

Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria (ESPPIN)

Report of Baseline Study of the Implementation
of Social Protection Programmes in Nigeria

Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice
(ANEEJ)

With support of Bread for the Word – Protestant Development Service
(Germany)

Thursday, April 29, 2021

Published by ANEEJ – Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice

39 Oyaide Avenue Off Benoni Road Benin City, Edo, NIGERIA

www.aneej.org

Copyright©2018 ANEEJ – Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice

All Rights Reserved

ANEEJ asserts the copyright to this publication but any of the text or information in this report may be used or quoted provided the author is properly referenced

Contact: info@aneej.org

ISBN 978-978-994-130-8

Acronyms

ANE EJ	Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice
CBT	Community Based Testing Team
CSDP	Community and Social Development Programme
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CTF	Cash Transfers Facilitators
DRGs	Debt Relief Gains
ERGP	Economic Recovery and Growth Plan
ESPPIN	Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FG	Federal Government
FS	Federating States
FMHDS	Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development
GEEP	Government Enterprises and Empowerment Programme
GEST	Girls Empowerment Skills Training
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
HUP	Household Uplifting Programme
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
LGAs	Local Government Areas
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NASSCO	National Social Safety Nets Coordinating Office
NASSP	National Social Safety Nets Project
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Developments Strategy
NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
NCTO	National Cash Transfers Office
NCTP	National Cash Transfers Programme
NHGSFP	National Home Grown School Feeding Programme
NPHCDA	National Primary Health Care Development Agency
NSITF	Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund
NSIO	National Social Investment Office
NSR	National Social Register
NSPP	National Social Protection Policy
N-SIP	National Social Investment Programme
PenCom	National Pension Commission
PUWOV	Public Works Volunteers Programme
PVHHs	Poor and Vulnerable Households
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SOCU	State Cash Transfer Unit
SOCU	State Operations Coordinating Unit
STEP	Skills Training and Empowerment Programme
TES	TraderMoni' Empowerment Scheme
THR	Take-Home Rations
SURE-P	Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme and Social Investment Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
YAGEP	Youth Agricultural Entrepreneurship Programme
YCAD	Youths in Commercial Agriculture
YESSO	Youth Employment and Social Support Operations

Table of Contents

Acronyms, 3

Table of Contents, 4

Acknowledgement, 5

Executive Summary, 5

Introduction
(Part I), 8

Methods
(Part II), 11

Policy and Institutional Framework
(Part III), 14

National Social Investment Programme:
An Overview
(Part IV), 16

Part V: Levels of Implementation of Social
Protection Programmes in Nigeria
(Part V), 21

Impact and Challenges of N-SIP
in Five Nigerian States
(Part VI), 24

Conclusion
(Part VII), 29

References, 32

NSSP Policy Measures and Thematic Areas
(Annexure I), 38

NSIP – Programmes, Objectives and Target Beneficiaries
(Annexure II), 39

Status of N-SIP in Nigeria and Five Target States
(Annexure III), 40

Status of Social Protection Policy
(Annexure IV), 47

Stakeholders List
(Annexure V), 48

Key Informant Interview Guide
(Annexure VI), 49

Participants at the Zoom Meeting Held on Tuesday, April 27, 2021
Annexure VII, 50

Acknowledgement

The Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice (ANEEJ) wishes to appreciate everyone who, in one way or the other, contributed to the successful completion of the baseline study of the implementation of the Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria (ESPPIN) project. The ESPPIN project remains our contribution to reduction of poverty plaguing millions of Nigerians, most of whom are in very precarious conditions without the basic needs of life.

First, our appreciation goes to Bread for the World – Protestant Development Service (Germany) who provided the funds for this baseline study and for the commencement of the three-year project.

We also appreciate our consultant, Dr. Oscar E. Ubhenin who led the research team that undertook this study. Our appreciation also goes to the project stakeholders, including the Federal Government of Nigeria, and the governments of the five benefiting states, namely: Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti, as well as civil society leaders in the target states for their cooperation with the research team vide the Key Informant Interviews.

Finally, we appreciate the supervisory role played by the Deputy Executive Director of ANEEJ, Mr. Leo Atakpu and other ANEEJ team leaders for their roles in ensuring the successful completion of this study.

Rev. David Ugolor

Executive Director, ANEEJ

Executive Summary

I. Introduction

The National Social Investment Programme (N-SIP) is the flagship of the current administration led by President Muhammadu Buhari. N-SIP coincides with Mr. President's desire to lift 100 million Nigerians out of poverty within the next 10 years. By its adoption in the sub-national level, N-SIP is beginning to occupy a space in inter-governmental programme formulation and implementation. However, the pace of adoption by the Nigerian Federating States (FS) is rather insufficient, hence the project 'Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria' (ESPPIN), implemented by the Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice (ANEEJ), with the support of Bread for World –Protestant Development Service (Germany). This baseline study illuminates the conceptual 'social investment', 'social policy', and 'social protection'. Thereafter, the policy diffusion framework is adopted as a potent lens of viewing public institutions, norms and programmes, as well as the diffusion innovation theory to explain the movement of the N-SIP from the Nigerian Federal Government (FG) as 'innovator', to the states as 'adopters', of the programme.

The methods adopted in this baseline study were a combination of desk research and key informant interviews (KIIs). In identifying the policy and institutional framework, the study draws on decades of 'international commitments' to human well-being, such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the fundamental laws of the land, the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan, as well as the 2017 National Social Protection Policy. The study finds some lessons, which are germane for learning in the course of N-SIP implementation for future practice, particularly, in the five target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti). The lessons learned and recommendations made are highlighted below.

II. Lessons Learned

1. Spending on social protection programmes is a huge investment as evidenced in the sums allowed for the N-SIP (over \$1 billion annually), but timely release of funds is critical to the N-SIP effectiveness.
2. To forestall potential 'mind boggling' graft, the N-SIP would require review, update and upgrade of its accountability and safeguard mechanisms.
3. N-SIP implementation needs the complementary efforts of the state governments to reach the target audience, and achieve faster policy diffusion with effective inclusion of the local governments.
4. Central to human capital development is infrastructure provision and services, which can be addressed via budgetary allocation and funding.
5. Social investment is a 'soft' component of human capital development, and the real diffusion is not in acceptance by the state actors and the people, but in results or outcomes that would follow in years or decades to come.
6. There are overlaps in the Nigerian social protection programme and its implementation as evidenced in the number of terminologies that have been deployed by the government to convey the message.
7. The Nigerian FG's desire to ensure sustainability via the crafting of an executive bill for treatment by the National Assembly shows the current lack of sustainability of the N-SIP.
8. The 2017 NSPP provides room for review every three years. This is to ensure its responsiveness to emerging issues and challenges, including pointers from monitoring and evaluation process.
9. Investment in the research components of the N-SIP is needed to address the data and information gaps of the programmes.

10. The very poor are extremely difficult to target and reach for the purpose of development interventions. This calls for a review of targeting mechanisms for social protection provisioning in Nigeria.

11. Apart from the four cardinal programmes, the target states are also benefitting from other FG's programmes, such as Rural Women Cash Grant (in Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, and Edo), Amnesty Programme (in Bayelsa, Delta, and Edo), FGN/CBN Empowerment Programme and NISRAL Grants (in Bayelsa), and N-SIP Hubs (in Edo).

12. Some of the target states have put in place their own social protection programmes, such as Skill Acquisition Programme and Full School Feeding Programme for 12 boarding schools (in Bayelsa).

13. None of the five target states currently has a social protection policy in place. The good news, however, is that the Government of Edo State has engaged CSOs and other stakeholders (including ANEEJ) in drafting a social protection policy, which would be submitted to government on or before May 30, 2021.

14. There are variations in the institutional partners implementing the N-SIP programmes across the five target states, but the Ministries of Budget and Planning, Education, and Health play key roles in all the states. This is apart from the supervisory roles assigned to political appointees.

15. There are diverse impacts of the N-SIP implementation on beneficiaries in the target states, such as the effective formation of cooperatives (in Anambra's NCTP), lifting people out of poverty (Ekiti's NCTP), expanding businesses (in Bayelsa's TraderMoni), improving the state economy (in Edo).

III. Recommendations

1. The Nigerian state (federal and state) should focus on the timely release of funds allowed for the N-SIP. The local governments should be empowered through available structures to contribute their quota to the effective implementation of the N-SIP.

2. The relevant authorities should take appropriate steps to review, update and upgrade the accountability and safeguard mechanisms of the social protection programmes to forestall potential 'mind boggling' graft in the N-SIP. Experience should be drawn from the country's success stories in anti-corruption.

3. Evidence-based advocacy is needed to draw the attention of state actors to the imperatives of 'faithful' budgetary allocation to the programmes. Such advocacy should be extended to the local government councils within the five target states of the ESPPIN project.

4. The state governments should do the needful by increasing budgetary allocation and funding for infrastructure provision and services.

5. There should be sensitisation of all on the future benefits of social investment as captured by the N-SIP.

6. The on-going review of the 2017 National Social Protection Policy should be extended to streamline the terms and frameworks of the N-SIP.

7. The on-going review of the 2017 National Social Protection Policy should culminate in a draft bill for debates, consideration and approval by the National Assembly, as well as the Houses of Assembly of the States of Nigeria.

8. The federal and state governments should invest on research on social protection programmes. This will help to provide adequate and timely information to interested parties and the general public.

9. There should be a review of the targeting mechanisms for the N-SIP beneficiaries. This will help to ensure that the very poor are covered in the interventions.

PART I

INTRODUCTION

1. Contextual Background

Pre-colonial Africa had existing institutions that were interrupted by the western-inspired state organisations. Prior to colonialism, the peoples of Africa had a reputation for enjoying some access to forms of support from ethnic and mutual aid societies. Extended family and kinship networks helped in the sustenance of social and communal cohesion through their performance of reciprocal duties, obligations and responsibilities (Ubhenin 2017a). Invariably, the state in pre-colonial Africa was defined by either centralisation or fragmentation, and this also inspired the domain of African chiefs and kings (Ubhenin 2017b). Centralised groups were associated with communities with more jurisdictional levels, while the fragmented societies were local communities with lesser jurisdictional levels (Gennaioli, & Rainer 2005). African chiefs and kings formulated social policies, which were passed down to public officials for implementation. To reiterate, however, these policies were altered by colonialism, which introduced targeted social policies for workers in the colonial public services.

During the first half of the twentieth century, Africa's social space was dominated by forced labour. This followed the change in the status of the slaves from export products to producers of raw materials. Forced labour presented the colonial authorities' consideration of indigenous Africans as "no more than simple working tools without basic human rights" (Fall 2002, 5). In general, forced labour prevented the emergence of free labour, and this elicited various forms of resistance from indigenous Africans. In response, some colonial governments gave minor concessions in order to maintain power. For example, Colonial Nigeria's government awarded a cost of living allowance of 20 to 40 percent in response to pressures from the newly formed Nigerian Union of Demobilised Soldiers. Second, further request by labour for a 200 percent increase yielded a 176 percent increase by the colonial government (Falola 2009). Third, the General Strike of 1945 moved the colonial government to set up the Tudor Commission whose report of 1946 recommended a 50 percent increase in workers' salaries, with arrears backdated to 1945 (Ubhenin 2014).

From the foregoing, anti-colonial struggles further gave rise to policy reforms towards better working conditions. On their part, post-independent African states witnessed the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), prescribed by the Bretton Woods Institutions in the 1980s and 1990s. SAP was predicated upon growth and development engendered by stabilisation, liberalisation and privatisation of the economies (*Bretton Woods Update* 2008). By implication, SAP was for a lean social sector, which inspired self-help, family-based solidarity, and community development as mechanisms for social security (Barchiesi 2006). Also, the financial, food and fuel crises, and lately climate change had re-awakened the imperatives for social protection in the continent.

In the ensuing African context, the Nigerian state has established a number of institutions for the implementation of social protection programmes. For example, the National Directorate of Employment's 'Basic National Open Apprenticeship Scheme' is to train people in cosmetology and phone repairs (Ehiaghe 2018). Industrial Training Fund's 'National Industrial Skills Development Programme' trains youths in job skills, such as tailoring and fashion design, welding and fabrication, as well as plumbing and pipefitting (Asishana 2018). Nigeria Social Insurance Trust Fund (NSITF) protects the workforce against risk and occupational hazards, and provide social security for the elderly and unemployed persons. National Pension Commission (PenCom) regulates the reformed pension sector. PenCom has also developed Guidelines and Framework for the Micro Pension Scheme to include the informal economy (PenCom 2018). National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is mandated to administer relief to disaster victims and others in vulnerabilities. However, these institutions established by Acts of Parliament to provide social protection have faced implementation challenges, such as poor remittance (in the case of NSITF) (Oham 2017), and misappropriation (in the case of NEMA) (Abuh 2018).

The Nigerian FG, through its National Planning Commission, made a bold attempt at formulating a broad policy on social protection in 2004. The draft policy was facilitated by a Social Protection

Advisory Group, with representatives from the National Social Protection Commission and the World Bank. The document applied a life-long and gender lens, and captured the socio-economic risks, such as job discrimination and traditional practices. It envisaged four main themes: social assistance, social insurance, child protection and labour markets. In 2005, a National Study on Targeted Safety Net Interventions formed the basis of the Debt Relief Gains (DRGs) negotiated with the Paris Club. This required certain allocation for pro-poor financing of the social sector to advance the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Also, the National Economic Empowerment and Developments Strategy (NEEDS) dedicated a section to safety nets (National Planning Commission 2004).

NEEDS' successor, the Vision 20:2020 allowed a chapter to social protection in Nigeria, which factored into the MDGs implementation, to reduce chronic poverty and hunger by 2015 (Awojobi 2015). NSITF provided leadership to formulate a National Social Security Policy for Inclusiveness, Solidarity and Sustainable Peace and Prosperity by the National Working Committee on Social Security in 2009. This policy was intended to promote human dignity and survival, through mitigation of vulnerabilities due to poverty, unemployment, job loss, ill-health, loss of the breadwinner, old age or other forms of disabilities. However, these attempts at formulating a comprehensive social policy could not go beyond the draft stage because of insufficient political traction (Holmes, Akinrimisi, Morgan, & Buck 2012).

Social protection in Nigeria has evolved into well-coordinated national programmes. At least since 1990, successive Nigerian governments have implemented over 26 social protection programmes (N-SIP 2019). These include supplementation and immunisation (to protect the young from risks of life), basic education (to provide compulsory, universal and qualitative education for the Nigerian child), employment schemes (to combat mass unemployment, with labour-intensive content), pension (to protect the citizens at old age), and health insurance (to promote equity and social justice in health care delivery) (Ajakaiye, & Fakiyesi 2009). In particular, Olusegun Obasanjo's National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) was aimed at providing employment and generating income for the poor, but hampered by administrative and operational challenges (Antai, & Anam 2014). Umaru Yar'Adua's Seven-Point Agenda (and its Vision 20:2020) sought to reduce chronic poverty and hunger by 2015 (Awojobi 2015), but were derailed by the unemployment of a significant number of the productive segment of the population (Ahiuma-Young 2018). Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme and Social Investment Programme (SURE-P) by the Goodluck Jonathan led FG was intended to 'socially protecting' the Nigerian citizens, but its operations were 'tainted with corruption and politics' (Okakwu 2015). The current N-SIP replaces SURE-P. However, initial reports pointed to inadequate funding and fraudulent practices, such as short-changing, racketeering, harassment of beneficiaries, and exploitation of the vulnerable in the NSIP implementation (Daka 2018).

