*Africare is a sub-grantee to CEDPA for \$300,000 for Orphans & Vulnerable Children.

Draft

**USAID Funding for PHN Sector
FY2002
(US\$)**

Implementing Partner	Child Survival	RH/FP	HIV/AIDS	Totals
BASICS II				
Supplemental Immuniz.	1,700,000			
Routine Immunization	1,400,000			
Nutrition	1,000,000			
Malaria	540,000			
Subtotal	4,640,000			4,640,000
JHU/CCP	1,100,000	750,000		1,850,000
NetMark	1,200,000			1,200,000
Harvard IID (Research)	525,000			525,000
PSI/SFH		600,000		600,000
CEDPA		800,000		800,000
Engender Health		1,000,000		1,000,000
Engender Health-Vision		4,569,000		
Pathfinder		631,000		631,000
Futures-Policy		505,000		505,000
MEASURE		845,000		845,000
FHI				-
USAID (contraceptives)		1,900,000		1,900,000
DELIVER		116,000		116,000
Totals	7,465,000	11,716,000	-	14,612,000

Draft

Appendix C

Subagreement Funding for PHN Priority States

**Subagreement Funding for PHN Priority States
FY 2001**

	CS		FP/RH		HIV/AIDS	
	No. of Sub-agreements	Amount (US\$)	No. of Sub-agreements	Amount (US\$)	No. of Sub-agreements	Amount (US\$)
Lagos						
BASICS*	15	?				
FHI					13	1,443,225
CEDPA			3	104,395		
JHU					1	98,083
Subtotal:	15	?	3	104,395	14	1,541,308
Kano						
BASICS*	13	?				
FHI					9	385,886
CEDPA			2	61,060		
Pathfinder			1	18,264		
EH			1	10,000		
Subtotal:	13		4	89,324	9	385,886
Abia						
BASICS*	7	?				
FHI					2	115,290
Pathfinder			1	19,420		
EH			1	10,000		
Subtotal:	7		2	29,420	2	115,290
Bauchi						
Vision			TBD	TBD		
Subtotal:		0		0		0
Enugu						
Vision			TBD	TBD		
CEDPA			1	11,164		
Subtotal:			1	11,164		
Oyo						
EH			2	20,000		
CEDPA			1	33,154		
Vision			TBD	TBD		
Subtotal:			3	53,154		
Taraba						
FHI					10	715,160
Subtotal:					10	715,160
Anambra						
CEDPA			1	38,933		
FHI					9	448,624
EH			1	10,000		
Subtotal:			2	48,933	9	448,624

NOTES: BASICS does not enter into subagreements

JHU PPFN subagreement not broken down by state

PSI present in all states but does not enter into subagreements

Draft

Appendix D

USAID Funded Implementing Partners FTE Staffing By Sub- Sector

Draft

**USAID Funded Implementing Partners FTE Staffing
By Sub-Sector (as of February, 2002)**

Page 1

Implementing Partner	Child Survival	RH/FP	HIV/AIDS	D&G	General Admin.	Transport	JSMB	Other Donors	Totals
CEDPA									
Central Office		8.00	1.00	5.70	6.00			0.30	21.00
Kano Office		0.75		1.00	1.00			0.25	3.00
Enugu Office		0.80	0.20	1.00	3.00	2.00			7.00
Jos Office		0.50			2.00	1.00		2.50	6.00
Otukpo, Benue			1.00		2.00	1.00			4.00
Subtotal		10.05	2.20	7.70	14.00	4.00	0.00	3.05	41.00
BASICS									0.00
Central Office	11.75				8.90		15.35		36.00
Lagos Field Off.	3.00				3.00				6.00
Abuja Office	1.00				1.00				2.00
Kano Office	5.00				3.00		7.00		15.00
Aba Office	4.00				3.00	1.00			8.00
Subtotal	24.75				18.90	1.00	22.35		67.00
JHU/PCS***									0.00
Central Office	3.50		5.50	4.00	4.00		2.00		19.00
Ibadan Office		1.50			0.50	2.00			4.00
Enugu Office		1.00		1.00					2.00
Kano Office	0.34	0.33		0.33				3.00	4.00
Bauchi		1.00			2.00	1.00			4.00
Subtotal	3.84	3.83	5.50	5.33	6.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	33.00
FHI*									0.00
Central Office			8.00		4.20		8.80		21.00
Lagos Field Off.			3.00		2.00				5.00
Kano Office			3.00		2.00				5.00
Taraba Office			3.00		2.00	1.00			6.00
Anambra Office			3.00		2.00	1.00			6.00
Subtotal			20.00		12.20	2.00	8.80		43.00
Total at JSMB Lagos	15.25	8.00	17.50	9.70	25.10	0.00	26.15	0.30	102.00