In summary, the challenges associated with past social protection programmes included: weak synergy between the units of government, failure to address fundamental issues of identification, unreliable mechanisms for targeting beneficiaries, lack of a credible and harmonised data base for planning, weak monitoring and evaluation systems, poor grievance and redress management processes, poor coordination (among donor, government and partners), lack of transparency, limited scale and coverage, as well as lack of accountability and ability to accurately measure impact (N-SIP 2019). In particular, the Nigerian FG had responded to insufficient political traction by approving the National Social Protection Policy in 2017, to provide social justice, equity and all-inclusive growth, using a transformative mechanism for the mitigation of poverty and unemployment (*Vanguard* 2017).

Arguably, social protection system in Nigeria has been steadily built historically through various administrations up until the current N-SIP. These efforts, notwithstanding, poverty still abounds in Nigeria. For the umpteenth time, President Muhammadu Buhari has re-affirmed his administration's resolve to lift 100 million Nigerians out of poverty within the next 10 years (Ogundele 2021). This is commendable, and the social protection programmes of the Nigerian FG are being complemented by the Nigerian Federating States (FS). For example, Kaduna State Governor, Nasir el-Rufai recently launched the state social protection policy to provide a safety net for the poor and vulnerable in the state (Asadu 2021). Support by the Nigerian FS for social protection is also evidenced in the implementation of the National Social Investment Programme (N-SIP), and its cardinal programmes: Job Creation (N-Power), National

Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (NHGSFP), and Government Enterprises and Empowerment Programme (GEEP), National Cash Transfers Programme (NCTP). However, the N-SIP has been extended to capture additional two programmes, namely: Community and Social Development Programme (CSDP) as well as Youth Employment and Social Support Operations (YESSO). Another programme pertains to the N-SIP Hubs, a technology-based innovation programme implemented in a state in each of the six geo-political zone.

The foregoing, notwithstanding, N-SIP programmes have yet to receive sufficient support from the Nigerian FG. This is in view of the federal architecture of the entire country, which does not support seamless diffusion of policies and programmes. In response to the foregoing, the Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice (ANE EJ) is implementing the development project ‘Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria’ (ESPPIN), with support of Protestant Development Service, ‘Bread for the World’ (Germany). This study will form the basis for assessing the effectiveness of ESPPIN project in the course of its implementation.

2. Purpose of the Study

From the terms of reference (ToRs) of this consultancy, the purpose is to carry out a baseline study of the social protection programmes as initiated and implemented by the Nigerian FG led by President Muhammadu Buhari (from inception in 2016 to February 2021). In specific terms, the baseline study is expected to:

- (i) Show the state of social protection in Nigeria (both at national and sub-national levels),
- (ii) Assess the impact (whether positive or negative) as well as the challenges of the aforementioned social protection programmes,
- (iii) Indicate any learnings in the course of implementation of specific programmes.
- (iv) Examine the level of implementation of the social investment programmes in the five target states.
- (v) Identify all institutional frameworks and policies that support any social protection programme in the five target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo and Ekiti).

3. Relevance of Research Findings

It is envisaged that the findings of this research will initially be for the private consumption of ANEEJ and other stakeholders in the course of implementation of the project, ‘Enhancing Social Protection Programme in Nigeria’ (ESPPIN). Second, the study findings will be extended to actors in government at national and sub-national levels, civil society organisations (CSOs) and media practitioners involved in monitoring the implementation of the social protection programmes. Third, the outputs will shed light on possible institutional and legal reforms of social policy in Nigeria. Fourth, the findings will provide a basis for policy learning and transfer of social protection programmes in Nigeria and elsewhere.

PART II

METHODS

1. Conceptual Framework

In developing an effective framework for this study, the concepts, ‘social investment’, ‘social policy’, and ‘social protection’ are illuminated. Thereafter, the policy diffusion framework is adopted as a potent lens for viewing public institutions, norms and programmes, as well as the diffusion innovation theory to explain the movement of the N-SIP from the Nigerian FG as ‘innovator’ to the Nigerian FS as ‘adopters’ of the programme. The literature (Giddens 1998) conceptualises social investment as a normative move towards spending more on people empowerment, and in the main, N-SIP seeks to achieve this objective. Social investment is a complementary mechanism to the ‘new’ and ‘active’ welfare state in reducing ‘cash heavy’ social policies, thereby maintaining budgetary equilibrium and promoting economic growth (Hummelen 2011). Thus, social investment justifies state’s intervention in certain services that are not delivered on the basis of profit, which would bring future gains to the society. Curiously, the discerning mind should expect the gains of N-SIP to the society in years and decades to come.

The foregoing sets the tone for understanding social policy as “the collective public efforts aimed at affecting and protecting the social well-being of people within a given territory” (Adesina 2010, 38). Thus, social policy is an instrument for dealing with publicly-mediated or guaranteed access to publicly provided services, such as education, healthcare, employment, housing, etc. Social policy is directed at inclusive development, defined by micro growth and reduced inequality in human well-being. The building block of social policy is social protection (Miroro 2016). By definition, social protection alludes to a range of public actions that are initiated in response to ranks of vulnerability, risk and deprivation, which are considered socially unacceptable in society (Conway, de Haan, & Norton 2000).

Social protection is primarily intended to ‘protect’ individuals and families from destitution and catastrophic losses of human capital. Also, it falls within the rubric of conflict/disaster recovery and development from the perspectives of human rights protection and safety linked to basic services and/or livelihoods (Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler 2004). The history of social protection is located in social safety nets and humanitarian relief, wherein assistance was provided on a ‘discretionary’ rather than an ‘entitlement’ basis. In the past, recipients were labelled as aid beneficiaries. In current practice, however, social protection has moved beyond this presupposition to identify ‘beneficiaries’ as ‘recipients’, ‘participants’ or even ‘claimants’ (Devereux, McGregor, & Sabates-Wheeler 2011). With its uniqueness in development strategies and the global fight to end poverty, social protection now broadly seeks to ‘protect’ people from hardship due to poverty, ‘prevent’ people from falling into poverty, and ‘promote’ people out of poverty. These objectives are broadly summarised as the ‘3Ps’ (Ulrichs & Roelen 2012).

Social protection systems have been established by many developed and developing countries (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2008). In developed countries, social protection systems have helped people survive, when they work, and taken care of people out of employment. On their part, developing countries have increasingly recognised the importance of social protection in reaching members of the society, especially the poor and vulnerable. In a study by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), nine countries - Nepal, Rwanda, Ghana, Tanzania, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cambodia, Uganda and Lesotho were discovered to have applied social protection to reduce poverty in all its dimensions significantly over the past decade (Samson 2013).

For Nigeria, social protection is becoming a combination of policies and programmes for affecting individuals and households throughout lifecycle, to prevent and reduce poverty and socio-economic shocks by promoting and enhancing livelihoods and a life of dignity. This perspective draws on the 2017 National Social Protection Policy (Federal Government of Nigeria 2017, Sterk, & Issaka 2019). Following Dror’s (1973) definition, this is the major guideline for action on the N-SIP. By design, the N-SIP requires inputs (men, money and materials) from both the Nigerian FG and the Nigerian FS, and perhaps the Local Government Areas (LGAs). Therefore, the programmes are inter-governmental in nature, and implementation may be hindered by a number of factors, such as the constitutional division of powers,

variation in demonstrable interests by federating units, peculiar circumstances of the locality, insufficient funding, and disagreements between centre and units of government (Ubhenin 2019).

One potent lens for viewing these public institutions, norms and programmes is the policy diffusion framework, which is traceable to Mohr (1969) and Walker (1969). For Sabatier (1999), however, the framework was developed by Berry and Berry (1999). There are two models in the context of adoption of new policy programmes by a given state or country: ‘internal determinants’ and ‘diffusion’. By internal determinants model, the adoption of a new policy is determined by the social, economic and political attributes of the state. In this case, policy actions are significantly determined by internal factors. Diffusion models, on the other hand, indicate that a state’s policy adoption is inextricably linked to policy initiatives by other states. By implication states emulate the behaviour of others to adopt a policy. Therefore, “policies are believed to be incremental in the most case; however, there is always policy innovation. It should also be noted that not every policy that countries use is invented by themselves. Some policies are adopted from other countries, which can be defined as policy diffusion” (Gultekin 2014, 63). Also, most policies would demonstrate gradual spread, in a manner that is associated with incremental policy learning and emulation (Boushey 2012).

Policy learning is most appropriate for states or countries that demonstrate similar characteristics or levels of economic development. Thus, there may be challenges in the course of comparison between developing societies and more advanced countries for the purpose of drawing lessons across the divide. For example, the Nigerian 2004 pension reform policy was inspired by the 1981 Chilean experience, and it was anticipated that the direct contributory pension scheme would address economic development and social objectives. However, it has been established in the literature that Nigeria did not possess the necessary preconditions, such as well-regulated capital markets to assimilate pension savings (Casey, & Dostal 2008; Dostal 2010). “Whereas flexibility, similarity and status are often potential sources of encouragement and foundations of policy transfer, it was not however clear why Nigeria decided to copy the Chilean model of pension policy” (Ubhenin 2012, 293). This, itself, is for a lesson.

In explaining the movement of the N-SIP from federal to state levels, this study draws on the diffusion of innovation theory, developed by Everett M. Rogers in 1962. Rogers identified five adopter categories. First, ‘innovators’ are willing to experience new ideas. Second, ‘early adopters’ would put their stamp of approval by adopting a new idea. Third, the ‘early majority’ would deliberately adopt, but they are neither the first nor the last to adopt it. Fourth, the ‘late majority’ actors are skeptical of change, and will only adopt an innovation after it has been tried by the majority. Fifth, compared to the ‘late majority’, ‘laggards’ are more skeptical about innovations and change agents. In addition, Rogers further divided his five categories of adopters into two main groups: ‘earlier adopters’ (comprising innovators, early adopters, and early majority), and ‘later adopters’ (consisting of late majority and laggards) (Rogers 2003, Sahin 2006).

A more appropriate classification for this study is to align the adopters with their period of implementation thus: ‘early adopters’, ‘late majority’ and ‘laggards’, with the Nigerian FG actors as ‘innovators’. For the Nigerian FG was willing to take the risks of huge investing in a robust social protection system for the weak and vulnerable. First, the ‘early adopters’ immediately commenced implementation of the social protection programmes apparently because they had established the required structures. Their implementation period ranges from inception in 2016 to August 2017. Second, the ‘late majority’ states were perhaps skeptical of the success of the N-SIP, and thus only adopted the programmes after they have seen their successes in the pilot states. Their period ranges from September 2017 to November 2019. Third, the ‘laggards’ were yet to implement the social protection programmes before the advent of coronavirus (COVID-19), which eventually took a toll on the already fragile and weak economies (including Nigeria). This implementation ranges from December 2019 to February 2021, when the ESPPIN project commenced. It is also important to mention that some states were ‘early adopters’ in some programmes and ‘laggards’ in others, and vice versa. This typology is adopted to explain implementation of the social protection programmes, particularly in the five target states (see Part V).

2. Methods or Tools

In working with the ToRs of this consultancy, the methods adopted in this research were a combination of desk research and key informant interviews (KIIs). First, the desk research draws on extant literature, publications from relevant agencies, as well as newspaper reports, to chart the data. The internet was very helpful in this regard. Second, the ESPPIN project inception meeting held on Tuesday, Mar. 23, 2021, provided a veritable ground for conversation with stakeholders, which factored into the KIIs. Participants at the inception meeting were drawn from the relevant federal ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) as well as CSOs in Abuja and the five target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti). Proximity of the Edo State Office of the N-SIP enabled the researcher to embark on a field visit for the purpose of physical interview (on Mar. 30, 2021). Thus, the KIIs provided insights into the subject matter, and helped to resolve the potential inconsistencies that arose in the course of data gathering from the various media outlets. The tools also gained further insights from discussion with ANEEJ's M&E staff. This was helpful in refining the scope for appropriateness of the adopted approach. Another window of opportunity was offered by the zoom meeting held on Tuesday, April 27, 2021 at 11:30am. This followed the request by the Senior Special Adviser to the Honourable Minister of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development (Dr. Engr. Umar B. Bindir) as part of sharing the official data. The National Social Investment Office was represented by National Social Safety Net Coordinating Office (NASSCO)'s Stakeholder Engagement & Social Safety Net Manager (Yimave Gyanggyang). **However, the official data were yet to be received as at the point of submitting this report.**

3. Scope and Delimitation of Study

This baseline study covers the implementation of the social protection programme by the Nigerian FG since 2016. The target states are Anambra (in the South-east), Bayelsa, Edo and Delta (in the South-south), and Ekiti (in the South-west). This spread is representative enough in consideration of Nigeria's six geo-political zones, alluding to an informal arrangement, which appears to have worked well for the country's unity and stability, even without its inclusion in the fundamental laws of the land, albeit with recent debates on competence and geography (Nwigwe 2020).

The organisational scope covers the National Social Investment Office (NSIO), which was hosted by the Office of the Vice President, and coordinated the N-SIP (from May 2016), when the social protection programmes were inaugurated by President Muhammadu Buhari (to October 2019), when the Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development (FMHDS) took over the coordination of the N-SIP. This followed the inauguration of the Federal Executive Council by the President, Muhammadu Buhari for a second tenure on Wednesday, August 21, 2019. In addition, this study will be extended to cover the NASSCO, N-Power (Job Creation and Employment Office), Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP) Office, and National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (NHGSFP) Office. Central to this study are the state offices of the N-SIP in Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti. The temporal scope of this study ranges from May 2016 to February 2021.

PART III

POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

‘International Commitments’

Decades of international commitments to human well-being are found in the 1990 Children’s Summit (New York) and Education Summit (Jomtien), 1992 Earth Summit (Rio de Janeiro), 1994 Population Conference (Cairo), 1995 Social Development Summit (Copenhagen) and Women’s Conference (Beijing), and 2000 World Education Forum (Dakar). Also, the United Nations (UN) approved the MDGs in 2000. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development was held in Johannesburg, with emphasis on partnerships in international development. A decade later, in 2012, the UN Conference on Sustainable Development was held. This culminated in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) or the Global Goals, approved in September 2015, to end global poverty, protect the planet and ensure peace and prosperity for all people by 2030. The 17 interconnected goals build on the successes of the MDGs, with inclusion of climate change, economic inequality, innovation, sustainable consumption, peace and justice, among other priorities, as new goals. Curiously, formulation and implementation of the NSIP suggest that Nigerian FG led by President Muhammadu Buhari is committed to the achievement of the SDGs or Global Goals, particularly Goal 1 (no poverty), Goal 2 (zero hunger), Goal 3 (good health and wellbeing), Goal 4 (quality education) Goal 5 (gender equality), Goal 8 (decent work and economic development), Goal 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure), as well as Goal 10 (reduced inequalities).

Other international commitments include:

- (I) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which enshrines right to social security (1948);
- (II) The African Charter on Human and People’s Rights (1981), which advances social protection with the human rights approach;
- (III) The Convention on the Rights of the Child which specifically emphasises children’s rights to social protection (1989);
- (IV) The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC, 1990),
- (V) The UN Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (1995);

‘The Constitution’

The fundamental laws of the land are a guarantee of the general welfare and happiness of the people. Subsection 2(b) of section 14 of the Nigerian 1999 Constitution (as amended) states that “the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government” (Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999). In subsection 1(b) of section 16, the state is to “control the national economy in such manner as to secure the maximum welfare, freedom and happiness of every citizen on the basis of social justice and equality of status and opportunity.” In subsection 3(f) of section 17, the state is to ensure that “children, young persons and the aged are protected against any exploitation whatsoever, and against moral and material neglect.” And in subsection 3(g) of section 17, “provision is made for public assistance in deserving cases or other conditions of need.” Thus, the Constitution aptly demonstrates that primarily, government is preoccupied with “the promotion of the general welfare and happiness of the people within its jurisdiction” (Adebayo 2000, 15).

‘Economic Recovery and Growth Plan’

On Wednesday, April 5, 2017, Nigeria’s President Muhammadu Buhari officially launched the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), a medium-term plan formulated “to haul the economy out of recession and chalk out path to national development” (Adebayo 2017). The ERGP document released on by the Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning on Tuesday, March 7, 2017 was expected to cover the period 2017-2020. Prior to that, the Nigerian government faced hurdles in accessing the funds needed to address economic challenges, including the provision of critical infrastructures. For example, the African Development Bank reportedly held back the last tranche of \$1 billion loan from Nigeria because of the absence a policy framework for that purpose. ERGP envisioned sustained inclusive growth,

increased national productivity, sustainable diversification, and maximum welfare for citizens. It placed emphasis on the use of science, technology and innovation as drivers of growth. Its three main objectives include: restoration of growth, investment in people, and becoming a global competitive economy.

Past development plans have been characterised by mismanagement, lack of coordination, and non-implementation. In response, ERGP was designed to tackle growth constraints like poor business environment; involving the private sector and allowing the market to function; promoting national cohesion, social inclusion and core values like dignity of labour, discipline, integrity, patriotism, religious tolerance, self-reliance, and social justice (Adebayo 2017). In sum, specific measures aimed at improved investments in people, through ERGP, include: ‘health care’, ‘education’, ‘social inclusion’, as well as ‘job creation and youth empowerment’. In particular, ERGP was intended to reduce unemployment from 13.9% (in 2016) to 11.2% (by 2020), through creation of over 15 million direct jobs by 2020; support the private sector to maximise its capability for job creation, as well as complement direct job creation by government. ERGP also relied upon targeted skill-building programmes to improve the employability of the Nigerian workforce. The specific measures show that the four cardinal programmes of the N-SIP, namely: N-Power, NCTP, NHGSFP, and GEEP are highlighted in the ERGP (Sterk, & Issaka 2019).

‘National Social Protection Policy’

The Nigerian Federal Executive Council approved the National Social Protection Policy (NSPP) on July 19, 2017. NSPP addresses vulnerabilities across the lifecycle, in view of the social and economic shocks that individuals and households may face. NSPP was developed within the framework of the ERGP, in consideration of the fact that “expenditures on social protection are necessary investments in people” (cited in Sterk, & Issaka 2019, 10).

The 2017 NSPP is in four chapters. Chapter one introduces the document with a background, the constitution, national development frameworks, international agreements, definition, goals and objectives of social protection, approaches to social protection, as well as principles (of redistribution, universal basic needs, citizenship, human rights, social control, and social inclusiveness). Chapter two reviews the existing social protection situation (including current programmes, gender mainstreaming, aged, and multi-sectoral approach). In chapter three, NSPP presents the policy measures on minimum package; prioritisation and sequencing; short, medium and long term; legislation and regulations; graduation and exits. In detail, the 2017 NSPP includes 15 policy measures which are located in eight thematic areas: ‘education and health services’, ‘social welfare and child protection’, ‘social housing’, ‘livelihood enhancement and employment’, ‘social insurance schemes’, ‘social assistance’, ‘traditional family and community support’, as well as ‘legislation and regulation’ (see annexure I, please). Chapter four covers institutional framework and implementation arrangements, such as coordination and integration as well as monitoring and evaluation.

In a bid to close the obvious gaps in the country’s social protection coverage, NSPP establishes a social protection floor with four elements: (1) access to education and essential health services, (2) income security through family or child benefits, (3) unemployment benefit, and (4) income security in old age (non-contributory pension). In the main, the NSPP seeks to establish a gender-sensitive and age-appropriate framework that would guarantee a minimum social (protection) floor for all Nigerian citizens for a dignifying life. In sum, the 2017 NSPP has 10 objectives: (1) protect individuals and households from shocks that can make fall into extreme poverty, (2) provide guiding principles for managing social protection projects and programmes, (3) promote synergy and coordination among all social protection intervention agencies, (4) provide social welfare and improve food security and nutrition, (5) ensure decent employment and sustainable livelihood, (6) promote social cohesion, equity and growth inclusiveness, (7) empower the poor and people vulnerable to economic shocks, (8) ensure citizens have access to basic social services and infrastructure, (9) enhance human capital development to ensure a life of dignity, and (10) reduce poverty among the people vulnerable to being poor (see Sterk, & Issaka 2019, 11).

PART IV

NATIONAL SOCIAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME: AN OVERVIEW

1. Introduction

The National Social Investment Programme (N-SIP) was conceived by the Nigerian Federal Government (FG) led by President Muhammadu Buhari to address key social concerns in the country. N-SIP is the outcome of Buhari's electoral promises during the 2015 electioneering. N-SIP followed the effective inauguration of APC led government at the federal level on May 29, 2015 (Daka 2017). N-SIP implementation commenced in September 2016. It seeks to socially invest in empowerment of Nigerians, particularly the weak, poor and vulnerable. Overall, N-SIP seeks to reach 13,363,680 direct beneficiaries, and 44,588,628 secondary beneficiaries.

2. Strategic Objectives of N-SIP

- (1) Increase the poor and vulnerable households with access to income/livelihood by providing access to targeted funds, thereby improving household ability to absorb economic shocks.
- (2) Reduce inequalities and wide disparities.
- (3) Increase access to education and health services, as well as empowering vulnerable sectors, thereby improving the quality of services.
- (4) Reduce rate of youth unemployment, linking interested volunteers to address existing gaps.
- (5) Eradicate malnutrition in school age children by establishing a sustainable school feeding programme.
- (6) Provide affordable credit for micro, small and medium enterprises, thereby increasing business revenue and facilitating market linkages.
- (7) Stimulate productivity and growth, especially in our rural communities.
- (8) Bringing into visibility those who have never before been registered on any platform by capturing identities for proper planning.
- (9) Promote access to financial services and increase rate of financial inclusion (N-SIP 2019, 9).

3. Programmes of the N-SIP

There are four cardinal programmes of the NSIP, namely: N-Power, NHGSFP, GEEP, and NCTP. However, some sources include Social Housing Scheme as one of the core programmes of N-SIP, with a goal to provide affordable shelter for low-income earners (*Vanguard* 2016). This is corroborated by the NSIP Budgets, which had earmarked the sum of ₦100 billion for the Social Housing Scheme since 2017 (Uwais 2020). Also, the Grants for Rural Women or 'Rural Women Cash Grant Programme', introduced in 2020, seeks to sustain the social inclusion agenda of President Muhammadu Buhari, through the disbursement of a cash grant (₦20,000.00) to a total of 125,000 women across the 36 states of the federation and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) (*Vanguard* 2021). In addition, President has approved the Special Public Works Programme, which is intended to employ 774,000 Nigerians in the nation's 774 LGAs, with a monthly earning of ₦20,000.00. From the March 2019 Brief on N-SIP, the programmes have been further extended to six: N-Power, NHGSFP, GEEP, NCTP, YESSO, and CSDP (see annexure II for the 'N-SIP – Programmes, Objectives and Target Beneficiaries').

A. Job Creation and Employment Programme (N-Power)

The job creation and employment programme (otherwise called N-Power) is intended to empower young Nigerians with the necessary tools to go and create, develop, build, fix, and work on exceptional ideas, projects and enterprises that would change the communities, the economy and the nation. N-Power has three sub-components: N-Power Volunteer Corps (NPVC), N-Power Knowledge and N-Power Build. NPVC will engage and train 500,000 young unemployed graduates in a paid volunteering programme of a two-year duration, with a monthly stipend of N30,000. Volunteer receive a computing device that contains the needed information for their specific engagement as well as continuous training and development. The volunteers provide teaching, instructional, and advisory solutions to improve the

inadequacies in public services, including agriculture extension services, basic education, community (civic and adult) education, and public health (N-Power no date).

The N-Power Knowledge seeks to engage 25,000 young Nigerians to further the federal government's efforts towards diversifying the Nigerian economy. It will prepare young Nigerians for a knowledge economy, equipped with local and global skills and certification to function in the global market place. The components of the N-Power Knowledge are N-Power Creative, N-Power Tech (Software or Developer), and N-Power Tech (Hardware or Devices). This will create a pool of software developers, hardware service professionals, graphic artists, and animators (N-Power no date). The N-Build is expected to engage 75,000 Nigerians, and it is intended to build a new crop of skilled and highly competent workforce. It will provide non-graduates with relevant technical and business skills that will enhance their work outlook and livelihood. The target population is drawn from technicians, artisans, and service professionals. The focus industries are building services, construction, built environment services, utilities and engineering, hospitality and catering, automotive and aluminum and gas (Ubhenin 2017a).

B. National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme

The National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (shortened and called as 'NHGSFP') entails the provision of a social safety net that would improve the nutrition, health and education of children from low-income and vulnerable backgrounds (Ajetunmobi 2018). Its specific objectives are to: (1) improve the enrolment of primary school children in Nigeria and reduce the current dropout rates from primary school which is estimated at 30 percent; (2) address the poor nutrition and health status of many children who have been affected as a result of poverty this has affected the learning outcomes of the children; (3) link the programme to local agricultural production to achieve direct economic objectives of the National Home Grown School Meal Program; and (4) create jobs along the value chain and provide a multiplier effect for economic growth and development.

C. Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme

The Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (shortened and called as 'GEEP') is intended to capture beneficiaries who are artisans, traders and market women, farmers and enterprising youths for soft loans. The components of GEEP include: 'MarketMoni', 'FarmerMoni' and 'TraderMoni', alluding to the loans provided to the different groups of beneficiaries (e.g. farmers, traders and those who work in the market). Applications for 'MarketMoni' and 'FarmerMoni' are processed online, and beneficiaries receive a six-month loan, ranging from ₦10,000 to ₦350,000. Requirements include membership of cooperatives or associations, a business location, a bank account, and a bank verification number (BVN). The target population of 'TraderMoni' comprises petty traders and artisans, and the loans range from ₦10,000 to ₦100,000. A beneficiary is qualified for a second loan of ₦15,000 when he or she pays the first loan within six months. In general, an applicant must have a phone to receive and use the money to qualify for this facility. "A bank account becomes a requirement only after paying back the first loan and the beneficiary wishes to apply for additional loans" (Sterk, & Issaka 2019, 14).

D. National Cash Transfers Programme (Household Uplifting Programme)

The National Cash Transfers Programme (NCTP) also called the 'Household Uplifting Programme' (HUP). NCTP or HUP is a component of National Social Safety Nets Project (NASSP) which is being supported by the World Bank, to provide financial support to targeted poor and vulnerable Nigerian households. NCTP focuses on responding to deficiencies in capacity and lack of investment in human capital, especially amongst the poorest citizens of Nigeria's population. NCTP or HUP delivers timely and accessible cash transfers to beneficiary households and sets to support development objectives and priorities, to achieve specific outcomes, including: 'improved household consumption', 'increased utilisation of health and nutrition services', 'improved school enrolment and attendance', 'improved environmental sanitation and management', 'encouraged household financial and asset acquisition', and 'engaged beneficiaries in sustainable livelihood'.

NCTP or HUP has three components, namely: unconditional ‘base cash transfer’, conditional ‘top-up’, based on state selected conditions, and ‘livelihood support’. The base (unconditional) cash transfer (₦5,000.00) is for the most vulnerable, mined from the National Social Register. An additional ₦5,000.00 is given to household with a pregnant woman, or a child between 0-2 years, or a child of school age, or for environmental sanitation purpose. In effect, the conditions for receiving a ‘Top Up’ (₦5,000.00) include being a beneficiary of the base (unconditional) cash transfer, attending immunisation exercises, antenatal clinic, enrolling a child in school, and environmental sanitation (ANEEJ 2018). In summary, the conditions for receiving a ‘Top Up’ fall into four broad categories: education, health, nutrition, and environment (Sterk, & Issaka 2019). On its part, the livelihood support facilitates graduation of beneficiaries out of poverty, thereby preparing them for financial freedom. It helps targeted households to build an entrepreneurial mind-set, such as ‘on-farm’ and ‘off-farm’ work among women and youth. NCTP’s beneficiaries are mined from the National Social Register (NSR), which is made up of State Social Registers (SR) of poor and vulnerable households. The SRs are being developed with the training, supervision and guidance from the National Social Safety Net Coordinating Office in Abuja

N-SIP Funding

Development watchers have observed that the N-SIP is about the largest social protection programme in Africa with over \$1 billion earmarked annually to cause positive changes in the lives of the poorest and most vulnerable in the Nigerian society (Bello 2021). The size of the programme is evidenced in the annual budgetary allocation to the programme. **Table 1** below illustrates the Nigerian FG’ budget and N-SIP allocation for the fiscal years (2016 - 2021).

Table 1: ‘Nigerian FG’s budget and N-SIP’s allocation (2016-2021)

Year	Designation (Budget of)	Total FG’ budget ₦	N-SIP Budget ₦	% Allocation for N-SIP
2016	Change	6.08 trillion	500 billion	8.22
2017	Recovery & growth	7.441 trillion	500 billion	6.72
2018	Consolidation	8.612 trillion	500 billion	5.81
2019	Continuity	8.916 trillion	500 billion	5.61
2020	Sustaining growth & job creation	10.805 trillion	30 billion	0.28
2021	Economic recovery & resilience	13.588 trillion	765 billion	5.63

Source: Compiled from various sources

In the fiscal year 2021, the N-SIPs got the highest allocation (₦765 billion) among the selected projects listed in the 2021 approved budget. Out of the ₦765 billion, ₦400 billion will go directly to the project while ₦365 billion will be applied to ‘upscaling the programme’. However, funds are not being released as budgeted. For example, in 2016, the sum of ₦79,985,158,705.32 (14.03 percent) was released; in 2017, the sum of ₦140,000,000,000.00 (35 percent) was released; in 2018, the sum of ₦250,840,363,989.00 (43.5 percent) was released; and in 2019, 57.8 percent was released (as at September). For 2017 to 2020, the sum of ₦100 billion was appropriated specifically for the National Housing Fund hosted by the Federal Ministry of Finance. “These releases covered operational activities and payments to 13,363,680 beneficiaries across all the 4 N-SIPs, all of whom can all be verified either through their BVN numbers or their unique numbers generated by the National Social Register, those identities having been generated for the poorest of the poor who do not own bank accounts for sundry reasons” (Uwais 2020). Despite the

obvious gaps in funding, the N-SIP appears to be covering tremendous grounds. **Table 2** below illustrates the current coverage of N-SIP.

Table 2: ‘Current coverage of the N-SIP’

Programme	States	Beneficiaries
N-Power	36 + FCT	549,500 N-Power graduates, non-graduates, 7 Technology Hubs
NHGSFP	33	9,963,762 pupils, 107,862 cooks, 54,952 primary schools
NCTP (NSR by NASSCO)	33	620,947 cash transfers beneficiaries 1,648,967 households in National Social Register
GEEP (BOI managed)	36 + FCT	2,279,380 TraderMoni, MarketMoni, FarmerMoni beneficiaries

Source: Derived from various sources?