**USAID Funded Implementing Partners FTE Staffing
By Sub-Sector (as of February, 2002)**

Page 2

Implementing Partner	Child Survival	RH/FP	HIV/AIDS	D&G	General Admin.	Transport	JSMB	Other Donors	Totals
Engender Health**									
Central Office		5.70	0.30		7.00	3.00			16.00
Enugu Office		2.00			3.00	1.00			6.00
Ibadan Office		2.00			3.00	1.00			6.00
Bauchi Office		1.00							1.00
Subtotal		10.70	0.30		13.00	5.00			29.00
Pathfinder									0.00
Central Office		2.15			1.50	1.00		12.35	17.00
Policy-Futures									
Central Office		1.50	2.50		5.00				9.00
Africare									
Central Office								9.00	9.00
Port Harcourt			1.00		3.00				4.00
Lagos Field Off.								1.00	1.00
Subtotal			1.00		3.00			10.00	14.00
PSI/SFH****									
Central Office								41.00	41.00
Field Offices								48.00	48.00
Subtotal								89.00	89.00
GRAND TOTALS	28.59	28.23	31.50	13.03	74.10	16.00	33.15	117.40	342.00

*FHI will staff each field office with 3 program staff, two admin staff and an office assistant. This chart includes the open positions.

FHI is also currently recruiting for 4 more program staff at the central office.(These positions are not included in the chart)

**Engender Health - One of the program staff in central office is a JHU employee working on Vision.

***JHU - in transition in Enugu and Ibadan field offices as D&G will end and Vision is beginning. The numbers of staff listed in these field offices may change.

****PSI/SFH receives funds from USAID for RH and HIV, but all staff are paid by DFID.

Draft

Appendix E

Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency to Abuja

**Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency to Abuja
(17 staff moving)
(High Estimate)**

Expense Category	Description	Unit Cost	Quantity	Amount (Naira)	Dollar Equivalent (116N=\$1)
Move Coordination	3 trips/4 days /2people				
Transportation	airfare+car hire	20,000	6	120,000	1,034
Lodging		11,000	24	264,000	2,276
Per diem	CEDPA estimate	5,700	24	136,800	1,179
Subtotal	Move Coordination			520,800	4,490
Staff Relocation					
Air tickets	One round trip air ticket for each staff member to find residential housing	14,000	17	238,000	2,052
Household goods	Based on USAID allowance	323,000	17	5,491,000	47,336
Air tickets	family of five (17 staff)	7,000	85	595,000	5,129
Temporary Quarters	2 rooms per family @ 7000 per room (USAID allowance) for 30 days (one room 5 staff, 2 rooms 12 staff)	7,000	870	6,090,000	52,500
Meal allowance	single (2 staff)	2,960	60	177,600	1,531
(USAID allow)	married, no children (3 staff)	5,920	90	532,800	4,593
(USAID allow)	married, with children (12 staff)	8,880	360	3,196,800	27,559
Housing adjustment	USAID Allowance (average of FSN 3-12) (360,670+238,697+126,106)/3	241,824	34	8,222,016	70,879
Subtotal	Staff Relocation			24,543,216	211,579
Office furnishings Shipment	Twice the USAID allowance for a household	323,000	2	646,000	5,569
Rent-Abuja	Cedpa estimate 45,000+15%	6,003,000	1	6,003,000	51,750
Agency Fees		600,300	1	600,300	5,175
Legal Fees		300,150	1	300,150	2,588
Subtotal	Rent-Abuja	6,903,450		6,903,450	59,512
Lagos Field Office					
Rent + Fees	approximately 1/2 of Pathfinder	575,000	1	575,000	4,957
Subtotal	Lagos Field Office	575,000		575,000	4,957
GRAND TOTAL				33,188,466	286,107