4. N-SIP Implementing Institutions

The major institutions implementing the programmes of the N-SIP are: Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development, the National Social Investment Office, and the National Cash Transfer Office. Others are the World Bank, Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning, the Federal Ministry of Education, the Federal Ministry of Health, and the Federal Ministry of Environment, and the National Primary Health Care Development Agency (NPHCDA). Partner agencies include UNICEF, Save the Children, Catholic Relief Services, and Caritas), independent monitors and CSOs. In addition, implementing state governments have established N-SIP offices. The State Universal Basic Education and LGAs also play key roles.

A. Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development

The Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development (FMHDS) was created by the Nigerian FG, in response to the global ranking of Nigeria as host to more of the world’s extreme poor and vulnerable. The core mandate of FMHDS includes coordination of all humanitarian affairs, protection of the rights of the vulnerable, and social development. FMHSD manages the formulation and implementation of fair focused inclusion and protection programmes, and by extension coordinates the implementation of all social protection programmes initiated by the Nigerian FG.

B. National Social Investment Office (NSIO)

At the early stage of the formulation of the National Social Investment Programme (N-SIP) in 2016, the National Social Investment Office (NSIO) was strategically hosted by the Office of the Vice Office to ensure objective leadership and proactive monitoring and evaluation (M&E), sustainable and long-term vision for social investment, proper coordination and synergy among key MDAs, states and local governments, standard delivery mechanisms, as well as elimination of duplication of roles and responsibilities (N-SIP 2019). NSIO was responsible for coordinating the four cardinal programmes of the N-SIP. NSIO addressed the gaps and challenges of past social protection programmes through (a) the use of digital tools to drive operations, (b) sharing resources and lessons for continuous improvement, (c) cross programme collaboration for cost effectiveness and shared learning, (d) support for partnership with states and local governments, and (e) leveraging existing capacities within MDAs.

C. National Social Safety Nets Project

The National Social Safety Nets Project (NASSP) was set up by the Nigerian FG, with support of the World Bank to reduce poverty and socio-economic vulnerabilities. NASSP warehouses the following offices:

(I) National Social Safety Nets Coordinating Office (NASSCO) and National Cash Transfers Office (NCTO) at the federal level,

(II) State Operations Coordinating Unit (SOCU) and State Cash Transfer Unit (SCTU) at state level, and
 (III) Community Based Testing Team (CBTT) and Cash Transfers Facilitators (CTFs) at LGAs.

D. National Cash Transfer Office

The National Cash Transfer Office (NCTO) is the intervention arm of the National Social Safety Nets Project (NASSP), which facilitates the cash transfers and capacity building of beneficiaries. NASSP is supported by the World Bank to provide support for targeted poor and vulnerable Nigerian households. NCTO is led by a Programme Coordinator who is responsible for project management specifically linked to administration of the cash transfers and livelihoods interventions. There are five main units under the Coordinator which are: (a) finance/administration, (b) management information system, (c) operations, (d) payments, and (e) monitoring and evaluation. Other offices include: procurement, grievance redress mechanism (GRM), and audit. Overall, NCTO's management responsibilities include:

- (a) Provide technical support and stakeholder engagement
- (b) Facilitate beneficiaries' enrolment and issue programme card to beneficiaries
- (c) Support capacity building of states and LGAs to deliver training and sensitisation by developing training materials and training of trainers
- (d) Integrate the Payment Service Providers (PSPs) into the systems developed under NASSP (these are the NSR, MIS, and financial management (FM) systems)
- (e) Provide effective coordination for the payment system
- (f) Provide technical and financial support to SCTUs and LGAs to carry out their responsibilities
- (g) Conduct performance assessment, review and reporting
- (h) Liaise with MDAs and civil societies organisations to support delivery
- (i) Provide framework for the co-responsibilities for state selection
- (j) Facilitate beneficiaries training, coaching and mentoring
- (k) Monitor the progress of activities at state levels to ensure conformity to plans and standards
- (l) Provide grievance redress hub and ensure that grievances emerging from states are investigated and addressed
- (m) Establish and implement system to minimize fraud, error and corruption
- (n) Engage and supervise payment service providers
- (o) Disburse cash transfers to beneficiaries

Stakeholders (Policy Support)

The following stakeholders provide policy support for the implementation of the cash transfers programme: (a) the World Bank, (b) Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning, (c) partner agencies (UNICEF, Save the Children, Catholic Relief Services, Caritas), (d) independent monitors / civil society organisations (CSOs).

Stakeholders (Direct Support)

The following stakeholders provide direct support for the implementation of the cash transfers programme: (a) the Nigerian Federal Government (NCTO), (b) state governments (State Cash Transfer Units), (c) LGAs, (d) community and beneficiaries

Stakeholders (Implementation Support)

The following stakeholders provide implementation support for the cash transfers programme:

- (a) Federal Ministry of Education, (b) Federal Ministry of Health, (c) Federal Ministry of Environment State Universal Basic Education, (d) National Primary Health Care Development Agency (NPHCDA)

State implementation

While NCTO's mandate is to deliver the targeted cash transfer across the country, the actual implementation happens at the state level through the State Cash Transfer Unit (SCTU). SCTU manages and coordinates the targeted cash transfer and livelihood intervention. Each local government area establishes a cash transfer team to implement activities at the community level.

PART V

LEVELS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL
PROTECTION PROGRAMMES IN NIGERIA**1. Introduction**

In this section, we adopt the typology of actors in the innovation process to explain the levels of implementation of social protection in Nigeria. As at Jan. 4, 2021, over 12 million households had reportedly benefitted from the N-SIP, 1 million indigents benefitted from cash transfers (₦5,000.00) under the NCTP, 1,092,405 micro and small business owners accessed loan to boost productivity, increase income and reduce poverty under GEEP, 500,000 unemployed youths were provided temporary income opportunities (₦30,000.00) under N-Power, 8,612,457 primary 1-3 pupils in public schools are receiving 1 meal per day under NHGSFP (Bello 2021). As at February 28, 2021, the National Social Register of Poor and Vulnerable Households (PVHHs) had covered 29,776,599 individuals, 6,969,230 PVHHs, 81,776 communities, 8,161 wards, 699 LGAs, and 36 Nigerian FS and Federal Capital Territory (FCT) (NASSCO Website Undated).

For a recap, the states have been classified as ‘early adopter’ states, ‘late majority’ states, and ‘laggard’ states. The ‘early adopters’ states are those wherein the social protection programmes were implemented when they were inaugurated by President Muhammadu Buhari on May 29, 2016, up until August 2017. The ‘late majority’ states include the states wherein the programmes were implemented (September 2017 and November 2019). This period is longer, compared to the others, and thus allowed many states to be included after the initial delay in processes. The ‘laggards’ states are those that have been abnormally slow in embracing the social protection programmes, to the extent that lack of implementation debarred their indigents from benefitting from the COVID-19 palliatives. It covers the period (December 2019 - February 2021), before the inception of the coronavirus (COVID-19) lockdown in April 2020.

It is important to note that some states were ‘early adopters’ in some programmes and ‘laggards’ in others, and vice versa. From the comprehensive analysis by the N-SIP, every LGA, every state and the FCT have beneficiaries in one of the four cardinal programmes. In some cases, states were already benefitting from more than one of the programmes as at April 2017 (*Premium Times* 2017). **Table 3** below illustrates the states typology in adoption of social protection programmes in Nigeria (since 2016).

Table 3: ‘States typology and adoption of the social protection programmes in Nigeria (since 2016)’

Programme/ Typology	‘Early adopters’ (Inception - Aug. 2017)	‘Late majority’ (Sep. 2017 – Nov. 2019)	‘Laggards’ (Dec. 2019 – Feb. 2021)
N-Power	<u>22 States</u> Abia, Adamawa, Anambra, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Cross River, Delta, Edo, Gombe, Jigawa, Katsina, Kogi, Niger, Ogun, Osun, Plateau, Rivers, Sokoto, Taraba, Yobe, Zamfara	<u>(Incomplete)</u> Bayelsa, Ekiti, Nasarawa	<u>Tbd</u>
NHGSFP	<u>14 States</u> Abia, Anambra, Bauchi, Benue, Delta, Ebonyi, Enugu, Kaduna, Ogun, Osun, Oyo, Plateau, Taraba, Zamfara	<u>18 states</u> Akwa Ibom, Borno, Cross River, Edo, Ekiti, Gombe, Imo, Jigawa, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Kogi, Nasarawa, Niger, Ondo, Sokoto, Taraba, Yobe	<u>Four States + FCT</u> Bayelsa, Kwara, Lagos, Rivers
GEEP	<u>13 States + FCT</u> Abia, Adamawa, Bauchi, Delta, Imo, Kogi, Kwara, Kano, Katsina, Lagos, Osun, Ogun, Oyo	<u>Incomplete</u> Anambra, Bayelsa, Edo, Ekiti	<u>Tbd</u>
NCTP	<u>Nine States</u> Bauchi, Borno, Cross River, Ekiti, Kogi, Kwara, Niger, Ogun, Oyo	<u>19 States + FCT</u> Abia, Adamawa, Akwa Ibom, Anambra, Benue, Edo, FCT, Gombe, Imo, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Nasarawa, Niger, Osun, Plateau, So---koto, Taraba	<u>Eight States</u> Bayelsa, Delta, Ebonyi, Enugu, Lagos, Rivers, Yobe, Zamdara

Note: This table will be completed with data from the N-SIP Office

N-Power

N-Power is implemented in six categories: ‘Agro’, ‘Build’, ‘Creative’, ‘Tech’, ‘Teach’, and ‘Health’. Initially, targeted beneficiaries were 500,000, but later expanded to cover 1,000,000 beneficiaries in December 2020. Non-graduates cannot apply for N-Power Teach and N-Power Health, but graduates and non-graduates can apply for N-Power Agro, N-Power Build, N-Power Creative, and N-Power Tech. Implementation of the N-Power commenced with the engagement of 200,000 out of the target 500,000 volunteers in the N-Power Volunteer Corps stream. N-Power Teach was later merged with N-Power Community Education as N-Power Teach/Community (150,000), N-Power Agro (30,000), N-Power Health (20,000). Thirty nine percent of total applicants were females, while 1,126 persons with disabilities emerged in the total selection matrix.

Primary places of assignments are primary schools (for assistant teachers), primary health centres (for community health aides), and state Agricultural Development Programmes (for agricultural extension workers). In order to mitigate the adverse socio-economic circumstances in the North-east, an additional 4,800 applicants from the region were selected thus: Borno (1,200). Adamawa (800), Yobe (800), Taraba (800), Bauchi (600) (*Vanguard* 2016). From table III above, three of the target states for this project (Anambra, Delta and Edo) were ‘early adopters’ of the N-Power programme. On their part, Bayelsa and Ekiti were ‘late majority’ states in the N-Power programme implementation.

NHGSFP

As at July 11, 2019, it was reported that 9.8 million pupils in 32 states of the federation were benefitting from the school feeding programme. The school feeding programme had two of the target states (Anambra and Delta) as ‘early adopters’. In particular, Anambra State commenced the school feeding programme

with 96,489 pupils, served by 30 cooks, and funded with N188.76 million. Also, two target states (Edo and Ekiti) were ‘late majority’, and one of the target states in this study (Bayelsa) did not make the list of the 32 states that benefitted from the school feeding programme as at July 11, 2019. Obviously, Bayelsa is a ‘laggard’ in the implementation of the school feeding programme. As at August 7, 2019, preparations were still being made for the take-off of the school feeding programme in Bayelsa State (Idio 2019). It is also imperative to mention the exceptionality of Kaduna State in the school feeding programme implementation. Kaduna State was already implementing the programme ahead of the federal government’s roll out. Hence, Kaduna got a refund of N3.4 billion for its past expenses in the school feeding programme implementation (*Premium Times* 2017).

An innovative aspect of the school feeding programme was the federal government’s response to the closure of schools due to the lockdown that followed the novel coronavirus (COVID-19), President Muhammadu Buhari directed the Minister of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development, Sadiya Farouq to liaise with state governments to develop strategies on the continuation of the school feeding programme on March 29, 2020. 3,131,971 households of children in primary 1 to 3 in public schools were to benefit from this innovation in complex humanitarian settings. Each household would receive uncooked food items valued at ₦4,200. The ration was assessed and approved by nutrition experts as sufficient for the children. The ration contains a 5kg bag of rice, 5kg bag of beans, 500ml vegetable oil, 750ml of palm oil, 500mg of salt, 15pieces of eggs, and 140gm of tomato paste.

Over 6,000 schools were to serve as distribution centres for clusters of communities except in some states with unique security and safety issues where other structures will be used. QR coded vouchers, serialised, dated and time-stamped, identified households will be able to access ration from distribution centres. “The Ministry in consultation and collaboration with state governments identified the distribution of Take-Home Rations (THR) to the households of the children on the programme as a feasible method of achieving this directive after exploring several options. “This is a globally accepted means of supporting children to continue to have access to nutrient-rich foods despite disruptions to the traditional channels of school feeding (Tahaya 2020). Two states (Lagos and Ogun) and the FCT were the ‘early adopters of the THR’. Curiously, none of the five target states was captured as an ‘early adopter’.

GEEP

Disbursement of soft loans on the GEEP commenced on November 25, 2016, with 13 pilot states and the FCT. These pilot states were the early adopters of the GEEP component of the N-SIP. Out of the 13 states, only one of the target states for this project (Delta) was an ‘early adopter’. Other target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Edo and Ekiti) were ‘late majority’ states in the GEEP. For example, Bayelsa had the ‘TraderMoni’ micro credit since October 2018 (Osahon, & Oyewole 2018). As at August 2019, the Federal Government had spent ₦5 billion on TraderMoni, MarketMoni and N-Power in Bayelsa (Idio 2019).

NCTP

NCTP seeks to reach one million households across the 36 and the Federal Capital Territory. As at April 2019, NCTP was reaching 420,000 households in 28 and the FCT. Ekiti was the only state, out of the target states that came under ‘early adopters’ in the implementation of the cash transfer programme. The nine pilot states were chosen because they had an existing social register that successfully identified the most vulnerable and poorest Nigerians, through a tried and tested community-based targeting (CBT) method, in collaboration with the World Bank. Borno was included because it had a validated list of IDPs, in addition to the social register, and was set for the development of the social register. States that commenced the development of their social registers immediately after commencement in the nine pilot states can be classified as ‘late majority’. In this regard, Adamawa, Anambra, Benue, Enugu, Jigawa, Katsina, Plateau, and Taraba States had complied with the stipulated framework, and were set for the development of their social register. Others that fall into the ‘late majority’ states in cash transfers were Delta, Gombe, Imo, Kaduna, and Kano (*Proshare* 2017). From the table, three target states (Anambra, Delta and Edo) were ‘late majority’ in the implementation of the cash transfers programme. On its part, Bayelsa State joins seven other states to become a ‘laggard’.

PART VI

IMPACT AND CHALLENGES OF N-SIP IN FIVE NIGERIAN STATES

1. Introduction

In this section, we discuss the impact and challenges of N-SIP implementation in Anambra State, an ‘early adopter of N-Power and NHGSFP, as well as a ‘late majority’ in GEEP and NCTP. Second, the impact and challenges of GEEP implementation are discussed using Bayelsa State as a case study. Bayelsa joined Anambra, Edo and Ekiti to make the ‘late majority’ list in the GEEP implementation. Delta was an ‘early adopter’ state of the programme. Third, the impact and challenges of NHGSFP implementation are discussed using Delta State as a case study. Delta was the only ‘early adopter’ among the five target state. Good enough, this researcher had conducted a prior study of NHGSFP, which would enable reference to other states where the programme is being implemented (Ubhenin 2018). Fourth, the impact and challenges of N-Power programme implementation are discussed using Edo State as a case study. Edo joins Anambra and Delta to make the ‘early adopters’ list in the N-Power implementation. Finally, the impact and challenges of NCTP implementation are discussed using Ekiti State as a case study. Ekiti was the only ‘early adopter’ among the five target states. On their part, Anambra and Edo were ‘late majority’ states while Bayelsa and Delta are ‘laggards’.

Impact and Challenges of N-SIP Implementation
(*Anambra State*)

The N-Power in Anambra has contributed to the talent development of volunteers in the state. As at July 2020, 14,689 N-Power beneficiaries had exited the programme in Anambra State. Between June 20 and 23, 2017, Anambra witnessed field visit by high-level delegation from the Nigerian FG’s N-Power Programme. The school feeding programme commenced in Anambra in December 2016, with an estimated 76, 690 pupils in 1050 schools that would be served every school day. The sum of ₦53,687,900.00 was released directly to cooks for programme take-off. About 774 cooks are gainfully employed under the NHGSFP in Anambra State. A total of 103,175 pupils in Primary 1-3 currently benefit from the NHGSFP in Anambra State’s 21 LGAs. The pupils are being served by 1009 cooks (Azor 2021). However, another media source says 126,958 pupils were being fed a meal a day in public primary schools (Primary 1-3) (Ovat 2021), Azor (2021) highlights the challenges of the NHGSFP implementation as follows: (i) incomplete payment of cooks, (ii) irregular payment of cooks/vendors, (iii) poor monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms, and (iv) lack of resources (including financial) for M&E and reporting. Also, the ₦70 allowed for a school child in the NHGSFP is grossly inadequate. This is in consideration of the inflationary trend and the consequent high cost of food items in the market.

As at February 19, 2021, about 8,313 persons were benefiting in CCT (in the 6 pilot LGAs). The NCTP beneficiaries were spread across the six pilot LGAs thus: Anambra West/ Mbamili (1088), Awka North (891), Ayamelum (1036), Dunukofia (1425), Ihiala (2497), and Orumba (1376) (Azor 2021). Also, 25,070 had been enrolled in the remaining 15 LGAs, and 185,254 households of the poorest and vulnerable enlisted in the State Social Register for any intervention programmes (Ovat 2021). Anambra State Cash Transfer Unit (SCTU) draws staff from the State Civil Service as follows, including: Head of Unit (HoU), Project Accountant (Head of Accounts/Admin), Head of Operations, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer, Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) Officer, Management Information System (MIS) Officers I & II, Training & Communication Officer, Admin Officer, Livelihood Officer, Gender Officer, Payment Officer, Co-responsibility Officer, Finance Officer, and Driver (Azor 2021).

Available evidence points to the effective formation of co-operatives in the six pilot LGAs due to the NCTP implementation. Anambra West/ Mbamili has 43 co-operatives with ₦4,827,061.00 as savings. There are 48 co-operatives in Awka North with ₦4,698,890.00 as savings. At Ayamelum, the 46 co-operatives have saved ₦4,134,000.00. Dunukofia has 69 co-operatives with ₦9,949,316.00 as savings. At Ihiala, the 113 co-operatives have saved ₦14,269,449.00. Orumba South has 62 co-operatives with ₦5,600.00 as savings (Azor 2021). Phase II of the GEEP’s TraderMoni was launched in Anambra State

in May 2019. On January 31, 2021, the Nigerian FG began the disbursement of grants to 2,800 rural women in Anambra under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme. The challenges of the GEEP implementation arise from direct administration and disbursement of funds by the supervising ministry, FMHDS. According to Azor (2021), this is “leaving state governments in the dark” (10).

Impact and Challenges of GEEP Implementation

(Bayelsa State)

Micro-credit has evolved in development circles as a paradigm shift to lift people out of poverty, through some forms of lending. Thus the GEEP (with its components: ‘MarketMoni’, ‘TraderMoni’, and ‘FarmerMoni’) is a vehicle for promoting financial inclusion and access to 1.6 million market traders, artisans, cooperatives, youth and farmers. In particular, the ‘TraderMoni’ Empowerment Scheme (TES) had been disbursed, at least two times (2018 and 2019), in Bayelsa State. The second tranche was disbursed in major markets in Yenagoa, including Tombia-Etegwé Roundabout and Okaka Market. As at 2019, over 10,000 traders had benefitted from the TES. Beneficiaries were excited over the N10,000 TraderMoni in Bayelsa. One beneficiary openly expressed that the GEEP’s TraderMoni had given her a sense of belonging for the first time in life (*The Nation* 2019). This is fulfilment, but there is a challenge.

One challenge encountered in the course of implementation of the TraderMoni scheme in Bayelsa was lack of proper sensitisation among beneficiaries who believe that the money was being distributed as a grant, instead of a loan (Osahon, Oyewole 2018). The perception that the money is a grant is influenced by the period of disbursement, which sometimes occur during electioneering. Thus, some citizens think it is a weapon of ‘vote buying’ or form of voter inducement (Aworinde 2019). By implication, the beneficiaries of the GEEP in Bayelsa do not demonstrate the willingness to pay. According to Slabor (2021), the challenges include logistics issues, lack of consideration for the terrain, planning was done outside the state, dependence on third party information, wrong targeting of beneficiaries, and general lack of awareness of the N-SIP. In consideration of the mode of implementation (through the Bank of Industry), the target beneficiaries are excluded from the decision-making process. Also, the shortness of both the facility ceiling (₦100,000) and repayment period (six months) may further push the beneficiaries into deeper poverty (Ubhenin mimeo).

Impact and Challenges of NHGSFP Implementation

(Delta State)

The school feeding covers pupils in grades one to three (1-3) in Delta. Foods served under the NHGSFP are rice, spaghetti, noodles, beans, sweet potatoes, vegetables, soup and sometimes fruits like orange and pineapple. Out of the approved slot (149,000 pupils) for Delta, 141,663 pupils in 742 public primary schools benefitted as at September 2017. This represented 5.01 percent of pupils 2,827,501 and 3.73 percent of 19,881 public primary schools, respectively. The impact of the programme is weighed against the issues to be addressed by the programme below:

Malnutrition disorder

The evidence suggests that parents whose pupils benefit from the school feeding programme, no longer bother about food for their children at school, their children in grades one to three (1-3) are no longer hungry at school, children benefitting from the programme are now healthier, and children are now growing well. By implication, the stunting that has become a major developmental problem in Nigeria is gradually being addressed by the Nigerian FG through the NHGSFP. However, some pupils in the beneficiary classes do not eat because their parents have instructed them to refuse since they have been catered for at home. This draws attention to the quality of meals being served to the target schoolchildren. It is not surprising that, in Niger State, two officials were sacked due to complaints by direct beneficiaries for being “treated like beggars in the sharing of food” (Alofetekun 2018, 8). Perhaps due to reservation on quality, unwilling parents would have allowed their children to eat the food served in school. By implication, not all children in public primary schools fall into the ‘very poor’ category. For the very poor are extremely difficult to target and reach for development interventions (Altaf and Pouw 17).

Poor education outcomes

The evidence suggests that there is an increase in enrolment of pupils in the beneficiary classes (primary 1-3), a reduction in absenteeism among affected pupils, school children are now very intelligent, and pupils now perform better in school activities. The research findings corroborate the NAN survey that the school feeding programme has caused conducive teaching and learning as well improved school attendance (in Delta), education consciousness and reduction in street trading (in Imo), improved academic performance (in Ogun), increase in pupils' enrolment (in Cross River, Imo, Osun and Oyo), reduction in pupil's absenteeism (in Osun), and transfer of children from private schools to public schools (in Anambra). Other enablers of school enrolment, namely: innovations, strategies, and incentives, such as good learning environment, near-zero school fees, and welfare packages for teachers. In Ekiti, these factors reportedly led to considerable increase in pupils' enrolment (e.g. from 378,000 in 2014 to 463,863 in 2017). (*Premium Times* 2018).

However, a gap exists between the approved feeding slot and the pupils' population in Delta. The approved school feeding slot for the state is 149,000 pupils, while there were 223,916 pupils in grade one to three (1-3). This created a shortfall of 74,916 pupils in grade one to three (1-3) not covered by the school feeding (Uwagwu, & Ekpokpobe undated). In schools where food is being served, pupils in grade four to six (4-6) are excluded from the feeding. As a result, those who would have loved to eat in these grades are demotivated and distracted. Sometimes, they cause rowdy sessions during feeding for lower classes. In extreme cases, they do not attend classes. This suggests that the much-awaited benefit in education outcomes are being threatened. In Osun, the state government is addressing this issue by taking responsibility for the feeding of 41,000 pupils in grade four (4), in support of the FG's school feeding programme for more than 145,000 pupils in grades one to three (1-3) (*Premium Times* 2018). In Jigawa, the state government also complements Nigerian FG's efforts by taking responsibility for the feeding of over 722,000 pupils in grade four to six (4-6), through the engagement of over 7,000 cooks (*The Eagle Online* 2018). On the other hand, increased enrollment rates raise issues on quality education and satisfactory learning achievement because resources are spread more thinly across a growing number of students. Thus, it is not surprising to find 100 pupils per teacher or students sitting under trees outside the school building because of the lack of classrooms, in some states (Onyenucheya 2018).

Weak economy

Available evidence also suggests that, due to the school feeding programme, farm produce do not go bad any more, market is readily available for farm produce, and the smallholder farmers and cooks now have money to meet their personal needs. Also, farmers are now encouraged to do more. This demonstrable encouragement, however, farmers, particularly smallholder women farmers are being constrained by lack of access to farmlands and improved seedlings, as well as insecurity, due to herdsmen/ farmers conflict in Nigeria. These women suffer rape in the hands of both herdsmen and non-herdsmen (Agbonkheshe 2018). Another challenge is the issue of delay in release of the rather insufficient funds by government. In one of the surveyed schools, cooks and vendors have not shown up for three weeks. This corroborates the evidence from Cross River, wherein a particular head teacher of a government primary school in Calabar noted that they have not seen anything since the beginning of the term, due to non-release of funds (*Premium Times* 2018). The strenuous process in accessing fund is depicted by a photo of food vendors who were on a queue at an Automated Teller Machine point at Yakubu Gowon Way in Kaduna (*The Punch* 2018). In Akwa Ibom, primary schools pupils were reportedly stranded and hungry as food vendors had withdrawn their services over alleged interference by government (Emmanuel 2018).

Impact and Challenges of N-Power Implementation (Edo State)

Edo was one of the 21 pilot states in the N-Power implementation. From the typology adopted, Edo was an 'early adopter' state of the N-Power programme implementation. Edo had 4,702 volunteers in the first batch of the programme. The N-Power programme reportedly brought out the hidden skills of beneficiaries. In 2017, the Government of Edo State absolved some of the N-Power volunteers who were

adjudged to have performed creditably well into the State Civil Service (Odunsi 2017). The programme impact also shows in the field assessment conducted by the Edo State Focal Person of N-SIP, Ms. Osayuwamen Aladeselu. In her words, “the N-power beneficiaries are supposed to be in their places of primary assignment to perform their duties; that is the reason the state and federal governments came together to ensure they are given the opportunity to serve the society. So, we are here to monitor them and ensure the idea of the programme is adhered to” (Okerefor 2020). She added thus: “we have spoken to the Principal of St. Maria Goretti Junior Secondary School and she gave us a good testimony about the N-Power beneficiaries deployed to the school and we are impressed. It is the same report we got from other places we visited” (Okerefor 2020). According to the Principal of St. Maria Goretti Junior Secondary School, Mrs. Celestina Aletor, “the N-power beneficiaries posted to the school are well behaved, dutiful and committed to their jobs” (Okerefor 2020). In general, N-Power has combined with the other three cardinal programmes (NHGSFP, GEEP, and NCTP) as well as the N-SIP Hubs and Edo Start-Up to activate the Edo State economy. In other words, the inflow of money is good for the state economy. Also, the N-SIP programmes have led to improved livelihoods for individuals, job creation, and expanded businesses for beneficiaries (Emobakhare 2021).

However, there are challenges. From the KII, the implementation challenges in Edo State include insufficient vehicles for moving around, lack of control to ensure discipline of beneficiaries, and lack of operational funding by the Nigerian FG (Emobakhare 2021). When situated within the context of the current living conditions, the earnings from N-Power do not sufficiently meet the needs of target beneficiaries. Worse of all, the N-Power beneficiaries do not enjoy the privileges in the civil service, such as job security, promotion, and statutory allowances. For some beneficiaries had thought that the N-Power would afford them the opportunity of joining the civil service. Second, young adults appear to be more interested in white collar jobs, while others are would prefer the ‘fast lane’ to succeed.

Impact and Challenges of NCTP Implementation *(Ekiti State)*

As reported by the NCTO, a number of beneficiaries have made huge progress in their lives and households as a result of the livelihood support activities of the NCTP. Through these activities, beneficiaries of the cash transfers programme are engaged in productive business activities for self-reliance. Some of the beneficiaries are engaged in animal husbandry, petty trading, such as dressmaking, grinding of grains, and other meaningful services at the community, which had been the preserve of a very few people. Ekiti was one of the pilot states where the NCTP commenced. During the COVID-19 Lockdown, about 5,000 beneficiaries drawn from the 16 LGAs of the state received between N20,000 and N60,000, as outstanding stipends and up-to-date disbursement under the Household-Uplifting Programme initiated by the Federal Government. The special intervention was intended to fight poverty and cushion the effects of hardship on indigents in the state (Yaqoub 2020).

The NGO, ‘New Initiative for Social Development’ (NISD) participated in the monitoring of the last tranche of payment (May-June 2020) in selected LGAs in Ekiti State. In the course of this activity, NISD observed that cash transfers programme is helping some of its beneficiaries to beat the ‘poverty mark’. “Through cooperatives savings, they are expanding their business worth and by extension their social relevance” (Ogunlade 2021b). The challenges of implementation to include: (i) unclear modalities in selection of beneficiaries, (ii) inadequate sensitisation of beneficiaries of effective capital use, (iii) undue omission of beneficiaries without corresponding explanations, (iv) centralisation of payment, (v) technical faults from payment devices, (vi) unwarranted threats from LGA desk officers, (vii) absence of clearly defined monitoring and evaluation framework for impacts, (viii) inadequacy of grievance redress mechanisms to ensure fairness (Ogunlade 2021a/b). From the perceptive selection of beneficiary states, the NCTP is being hijacked by the political class for ethnic advantage (Sobowale 2017). More fundamentally, the ₦5000 may hardly take a beneficiary out of poverty. This is against the backdrop of the current living conditions in Nigeria.

General Challenges

It can be argued that the full contents of the N-SIP will adequately achieve their goals, particularly in reducing the level of poverty among Nigerians. However, there are challenges, which have sufficiently highlighted in the literature and media space (Onah, & Olise 2019).

(1) The Nigerian FG led by President Muhammadu Buhari is avowedly committed to lifting Nigerians out of poverty through the social investment programmes, but the actual release of funds of budgeted funds remains a consideration. For example, the controller and watchdog of the national purse, the National Assembly had approved the sum of ₦1.7 trillion for the period 2016 to 2019, but the sum of N619.1 billion (36.4 percent) only was released from January 2016 to October 2019. Recall that the N-SIP was handed over to the FMHDS in 2019. Also, the programmes lack provision for logistics (Onah, & Olise 2019).