Draft

**Estimated Costs of Moving One Agency to Abuja
(17 staff moving)
(Low Estimate)**

Expense Category	Description	Unit Cost	Quantity	Amount (Naira)	Dollar Equivalent (116N=\$1)
Move Coordination	3 trips/3 days /2people				
Transportation	airfare+car hire	20,000	6	120,000	1,034
Lodging		11,000	18	198,000	1,707
Per diem		5,700	18	102,600	884
Subtotal				420,600	3,626
Staff Relocation					
Household goods	Based on Cedpa estimate	20,000	17	340,000	2,931
Air tickets	family of five (17 staff)	7,000	85	595,000	5,129
Temporary Quarters	2 rooms per family @ 5900 per room for 30 days (one room 5 staff, 2 rooms 12 staff)	5,900	870	5,133,000	44,250
Meal allowance	single (2 staff)	2,960	60	177,600	1,531
(USAID allow)	married, no children (3 staff)	5,920	90	532,800	4,593
(USAID allow)	married, with children (12 staff)	8,880	360	3,196,800	27,559
Housing adjustment	Cedpa estimate	103,381	17	1,757,477	15,151
Subtotal	Staff Relocation			11,732,677	101,144
Office furnishings Shipment	Cedpa estimate	300,000	1	300,000	2,586
Rent-Abuja	See Table ? Policy- 9740N *25 sq.m*17 people	4,139,500	1	4,139,500	35,685
Agency Fees		413,950	1	413,950	3,569
Legal Fees		206,975	1	206,975	1,784
Subtotal	Rent-Abuja	4,760,425		4,760,425	41,038
Lagos Field Office					
Rent + Fees	similar to field offices in states	400,000	1	400,000	3,448
Subtotal	Lagos Field Office	400,000		400,000	3,448
GRAND TOTAL				17,613,702	151,842

Draft

Appendix F

Questions for IP Resident Advisors

Questions for IP Resident Advisors
Assessment of USAID's Administrative Support to IPs

Program scope

1. In which areas (CS, HIV/AIDS and FP/RH) are you working (under all funding sources and under USAID funding)?
2. What strategies, activities are you engaged in? (tick off attached list).
3. Please give us a list of the geographic areas in which you conduct your program activities currently and where you plan to be within the next two years. With how many LGAs are you working in each state?
4. Who are the beneficiaries/target groups of your projects?
5. Who are your implementation collaborators (NGOs, public entities, commercial agencies, etc.)

Field Offices

6. Where are your field/liaison offices currently located? Do you have plans to open new offices within the next two years? Would you consider sharing space with other IPs working in the same geographic area? Would you consider being housed within LGAs if that were an option?
7. How many staff do you have in each field office? What type of staff? Program? Administrative?
8. *For JSMB members.* How would you describe the experience of JSMB shared field offices? Pros, cons?
9. If you have no plans to open field offices within geographical areas where you have program activities, could you use assistance with transportation or logistical support from IPs who have field offices there? Could you use occasional office space within the IPs field office?
10. Please provide coverage and service data from field offices, and number of subagreements monitored by the field offices.

Relations with USAID

11. What is your current contractual/funding arrangement with USAID? Get dates where appropriate.
12. Please describe the nature of your communications with USAID. Were they markedly different when the Mission was located in Lagos? Are you satisfied with the current arrangement?

Collaboration with public sector

13. Are you currently collaborating with any public entities (Federal, state, LGA)? Do you have plans to increase your collaboration with the public sector within the next two years?
14. Where is the leadership for your sub-sector (HIV/AIDS, CS, or FP/RH) coming from?