(2) Lack of official document for dependable information on N-SIP management. “Hence, there is undue reliance on newspaper and other on-line sources which validity cannot be assured for data and other information on the programme” (Onah, & Olise 2019, 26).

(3) Political, kinship and other primordial considerations are beginning to factor into the N-SIP implementation. Obviously, past interventionist programmes were hampered by these considerations. Curiously, “severe hardship orchestrated by the high rate of inflation, hike in the price of petroleum products and other essential commodities and the low purchasing power of the Naira make many people desperate for the ₦5,000.00 monthly stipend” (Onah, & Olise 2019, 27).

(4) N-SIP implementation is being hampered by communication gap and overlap of responsibilities by state actors (especially between the state focal persons as well as ministries, departments and agencies).

(5) There are also challenges in the N-SIP implementation in the five target states. The challenges associated with the school feeding programme include inadequate sum of N70 allowed per child and irregular payment of food vendors (in Anambra and Delta). N-Power implementation is constrained by over centralised payments, non-existent mechanism for reprimanding defaulters (in Anambra and Edo). The cash transfers programme implementation is being hindered by unclear modalities for selecting beneficiaries, indiscriminate removal of beneficiaries’ names from the register (Anambra and Ekiti), wrong targeting (in Bayelsa), logistics, insecurity, youth resistance, and poor information (in Delta and Ekiti). The GEEP is characterised by over centralised payments (Anambra), lack of awareness, difficult terrain, and lack of coordination (in Bayelsa).

(6) In general, the challenges are logistics, insufficient vehicles, lack of fund for M&E, poor supervision, difficult terrain, lack of integrity, lack of legal framework, lack of synergy among units of government, non-inclusion of civil society, lack of real time grievance redress mechanism, poor sensitisation and mobilisation mechanisms.

PART VII

CONCLUSION

1. Introduction

This study seeks to find the baseline for enhancing social protection programme in Nigeria in five target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo and Ekiti). It is part of the ESPPIN project, which serves to respond to the insufficient adoption of the Federal Government's N-SIP by the Nigerian Federating States. An effective framework was developed for the study using the conceptual 'social investment', 'social policy', and 'social protection'. The policy diffusion framework was adopted as a potent lens to view public institutions, norms and programmes, as well as the diffusion innovation theory to explain the movement of the N-SIP from the Nigerian FG as 'innovator' to the Nigerian FS as 'adopters' of the programme.

2. Lessons Learned

This baseline study shows there are lessons from the N-SIP implementation, thus far. These lessons are germane for learning in the course N-SIP implementation for future practice, particularly, in the five target states (Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti)

I. Spending on social protection programmes is a huge investment. It is capital intensive. This is evidenced in the huge sums allowed for the N-SIP (over \$1 billion annually), which is about the largest social protection programme in Africa. However, timely release of funds is critical to the N-SIP effectiveness.

II. One characteristic of huge investments is the likelihood of graft. This will require review, update and upgrade the accountability and safeguard mechanisms of the social protection programmes to forestall potential 'mind boggling' graft in the N-SIP.

III. N-SIP implementation needs the complementary efforts of the state governments to reach the target audience. It is also possible to achieve faster policy diffusion with effective inclusion of the local governments.

IV. Central to human capital development is infrastructure provision. This can be addressed via budgetary allocation and funding of infrastructure provision and services.

V. Social investment is a 'soft' component of human capital development. Apart from the movement of programmes from the centre to the federating states, it will take a long time to diffuse. Therefore, the real diffusion is not in acceptance by the state actors and the people. Rather, it will be in the results or outcomes that will follow in years or decades to come.

VI. There are overlaps in the Nigerian social protection programming and implementation. This is evidenced in the number of terms that have been deployed by the government to convey the messages. Apart from the four cardinal programmes of the N-SIP, others are being developed and deployed within the contexts of implementation. Therefore, the institutional framework of N-SIP should be revised to focus on regular programmes.

VII. Currently, the N-SIP does not appear to have sustainability. This is corroborated by the Nigerian Federal Government's desire to ensure sustainability via the crafting of an executive bill for treatment by the National Assembly.

VIII. The 2017 NSPP provides room for a review of the document every three years. This is to ensure its responsiveness to emerging issues and challenges, including the pointers from the monitoring and evaluation process.

IX. Data and information on the N-SIP are not easy to find. Even dedicated websites do not provide adequate information. This can be addressed by investing in the research components of the N-SIP.

X. The very poor are extremely difficult to target and reach for development interventions. This calls for a review of targeting mechanisms for social protection provisioning.

XI. Apart from the four cardinal programmes (N-Power, NHGSFP, GEEP, and NCTP), the target states are also benefitting from other Federal Government's programmes, such as Rural Women Cash Grant (in Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, and Edo), Amnesty Programme (in Bayelsa, Delta, and Edo), FGN/CBN Empowerment Programme and NISRAL Grants (in Bayelsa, and N-SIP Hubs (in Edo).

XII. Some of the target states have put in place their own social protection programmes. These include the Skill Acquisition Programme and Full School Feeding Programme for 12 boarding schools (in Bayelsa), Skills Training and Empowerment Programme (STEP), Youth Agricultural Entrepreneurship Programme (YAGEP), and Girls Empowerment Skills Training (GEST) (in Delta), Reintegration of Libya Returnees, Edo StartUps Initiative, Public Works Volunteers Programme (PUWOV) (in Edo), and *Ounjé arugbo* (food for the elderly), *Owo arugbo* (money for the elderly), Youths in Commercial Agriculture (YCAD) (in Ekiti State).

XIII. None of the five target states currently has a social protection policy in place. The good news, however, is that the Government Edo State has engaged CSOs and other stakeholders (including ANEEJ) in drafting a social protection policy, which would be submitted to government on or before May 30, 2021.

XIV. There are variations in the institutional partners implementing the N-SIP programmes across the five target states, but the Ministries of Budget and Planning, Education, and Health play key roles in all the states. This is apart from the supervisory roles assigned to political appointees. For example, the Executive Assistant to the Governor (Special Duties) plays key role in the N-SIP implementation in Delta State. The Governor's Office supervises its implementation in Edo State. Ekiti State has a Senior Special Assistant (Social Investment), as well as a Senior Special Assistant (School Feeding).

XV. There are diverse impacts of the N-SIP implementation on beneficiaries in the target states. In Anambra State, NCTP has led to the effective formation of cooperatives to encourage savings for possible business start-ups and expansion. Also, the cash transfer programme is lifting many people out of poverty (in Ekiti). N-Power is building capacity of beneficiaries, and 'TraderMoni' is helping beneficiaries to expand their businesses (in Bayelsa). The N-SIP implementation is improving the state economy, improving household livelihoods, creating jobs, and enabling business start-ups (in Edo). In Ekiti, N-SIP implementation is expanding beneficiaries' businesses and giving them social relevance. The exception, however, is in Delta State where some N-Power beneficiaries saved up to start their businesses, while others fell back into the labour market, and the cash transfers enabled some beneficiaries to save up for tangible impact, while others spend their earnings on consumables. In effect, very few people took the money to add to their existing business for expansion (in Delta State).

3. Recommendations

I. The Nigerian state (federal and state) should focus attention on the timely release of funds allowed for the N-SIP. The local governments should be empowered through available structures to contribute their quota to the effective implementation of the N-SIP.

II. The relevant authorities should take appropriate steps to review, update and upgrade the accountability and safeguard mechanisms of the social protection programmes to forestall potential 'mind boggling' graft in the N-SIP. Experience should be drawn from the country's success stories in anti-corruption.

III. Evidence-based advocacy is needed to draw the attention of state actors to the imperatives of 'faithful' budgetary allocation to the programmes. Such advocacy should be extended to the local government structures within the five target states.

IV. The state governments should do the needful by increasing budgetary allocation and funding for infrastructure provision and services.

V. There should be sensitisation of all on the future benefits of social investment as captured by the N-SIP.

VI. The on-going review of the 2017 National Social Protection Policy should be extended to streamline the terms and frameworks of the N-SIP.

VII. The on-going review of the 2017 National Social Protection Policy should culminate in a draft bill for debates, consideration and approval by the National Assembly, as well as the Houses of Assembly of the States of Nigeria.

VIII. The federal and state governments should invest on research on social protection programmes. This will help to provide adequate and timely information to interested parties and the general public.

IX. There should be a review of the targeting mechanisms for the N-SIP beneficiaries. This will help to ensure that the very poor are covered in the interventions.

References

- Abuh, A. (2018). Reps probe NEMA over alleged theft of N17 billion meant for disaster victims. In *The Guardian*, Feb. 16, p.2.
- Adebayo, A. (2000). *Principles and practice of public administration in Nigeria*, 2ed. Ibadan: Spectrum.
- Adebayo, H. (2017), Nigeria launches Economic recovery plan; targets 10 GW, food security. In *Premium Times*, Mar. 7. Retrieved from <http://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/225479nigeria-launches-economic-recovery-plan-targets-10-gw-food-security.html>
- Adesina, J.O. (2010), Rethinking the Social Protection Paradigm: Social Policy in Africa's Development. Paper prepared for the Conference "Promoting Resilience through Social Protection in Sub-Saharan Africa", organised by the European Report of Development in Dakar, Senegal, Jun. 28-30.
- Agbonkhese, J. (2018). What women farmers suffer cultivating the foods Nigerians eat daily. In *Vanguard*, Jan. 25. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2018/01/women-farmers-suffer-cultivating-foods-nigerians-eat-daily/>
- Ahon, F. (2016). Delta commences feeding of pry school pupils Jan. In *Vanguard*, Dec. 7. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2016/11/delta-commences-feeding-pry-school-pupils-jan/>
- Ajetunmobi, W. (2018). Vibes from Fed Govt's School Feeding Initiative. In *The Nation*, Jul. 27, p.33.
- Alofetekun, A. (2018). Presidency sacks two officials in Niger over alleged corruption in school feeding. In *The Guardian*, Feb. 5, 8.
- ANEEJ (2018). Scoping Study on Utilisation and Monitoring of Recovered Abacha Loot and Broader Developmental and Governance Outcomes and Context of the MANTRA Project. Combined draft report prepared for the Monitoring of Recovered Assets in Nigeria through Transparency and Accountability Project. Benin City: Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice (2018). Unpublished.
- Ahiuma-Young, V. (2018). Employment crisis may derail Nigeria's 2020 target. In *Vanguard*, Feb. 1, p.24.
- Ajakaiye, O., & Fakiyesi, T. (2009). *Global Financial Crisis Discussion Series Paper 8: Nigeria*. London: ODI.
- Altaf, A., & Pouw, N. (2017). Defining, targeting and reaching the very poor in Benin. In Lawson, D., Ado-Kofie, L., & Hulme, D. (eds.). *What works for Africa's poorest?: Programmes and policies for the extreme poor* (pp.17-34). UK: Practical Action Publishing Ltd.
- Antai, A.S., & Anam, B.E. (2014). National poverty eradication programme and poverty reduction in Nigeria: Empirical investigation of the programme impact in Cross River State. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies* 4 (3), 269-279.
- Asadu, C. (2021). Kaduna to establish social protection agency for vulnerable residents. In *The Cable*, Feb. 23. Retrieved from <https://www.thecable.ng/kaduna-to-establish-social-protection-agency-for-vulnerable-residents>
- Asishana, J. (2018). ITF trains 11,000 youths. In *The Nation*, Feb. 13, p.20.
- Awojobi, O. (2015). Cultivating policy for development in Nigeria: An appraisal of President Goodluck Jonathan's transformation agenda (2011-2014). *International Research Journal of Humanities, Engineering & Pharmaceutical Sciences* 9, 1-11.
- Aworinde, T. (2019). TraderMoni is vote buying, says Transparency International. In *Punch*, Jan. 25. Retrieved from <https://punchng.com/tradermoni-is-vote-buying-says-transparency-international/>

Azor, C. (2021). National Social Investment Programme (NSIP): The Anambra State experience; Impact, issues, challenges, and way forward. Paper presented at the 'Inception Meeting and Official Launch of Social Protection Movement in Nigeria', organised by ANEEJ, Abuja, Mar. 23-24. Unpublished.

Barchiesi, F. (2006). The Debate on the Basic Income Grant in South Africa: Social Citizenship, Wage Labour and the Reconstruction of Working-class Politics. Paper presented at the Harold Wolpe Memorial Trust's Tenth Anniversary Colloquium, "Engaging silences and unresolved issues in the political economy of South Africa." Cape Town, Sep. 21-23.

Bello, B. (2021). Social investment programme: Over 12 million households benefitted from project in last 5yrs. In *Vanguard*, Jan. 4. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2021/01/social-investment-programme-over-12-million-households-benefitted-from-project-in-last-5yrs-fg/amp/>

Berry, F.S., & Berry, W.D. (1999), Innovation and diffusion models in policy research. In Sabatier, P.A. (ed.). *Theories of the policy process* (pp.169-200). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press,

Boushey, G. (2012). Punctuated equilibrium theory and the diffusion of innovations. *Policy Studies Journal*. 40 (1), 127-146.

Bretton Woods Update (2008). Africa and the making of adjustment: How economists hijacked the Bank's agenda. London: Bretton Woods Project.

Casey, B.H., & Dostal, J.M. (2008) Pension reform in Nigeria: How not to learn from others. *Global Social Policy* 8 (2), 238-266.

Conway, T., de Haan, A., & Norton, A. (ed.) (2000). *Social protection: New directions of donor agencies*. London: DFID.

Daka, T. (2017). FG's programmes to empower Nigerians. In *The Guardian*, Jan. 19, p.8.

Daka, T. (2018). Govt admits fraud in N1tr social investment fund. In *The Guardian*. Feb. 16, p.1.

Devereuax, S.J., McGregor, A., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2011). Introduction: Social protection for social justice. *IDS Bulletin* 42 (6), 1-9.

Devereuax, S.J., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004). Transformative social protection. *IDS Working Paper* 232. Oct, pp?

Dostal, J.M. (2010). Nigerian pension reform 2004-2010: Great leap or inappropriate design. *The Korean Journal of Policy Studies* 25 (2), 13-37.

Dror, Y. (1973). Public policy making reexamined. London: Leonard Hill Books.

Ehiaghe, G. (2018). NDE to empower 3500 youths through apprenticeship scheme. In *The Guardian*, Feb. 1, p.34.

Ekaunkumo, A. (2020). FG commences payment of 5,000 cashtransfer to vulnerable persons in Bayelsa. In *Daily Watch*, Sep. 29. Retrieved from <https://dailywatchng.org/fg-commences-payment-of-5000-cash-transfer-to-vulnerable-persons-in-bayelsa/>

Emmanuel, H. FG's school feeding programme suffers setback in A-Ibom. In *Vanguard*, Jan. 30, p.30.

Enobakhare, O. (2021). Key Informant Interview Extracts. Mar. 30, 2:30pm.

Fall, B. (2002). *Social History in French West Africa: Forced Labor, Labor Market, Women and Politics*. Amsterdam/Calcutta: SEPHIS/CSSSC.

Falola, T. (2009). *Colonialism and Violence in Nigeria*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Federal Government of Nigeria (2017). *National Social Protection Policy*. Abuja: Ministry of Budget and National Planning.
- Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (2008). *Strengthening social protection systems in developing countries and emerging economies*. Germany.
- Gennaioli, N., & Rainer, I. (2005). Precolonial centralization and institutional quality in Africa. In *Institutions and Norms in Economic Development*, ed. Mark Gradstein and Kai Andreas Konrad. Boston, MA: MIT Press, 21-46.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Oxford: Policy Press.
- Gultekin, S. (2014). Understanding policy process: Is there a single best way. *Journal of Administrative Sciences* 12 (24), 43-74.
- Holmes, R., Akinrimisi, B., Morgan, J., & Buck, R. (2012). *Social Protection in Nigeria: Mapping Programmes and their Effectiveness*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Hummelen, S.V. (2011). Introduction. In *Rethinking social investments*. Brussels: Foundation for European Progressive Studies/Young Academics Network, pp.2-7.
- Idio, E. (2019). FG spends N5bn on social investments programmes in Bayelsa. In *Vanguard*, Aug. 8. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2019/08/fg-spends-n5bn-on-social-investments-programmes-in-bayelsa/amp/>
- Lawal, E. (2020). School feeding, conditional cash transfer programs yet to commence in Bayelsa. In *Nigerian Tribune*, Jun. 24. Retrieved from <https://tribuneonlineng.com/school-feeding-conditional-cash-transfer-programs-yet-to-commence-in-bayelsa/amp/>
- Miroro, O.O. (2016). The rise of social protection in Sub-Saharan Africa, *Include*, Feb. Retrieved from <http://includeplatform.net/downloads/the-rise-of-social-protection-in-sub-saharan-africa/>
- Mohr, L.B. (1969). Determinants of innovation in organizations. *American Political Science Review* 75 (1), 963-974.
- National Planning Commission (2004). *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy 2003-2007*. Abuja: National Planning Commission.
- Nwigwe, N. (2020). Mamman Daura and southern presidency. In *The Cable*, Jul. 31. Retrieved from www.thecable.ng/mamman-daura-and-southern-presidency
- N-SIP (2019). *Investing in Our People: A Brief on the National Social Investment Programmes in Nigeria*. N-SIP/ National Social Investment Office. Sep.
- Ochoga, P. (2021). Nigeria: 13 million Nigerians to benefit from social intervention programmes – Govt. In *Leadership*, Feb. 17. Retrieved online at <https://allafrica.com/stories/202102180034.html>
- Odunsi, W. (2017). N-Power: Edo government employs volunteers. In *Daily Post*, Jun. 19. Retrieved from <https://dailypost.ng/2017/06/19/n-power-edo-government-employs-volunteers/>
- Ogundele, B. (2021). We'll lift 100 million Nigerians out of poverty - Buhari. In *The Nation*, Feb. 24. Retrieved from <https://thenationonlineng.net/well-lift-100-million-nigerians-out-of-poverty-buhari/>
- Ogunlade, O.M. (2021a). Summary of SIP Impacts in Ekiti State. Paper presented at at the 'Inception Meeting and Official Launch of Social Protection Movement in Nigeria', organised by ANEEJ, Abuja, Mar. 23-24. PPT.
- Ogunlade, O.M. (2021b). Key Informant Interview Extracts. Mar. 29, 9:45am.

- Oham, O. (2017). Reps summon Adeosun, Udoma, Ngige over poor remittance to NSITF. In *The Guardian*, Dec. 19, p.4.
- Okakwu, E. (2015). Low oil prices: SURE-P excluded from 2015 budget. In *Premium Times*, Sep. 19.
Retrieved from
<https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/top-news/190304-low-oil-prices-sure-p-excluded-from-2015-budget.html>
- Okereafor, K. (2020). N-Power: Edo govt assesses beneficiaries' impact in communities. In *Nigerian Observer*, Jan. 23.
Retrieved from
<https://nigerianobservernews.com/2020/01/n-power-edo-govt-assesses-beneficiaries-impact-in-communities/>
- Onabu, O-J. (2016). Nigeria: Delta's home-grown school feeding programme kicks off. In *Thisday*, Dec. 12.
Retrieved from
<http://www.thisdaylive.com/>
- Onah, R.C., & Olise, C. (2019). National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) and sustainable poverty reduction in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 24 (10: 11), 20-31.
- Ogundele, B. (2021). We'll lift 100 million Nigerians out of poverty – Buhari. In *The Nation*, Feb. 24.
Retrieved from
<https://thenationonline.net/well-lift-100-million-nigerians-out-of-poverty-buhari/>
- Osahon, J., & Oyewole, R. (2018). FG disburses TraderMoni to Bayelsa, Bauchi traders. In *The Guardian*, Oct. 24.
Retrieved from
<https://guardian.ng/news/fg-disburses-tradermoni-to-bayelsa-bauchi-traders/>
- Onyenucheya, A. (2018). UNICEF, Blaugrana Group partner on girl-child education. In *The Guardian*, Mar. 11, p.47.
- Ovat. M. (2021). "150 trained to monitor FG social investment programme in Anambra." In *Nigerian Tribune*, Feb. 24.
Retrieved online at
<https://tribuneonline.com/150-trained-to-monitor-fg-social-investment-programme-in-anambra/>
- PenCom (2018). Advertorial: Re: 'declining activities at Pencom'. In *Punch*, Feb, 15, p.37.
- Premium Times* (2017). Presidency provides details of Buhari's social investment programmes. May 16. Retrieved from
<https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/more-news/231443-presidency-provides-details-of-buharis-social-investment-programmes.html>
- Premium Times* (2018). School feeding programme, other factors boosting enrolment across southern Nigeria - Survey. Feb. 12. Retrieved from
<https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/top-news/258365-school-feeding-programme-factors-boosting-enrolment-across-southern-nigeria-survey.html>
- Premium Times* (2019). 9.8m pupils have benefitted from school feeding programme – Presidency. Jul. 11.
Retrieved from
<https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/more-news/340380-9-8m-pupils-have-benefited-from-school-feeding-programme-presidency.html>
- Proshare* (2017). FG commences N5,000 cash transfer to 1ml poor Nigerians. Jan. 3. Retrieved from
<https://www.proshareng.com/webtvnews/BANKING/FG-commences-N5-000-cash-transfer-to-1ml-poor-Nigerians/631>
- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Sabatier, P.A. (1999). The need for better theories. In Sabatier, P.A. (ed.). *Theories of the policy process* (pp.3-17). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press,

- Samson, M. (2013). How are countries using social protection to benefit the poor? *Development Cooperation Report 2013: Ending Poverty*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 71-80.
- Slabor, P. (2021). Key Informant Interview Extracts. Mar. 24, 8:45pm.
- Sobowale, D. (2017). N5,000 welfare: Buhari and the urgent need for full disclosure. In *Vanguard*. Jan. 22. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/01/buhari-and-the-urgent-need-for-full-disclosure/>
- Sterk, A., & Issaka, F. (2019). *Mapping linkages of humanitarian cash transfers and social protection in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe (BAY) states, North East Nigeria – Report*. UK: Department for International Development. Oct.
- The Eagle Online* (2018). Jigawa says 134,344 youth, women, empowered in three years. May 29. Retrieved from <https://theeagleonline.com.ng/jigawa-says-134344-youth-women-empowered-in-three-years/>
- The Nation* (2019). FG resumes disbursement of N10,000 Tradermoni in Bayelsa.
- The Punch* (2018). May 25, p.1.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2012). An assessment of the effectiveness of the Nigerian 2004 pension reform policy. *Pensions* 17 (4), 289-304.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2014). *African forms of administration*. Benin City: Dos-Nitas Global.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2017a). Nigerian Social Protection: Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme and Social Investment Programme. *Benin Journal of Social Sciences* 23 (1), 103-122.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2017b). Domain without subjects: Traditional rulers in post-colonial Africa. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 13 (2), 31-54.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2018). Social Protection for Nigerian Children: The National Home Grown School Feeding Programme. Paper presented at conference, ‘What works for Africa’s poorest children?’, organised by the Government of Uganda, Economic Policy Research Centre, the University of Manchester Global Development Institute, and UNICEF, Kampala, Sep. 10-12.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (2019). Inter-governmental programmes. In *Components and the whole of government* (pp.225-258). Benin City: Dos-Nitas Global. Cap.10.
- Ubhenin, O.E. (mimeo). Elite versus poor: Political incentives and social protection in Nigeria.
- Ulrichs, M., & Roelen, K. (2012). Equal opportunities for all? – A critical analysis of Mexico's Oportunidades. *IDS Working Paper* 413, 1-23.
- Uwagwu, M., & Ekpokpobe, I. (undated). FG okays feeding of 149,000 pupils in Delta. In *The Pointer*. Retrieved from <http://thepointernewsonline.com/?p=49618>
- Uwais. M. (2020). Clearing the air on the National Social Investment Programme -Maryam Uwais. In *Proshare*, Apr. 9. Retrieved from <https://www.proshareng.com/news/Nigeria-Economy/Clearing-the-Air-on-The-National-Social-Investment-Programme---Maryam-Uwais/50373>
- Vanguard* (2016). Gov’s aide laments 24% truancy recorded during N-Power verification in Bauchi. Dec. 20. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2016/12/govs-aide-laments-24-truancy-recorded-n-power-verification-bauchi/>

Vanguard (2016). FG plans N1trn social housing scheme, Oct. 17. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2016/10/fg-plans-n1trn-social-housing-scheme/>

Vanguard (2017). FG approves national social protection, oil, employment policies. Jul. 19. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/07/fg-approves-national-social-protection-oil-employment-policies/>

Vanguard (2019). School feeding programme expands to more schools in Edo. Mar. 15. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2019/03/school-feeding-programme-expands-to-more-schools-in-edo/>

Vanguard (2020). Minister says 109,823 N-Power beneficiaries now business owners. Jul. 5. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2020/07/minister-says-109823-n-power-beneficiaries-now-business-owners/>

Vanguard (2021). FG begins disbursement of grants to 2,800 rural women in Anambra. Feb. 1. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2021/02/fg-begins-disbursement-of-grants-to-2800-rural-women-in-anambra/amp/>

Walker, J.L. (1969). The diffusion of innovations among the American states. *American Political Science Review* 63 (3), 880-899.

Yahaya, F. (2020). FG commences school feeding programme on Thursday. In *The Nation*, May 12. Retrieved from <https://thenationonlineng.net/fg-commences-school-feeding-programme-on-thursday/>

Yaoub, P. (2020). 5,000 lifted through FG's cash transfer scheme in Ekiti - Fayemi. In *Independent*, Apr. 7. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.ng/5000-lifted-through-fgs-cash-transfer-scheme-in-ekiti-fayemi/>

Annexure I

NSSP Policy Measures and Thematic Areas

<i>Thematic area</i>	<i>Policy measures</i>
Education and health services	(1) Free school meals will be provided to all pupils in public primary schools (2) Provide scholarship, learning materials, uniforms and cash transfers for children in poor households and children living with disabilities (3) All children and adults living with disabilities have access to free health care, education and required special services and assistive devices (4) Provide free health care services for pregnant women, lactating mothers, children under 5, the aged (people over 65 years) and people living with disabilities (5) Universal access to health insurance scheme and/or other social health insurance schemes
Social welfare and child protection	(6) Provide health services, psycho-social support, and counselling to survivors of violence against persons, child labour child abuse, child rape and human trafficking
Social housing	(7) Provide decent and affordable housing for the homeless, the monetary poor, and families living in overcrowded and unhealthy conditions
Livelihood enhancement and employment	(8) Unemployment insurance and non-cash unemployment benefits to job seekers (9) Labour-based cash transfer/public works programmes for youths, persons with disabilities and the unemployed (10) Provide support for sustainable livelihood through skills training, access to land, inputs for smallholder farmers, affirmative action for youth and women's employment, ad access to financial services for micro and small enterprises and cooperatives (11) Provide affordable child care services for children under 5 to enable parents engage in productive activities
Social insurance schemes	(12) Contributory pensions available to all citizens 60 years of age and above
Social assistance	(13) Provide cash transfers to families and cash for work schemes which are activated at the onset of emergencies (14) Provide non-contributory pensions for all citizens over 60 years of age, as well as cash and food grants for poor families, orphans, street children and others vulnerable to harmful cultural practices
Traditional family and community support	(15) Support family and community-based mechanisms and systems for the intended beneficiaries to respond to shocks and extreme poverty
Legislation and regulation	(16) Provide a legal framework that specifically protects intended beneficiaries including children through inheritance rights, birth registrations, child care services and breast feeding

Source: Adapted from Sterk, & Issaka (2019), 69

Annexure II
NSIP – Programmes, Objectives and Target Beneficiaries

<i>Programme</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Target beneficiaries</i>
N-Power	Job creation and youth employment programme	500,000 unemployed graduates, 100,000 non-graduates, 1,000,000 junior pupils (aged 18-35)
NHGSFP	Improve pupil enrolment in primary schools Address poor nutrition and health status of children Encourage local agricultural production Create jobs along the value chain	12 million pupils in public primary schools (1-3) Cooks, farmers
GEEP	Provide financial support and training to businesses at bottom of the financial pyramid. Provide micro-lending to petty traders & MSME	Petty traders, MSMEs (2.5m beneficiaries)
NCTP (HUP)	Improve household consumption; Increase utilisation of health & nutrition services; Encourage household financial & asset acquisition; Engage beneficiaries in sustainable livelihoods	Poor & vulnerable households (1 million beneficiaries)
YESSO	Increase access to youth employment opportunities Provide targeted granted transfers	Poor & vulnerable (including youths and IDPs)
CSDP	Provide grants (no cash transfers)	Vulnerable households

Source: Derived with modification from Sterk, & Issaka (2019, 13); N-SIP (2019, 8)

Notes:

CSDP (Community and Social Development Programme), GEEP (Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme), HUP (Household Uplifting Programme), NCTP (National Cash Transfers Programme), NHGSFP (National Home Grown School Feeding Programme), YESSO (Youth Employment and Social Support Operations)

Annexure III**Status of N-SIP in Nigeria and Five Target States**

Poverty ratio (as at August 2019)

Nigeria: 40.2 percent

Anambra: 14.8 percent

Bayelsa: 22.6 percent

Delta: 6 percent

Edo: 12 percent

Ekiti: 28 percent

Population (2016 population forecasts)

Nigeria: 193 million

Anambra: 5,527,809

Bayelsa: 2,277,961

Delta: 5,663,362

Edo: 4,235,595

Ekiti: 3,270,798

Nigeria (36 States + FCT)

 Poverty ratio: 40.2 percent (as at August 2019)