Central Office

15. What is your legal status in Nigeria?
16. How adequate are the facilities you occupy now – with regard to physical space, communications, location, security, and future growth?
17. What are your views regarding having your central office located in Lagos? Is this the most logical location for you, given your current and future program operations, collaboration with other IPs, access to USAID and access to government agencies with whom you need to interact? Would Abuja be more logical?
18. If Abuja would be a more logical location, how difficult a move would that be for you with regard to staffing, disruption of program activities, finding appropriate office space etc.? Or would you prefer to consider a liaison office? If so, would you consider a joint liaison office with other IPs?
19. Would you maintain a field office in Lagos?

Collaboration with other IPs

20. Which IPs do you collaborate with in the implementation of your programs? Please describe nature of activities.
21. Have you been involved in joint programming with other IPs?

Draft

22. Do you attend IP monthly meetings? Are you satisfied with the content of these meetings?
23. *For JSMB members.* Has your participation in JSMB facilitated program collaboration/synergies? How?
24. Did you participate in the IP collaboration meeting action plan which took place last Spring? How useful was that? How feasible is the implementation of the action plan?

Management and Administration

25. What is your current administrative arrangement? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this arrangement?
26. Please provide a copy of your organizational chart.
27. *For JSMB members only.* What was the raison d'être of the JSMB? Is that still valid today? Should this arrangement be pursued? Should any changes be introduced?
28. Should JSMB be expanded to include other PHN IPs?
29. What would be the impact on JSMB if all members should move to Abuja? If only certain of the current four members moved?

Draft

Appendix G

SOW MEDS Project Assessment

MEDS Project
Scope of Work
Assessment of USAID/Nigeria's Implementing Partners' (IPs) Current
Administrative System through the Joint Services Management Board (JSMB), the
Lagos location of most IPs and the Location of Field Offices

I. Background

Since the 1980s, when the Nigeria Mission had a large PHN program, through a major downsizing in the early 1990s and continuing through the restrictive and constrained years of military rule, USAID/Nigeria's Implementing Partners have been a reasonably close-knit group. At least four of them have consistently occupied the same building and share facilities and logistics and this arrangement has worked more or less well during this time. Since the democratic transition, however, the USAID/Nigeria PHN program has expanded from its previous sole focus on NGO programs implemented in a number of states nationwide. Presently it increasingly focuses on public-private partnerships in select states accompanied by increased interaction and technical assistance to the Federal Ministry of Health in Abuja. A comprehensive and thorough stocktaking of the current administrative arrangement (JSMB), the location of field offices, and the Lagos location of most IP offices dealing with USAID programming and its impact on PHN programming needs to be conducted. The result of this assessment should be recommendations for the most cost-efficient and program-effective way forward in terms of administrative arrangements for the IPs as USAID prepares for a long-term sustainable development strategy to be accompanied by even more aggressive collaboration across program sectors (health, education, democracy, economic growth) and PHN sub-sectors (Reproductive Health/Family Planning, Child Survival, HIV/AIDS).

All but two of USAID's current roster of ten IPs has headquarters located in Lagos. The newest IP, The Futures Group, located immediately in the capital city of Abuja where most of their work takes place. Africare has very recently moved (in August 2001) their headquarters from Lagos, where they have been located since at least mid-1980, to Abuja. Of the remaining eight IPs, four have been co-located in the same building, first sharing space with USAID in Lagos and then, when USAID began expanding its staff, moving to a site close by the mission. The four IPs co-located in the same building in Lagos are BASICS (first I and now II), JHU/CCP, CEDPA, and FHI. The remaining IPs in Lagos are EngenderHealth, PSI/SFH, Pathfinder, and NetMark (NetMark has yet to establish a full-time office presence in Nigeria). Except for NetMark, the others immediately aforementioned have long-established offices and settled staff in the Lagos environment. With the exception of BASICS and NetMark, they also have considerable amounts of non-USAID funding. While there are plans for all IPs to more closely coordinate their respective activities in the health field, there are no plans just now for any physical co-location to include the four "independents." The "Core Four" IPs that form the JSMB have, over time, established an efficient

Draft

working relationship of shared resources, such that they share a motor pool and divide responsibility for items such as rent, utilities, insurance and communication support (computer systems and telephones). The administrative mechanism for this arrangement is called the Joint Services Management Board (JSMB), with the chairmanship rotating each year to the next-in-line Country Director of one of the four IPs. Financial responsibilities associated with program administration have been allocated proportionately according to the amount each IP receives from USAID.

The breakdown of areas of interest and expertise for each of the named IPs are as follows:

BASICS II	-	Child Survival
JHU/CCP	-	IEC support for RH/FP, CS, HIV/AIDS
FHI	-	HIV/AIDS
CEDPA	-	CS, FP/RH, D&G, HIV/AIDS
Futures Group	-	HIV/AIDS, FP/RH
AfriCare	-	Vulnerable Children (HIV/AIDS)
EngenderHealth	-	FP/RH
PSI/SFH	-	HIV/AIDS, FP/RH
Pathfinder	-	HIV/AIDS, FP/RH
NetMark	-	Malaria

II. Scope of Work

The purpose of this SOW is to provide USAID/Nigeria and its Implementing partners with the objective data needed with which to make critical decisions regarding the future placement of USAID program-related offices.

Objectives

- To ascertain the most appropriate administrative model for maximizing PHN program efficiency and impact, for all IPs implementing PHN programs
- To document the geographic spread of each IP in terms of where they work and with whom they work
- To determine the most appropriate field office configuration for maximum program impact and efficiency
- To ascertain which IPs require field offices and where they should ideally be located
- To determine the most effective location from which IPs can manage the overall implementation of their USAID-funded projects
- To assess the impact of a move to Abuja on IP staff members if such a move is deemed advisable
- To determine the impact on JSMB of a move to Abuja if all IPs move and if only one or two IPs move
- To ascertain the cost to USAID of any move or reconfiguration of IP administration

1. What is the most effective administrative model for in-country Implementing Partners in order to maximize PHN program efficiency and impact (consider the

Draft

current JSMB, field office and independent office models, the move to Abuja of IPs who collaborate with the federal government, alternative models and cost implications for USAID)?

2. What is the geographic spread of Implementing Partner programs in terms of where they work and with whom they work
3. What is the current resource spread – human and financial – and how it contributes to overall impact of program (by sub-sector CS, RH/FP, HIV/AIDS; by state, by IP?)
4. How can the field offices become more efficient? Can field office sites be coordinated (Coordination of resources, program implementation, logistics, etc.)? (UNICEF pattern of 4 zonal offices, WHO state offices model)
5. Where is the best place for each IP to have their main USAID activity coordination office – Lagos, Abuja?
6. Who needs liaison offices and where should they be?
7. What will be the impact of a major move to Abuja on each staff member (FSN and ex-pat)?
8. What will be the impact on JSMB of a move to Abuja? If all move? If only certain of the current four members move?
9. Do all IP main offices for USAID activity coordination need to be in the same place (town) to maximize program impact?
10. What is the cost to USAID if only certain or all IPs move their offices to Abuja from Lagos?

Review Methods

The Review Team will:

- Review current JSMB structure and its advantages and disadvantages
- Review current and proposed field offices and their functionality
- Interview Country Director of each IP
- Interview USAID program staff and GDO
- Conduct field assessments of each Field Office of every IP, including interviews with relevant staff in each
- Interview program people in each IP (including field staff)
- Review the Organogram of each IP
- Review the operating procedures for each IP
- Review work plan of each IP through at least 2003

Review Team Deliverables

At the conclusion of the assessment, the review team will produce:

- A detailed, written report of findings in terms of the current IP administrative structure – what works and what doesn't work
- Detailed recommendations for alternate IP administrative structure(s) taking into consideration human and financial as well as programmatic implications and what the proposed modifications

Draft

imply in terms of time required to execute them and potential program impact.

Team Composition

The three-person team comprised of two international consultants and one local consultant should contain the following mix of skills and background:

- Strong financial background and experience
- Strong managerial background and experience
- In depth knowledge of NGOs and their operations
- Sensitivity to PHN program implications
- Field experience
- Strong analytical skills
- Deep understanding of health program issues
- Thorough knowledge of USAID systems and procedures
- Broad experience/understanding of all three sub-sectors of PHN/Nigeria
- Most critically, ability to synthesize disparate information and data into a coherent whole for presentation and clear, unambiguous recommendations.
- Computer Skills