N-SIP:	*Over 12 million households benefitted from all programmes in last five years (as at Jan. 4, 2021)
N-Power:	*549,500 N-Power graduates, non-graduates in 36 states + FCT *7 Technology Hubs *109,823 beneficiaries of Batches A&B became business owners (as at Jul. 5, 2020) *3,700 volunteers selected to work as Community Tax Liaison Officers within their states of residence
NHGSFP:	*9,963,762 pupils in 54,952 public primary schools in 33 states 107,862 cooks engaged *Take Home Ration (5kg bag of Rice, 5kg bag of beans, 500ml vegetable oil, 750ml of palm oil, 500mg of salt, 15pieces of eggs, and 140gm of tomato), valued at ₦4,200) distributed to 3,131,971 households of children in Pry 1-3 in public schools
GEEP:	*Introduced in 2017, powered by Bank of Industry *TraderMoni, MarketMoni, FarmerMoni in 36 states + FCT *Over 350,000 loans under ‘MarketMoni’ (as at Jul. 16, 2018) *1,092,405 MSME owners accessed (as at Jan. 4, 2021) *2,279,380 beneficiaries of GEEP (as Mar. 2021)
NCTP:	*29,766,599 individuals, in 6,969,230 PVHHs, in 81,776 communities, 8,161 wards, 699 LGAs, in 36 states + FCT captured in National Social Register (as at Feb. 28, 2021) *NCTO enrolled 1,632,535 benefiting PVHHs in 45,744 communities from 5,483 wards, 557 LGAs in 35 states + FCT *8,100,682 individuals in benefiting households through a PVHH rep called ‘Caregiver or Alternate Caregiver’, paid bi-monthly (₦10,000) *991,965 PVHHs receiving payment in 28 states + FCT *1 million indigents benefitted (as at Jan. 4, 2021)
Others:	*About 125,000 women to benefit from ₦20,000 Cash Grant for Rural Women Project across 36 states + FCT *1,000 youths in each LGA under the three-month 774,000 Special Public Works (SPW) programme (Jan. 5-Apr. 4, 2021) *Beneficiaries awaiting payment (₦20,000 monthly) *8 pilot states- Bauchi, Cross River, Ekiti, Kogi, Kwara, Niger, Osun, Oyo benefit from the Youths Empowerment & Social Support Operations (YESSO) *Community & Social Development Programme (CSDP)

 2021 Social Protection Budget: ₦765bn or 5.63 percent of ₦13.588 trillion (total budget)

Anambra State (21 LGAs)

Aguata, Anambra East, Anambra West, Anaocha, Awka North, Awka South, Ayamelum, Dunukofia, Ekwusigo, Idemili North, Idemili South, Ihiala, Njikoka, Nnewi North, Nnewi South, Ogbaru, Onitsha North, Onitsha South, Orumba North, Orumba South, Oyi

Poverty ratio:	14.8 percent (as at August 2019)
N-Power:	*All LGAs *14,689 beneficiaries exited the programme (as at July 2020,)
NHGSFP:	*All LGAs *103,175 pupils in Pry 1-3 currently benefit in 21 LGAs *1009 cooks engaged in the school feeding programme
GEEP:	*Over 30,000 beneficiaries in Phase I (2017 & 2018) *At least 2,000 target beneficiaries in Phase II launched at Eke Awka main market (on May 3, 2019)
NCTP:	*About 8,313 persons benefiting in 6 pilot LGAs Ayamelum (1036), Anambra West/Mbamili (1088), Awka North (891), Dunukofia (1425), Orumba South (1376), Ihiala (2497)
Others:	*FG began disbursement of grants (₦20,000) to 2,800 women under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme (on Jan. 31, 2021)
Home-grown programme(s):	Youth entrepreneurship and empowerment programmes Vocational, agricultural and artisan training programmes Creative centres, innovation hubs and ICTs
<i>2021 Social Protection Budget:</i> ₦11.0bn (with healthcare, agriculture, manufacturing, youth entrepreneurship, out of ₦143.7bn (total budget)	

Institutional partners:

Ministries of Agriculture, Education, Health, Budget and Development, SUBEB, PHCDA, National Orientation Agency, National Youth Service Corps, RUWASSA (WASH)

N-SIP impact:

Effective formation of cooperatives to encourage savings for possible business start-ups and expansion.

N-SIP implementation challenges:

Inadequate sum of N70 per child, irregular payment of food vendors (NHGSFP), over centralised payments (GEEP), non-existent mechanism for reprimanding defaulters (N-Power), lack of fund for M&E, poor supervision, lack of integrity, lack of legal framework, lack of synergy among units of government, non-inclusion of civil society, lack of real time grievance redress mechanism, indiscriminate removal of beneficiaries names from the register, poor sensitisation and mobilisation mechanisms.

Bayelsa State (8 LGAs)

Brass, Ekeremor, Kolokuma/Opokuma, Nembe, Ogbia, Sagbama, Southern Ijaw, Yenagoa.

Poverty ratio:	22.6 percent (as at August 2019)
N-Power:	*All LGAs (since 2018) *Over 10,000 youths engaged and exited (as at Aug. 2019)
NHGSFP:	Yet to commence
GEEP:	'TraderMoni' commenced (in 2018) with over 10,000 beneficiaries (as at Aug. 2019)
NCTP:	*Beneficiaries enrolled (in Sep. 2019) *Payment cycle commenced in 96 communities in 3 LGAs - Ekeremor, Nembe, Southern Ijaw (on Sep. 28, 2020)
Others:	FG began disbursement of grants (N20,000) to women under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme (since 2021)
Home-grown programme(s):	*Skill Acquisition Programme by Ministries *School Feeding Programme by Min. Education (in 12 schools)

2021 Social Protection Budget: Not specified

Institutional partners:

State Cash Transfer Unit, Bayelsa State Ministry of Budget and Economic Planning

N-SIP impact:

Tangible. CCT is little money, but lifting many people out of poverty. N-Power is building capacity of beneficiaries. 'TraderMoni' is helping beneficiaries to expand their businesses.

N-SIP implementation challenges:

Logistics, poor planning because it was done outside the state, dependence on third party information, wrong targeting of beneficiaries, lack of awareness, terrain was not taken into consideration, in movement, Lack of coordination within the state.

Delta State (25 LGAs)

Aniocha North, Aniocha South, Burutu, Bomadi, Ethiope East, Ethiope West, Ika North, Ika South, Isoko North, Isoko South, Ndokwa East, Ndokwa West, Oshimili North, Oshimili South, Okpe, Patani, Sapele, Udu, Ughelli North, Ughelli South, Ukwuani, Uvwie, Warri North, Warri South, Warri South West

Poverty ratio:	6 percent (as at August 2019)
N-Power:	*Over 30,000 applied, more than 8,000 shortlisted, and more than 7,000 were deployed in Batch A. *At least 6,000 volunteers received stipends as FG paid about ₦1.4 billion to volunteers in Delta (as at Jun. 19, 2017)
NHGSFP:	*Out of approved slot (149,000 pupils) for Delta, 141,663 pupils in 742 public pry schools benefitted (as at Sep. 2017) 5.01 percent of pupils 2,827,501 and 3.73 percent of 19,881 public primary schools
GEEP:	One LGA (Bomadi)
NCTP:	Formally launched in Aniocha North (on Sep. 28, 2019), and extended to two other LGAs (Warri North, Ika North-East)
Others:	FG began disbursement of grants (₦20,000) to 3,300 women under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme (on Mar. 23, 2021)
Home-grown programme(s):	*Skills Training and Empowerment Programme (STEP) *Youth Agricultural Entrepreneurship Programme (YAGEP) *Girls Empowerment Skills Training (GEST), since 2020
2021 Social Protection Budget:	Not specified

Institutional partners:

Executive Assistant to the Governor (Special Duties), Ministries of Agriculture, Basic and Secondary Education, Health, and Delta State Micro, Small, Medium Enterprises Development Agency

N-SIP impact:

Impact is in long-term value. Some N-Power beneficiaries saved up to start their businesses. With N-Power, there is financial inclusion, and the youths are shifting their focus from various social vices to more creative and worthwhile ventures. However, some beneficiaries fell back into the labour market. The cash transfers enabled some beneficiaries to save up for tangible impact, while others spend their earnings on consumables. Very few people took the money to add to their existing business for expansion.

N-SIP implementation challenges:

Logistics related, insecurity, resistance from youth who were not captured, as well as poor information and awareness.

Edo State (18 LGAs)

Akoko-Edo, Egor, Etasko Central, Etsako East, Etsako West, Esan Central, Esan North-East, Esan South-East, Esan West, Igueben, Ikpoba-Oka, Oredo, Orhionmwon, Ovia North-East, Ovia South-West, Owan East, Owan West, Uhunmwode

Poverty ratio:	12 percent (as at August 2019)
N-Power:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *All LGAs *Commenced with 4,702 volunteers (in 2016) *Over 13,000 beneficiaries from Batches A & B in 18 LGAs
NHGSFP:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Commenced with over 60 public primary schools in two pilot LGAs - Orhionmwon, Uhunmwode (in Apr. 2019) *Over 261 caterers engaged to feed the pupils *Edo State Government supports to ensure that pupils in primary 4-6 are included in the programme
GEEP:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Implemented through market clusters across the 18 LGAs *Over 4,000 loans disbursed under 'MarketMoni' (as at Jun. 16, 2018) *4,009 'TraderMoni' beneficiaries *Over 31,000 'MarketMoni' beneficiaries
NCTP:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Commenced with six pilot LGAs (Igueben, Esan West, Estako Central, Oredo, Ovia South-West, Owan East) in 2019 *10,407 beneficiaries, but there has not been payment since over a year
Others:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *N-SIP Hubs (Edo Innovate), training people on innovative tech (since 2017) *FG began disbursement of grants (₦20,000) to 3,400 women under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme (on Mar. 24, 2021)
Home-grown programme(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Reintegration of Libya Returnees *Edo StartUps Fund *Public Works Volunteers Programme (PUWOV)
2021 Social Protection Budget:	₦860m or 1 percent of ₦164.072bn (total budget)

Institutional partners:

Governor's Office (N-SIP), SUBEB, PPEB, Ministries of Education, Agriculture, Health (N-Power), SUBEB, Ministry of Education (NHGSFP), Ministry of Wealth Creation (GEEP, N-SIP Hubs), Ministries of Budget & Planning, Social Development & Gender Issues (NCTP)

N-SIP impact:

Improved state economy, improved household livelihoods, business start-ups and expansion, job creation

N-SIP implementation challenges:

Logistics related, insufficient vehicles, lack of control over beneficiaries, difficult terrain

Ekiti State (16 LGAs)

Ado-Ekiti, Ikere, Oye, Aiyekire (Gbonyin), Efon, Ekiti East, Ekiti South-West, Ekiti West, Emure, Ido-Osi, Ijero, Ikole, Ilejemeje, Irepodun/Ifelodun, Ise/Orun, Moba

Poverty ratio:	28 percent (as at August 2019)
N-Power:	All LGAs
NHGSFP:	*All LGAs *104,000 beneficiaries, mostly pupils
GEEP:	*All LGAs *Over 20,000 ‘TraderMoni’ beneficiaries (as at Jan. 25, 2019) *Over 8,000 ‘MarketMoni’ beneficiaries (as at Jan. 25, 2019)
NCTP:	*All LGAs *4,705 beneficiaries
Others:	FG disburses cash grants to women under the Rural Women Cash Grant Programme (on Mar. 23, 2021)
Home-grown programme(s):	* <i>Ounje arugbo</i> (food for the elderly) * <i>Owo arugbo</i> (money for the elderly) *YCAD (youths in commercial agriculture)
2021 Social Protection Budget:	₦25.27bn or 23 percent of ₦109b (total budget)

Implementing partners:

SCTU, SSA (Social Investment), SSA (School Feeding)

N-SIP impact:

Lifting beneficiaries above poverty, business expansion, social relevance of beneficiaries

N-SIP implementation challenges:

Unclear modalities for selecting beneficiaries, inadequate sensitisation of beneficiaries on effective capital use, absence of clearly defined M&E framework for impacts, inadequacy of grievance redress mechanisms to ensure fairness.

Annexure IV

Status of Social Protection Policy

*2017 National Social Protection Policy provides for a review of the document every three years to ensure an all-inclusive and integrated policy that will address poverty and economic vulnerability in Nigeria.

*Stakeholder's consultation and sensitisation workshop have been held across the six geo-political zones.

*Consultation, sensitisation and validation to be repeated after the draft policy for approval by FEC and legislation by the National Assembly.

*Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning, in collaboration with the Joint UN development partners, conducted a quality check and validation session on the six-chapter document.

*Feedback from stakeholders and partners;

*Presentation to policy makers, ministers, permanent secretaries and MDAs;

*Engagement with lawmakers and state governors for legal backing and institutionalisation;

*Engagement with National Economic Council and the Federal Executive Council;

Related Social Policy Making by States

None of the five target states currently has a social protection policy in place. However, Edo is taking the lead in social protection policy formulation, with the engagement of CSOs and other stakeholders in drafting a policy that would be submitted to the Government by May 30, 2021.

Yet, the five target states have existing components of social policy making that could fast-track their individual social protection policy formulation. The social policy making by states is captured below:

Anambra:	Anambra State Pension Law, 2013 (amended in 2014) Anambra State Health Insurance Scheme, 2016
Bayelsa:	Bayelsa State Pension Law, 2009 Bayelsa Health Insurance Scheme, 2013
Delta:	Delta State Pension Law, 2008 (amended in 2011) Delta state Contributory Health Commission Law, 2015
Edo:	Enacted State Pension Law, 2010 (amended in 2017) Edo State Mandatory Health Insurance Scheme, 2019
Ekiti:	Ekiti State Pension Law (amended in 2017) Ekiti State Health Insurance Scheme, 2016

Annexure V

Stakeholders List

S/n	Name	Designation	Organisation
1	Hajia Sadiya Umar Farouq	Hon. Minister	Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development
2	Engr. (Dr.) Umar B. Bindir	Senior Special Adviser to the Honourable Minister	Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development
3	Mrs. Maryam Uwais	Special Adviser	Office of Special Adviser to President (Social Investment)
4	Iorwa Apera	National Coordinator	National Social Safety-Net Coordinating Office (NASSCO)
5	Yimave Gyanggyang	Stakeholder Engagement & Social Safety Net Manager	NASSCO
6	Afolabi Imoukhuede	National Coordinator/ SSA	Office of Senior Special Assistant to President on Job Creation (N-Power)
7	Abimbola Adesanmi	Programme Coordinator	NHGSFP
8	Dr. Temitope Sinkaye	Programme Coordinator	NCTP
9	Uzoma Nwagbe	COO	GEEP
10	<i>Mrs. Chinwe Iwuchukwu</i>	<i>Focal Person</i>	<i>N-SIP, Anambra State</i>
11	Chris Azor	President	International Peace and Civic Responsibility Centre, Awka
12	<i>Mrs. Martha Jenakumo</i>	<i>Focal Person</i>	<i>N-SIP, Bayelsa State</i>
13	Philip Slabor	Executive Director	Development Initiators, Yenagoa
14	<i>Barr. Bridget Anyafulu</i>	<i>Focal Person/ Executive Asst.</i>	<i>N-SIP, Delta State/ Special Duties</i>
15	Mrs. Martha Onose	Executive Director	Community Empowerment and Development Initiative, Warri
16	<i>Ms. Osayuwamen Aladeselu</i>	<i>Focal Person</i>	<i>N-SIP, Edo State</i>
17	Mr. Oghosa Enobakhare	Programme Manager	CCT, Edo State
18	<i>Mr. Victor Kolade</i>	<i>Focal Person</i>	<i>N-SIP, Ekiti State</i>
19	Ogunlade Olamide Martins	Rep. Abiodun Oyeleye	New Initiative for Social Development, Ekiti State

Annexure VI
Key Informant Interview Guide

N-SIP Implementation in
Anambra, Bayelsa, Delta, Edo, and Ekiti States

1. What is your understanding of the National Social Investment Programme (N-SIP)?
2. What is your role in the N-SIP implementation in your state?
3. When did the Nigerian Federal Government commence implementation of N-SIP in your state?
3b. Please, state for each programme:
N-Power -
NHGSFP -
GEEP -
NCTP -
4. How many LGAs are currently covered by the social protection programmes in your state?
4b. Please state for each programme and their beneficiaries:
N-Power -
NHGSFP -
GEEP -
NCTP -
5. Apart from the above, is your state benefitting from any other related programme by the Fed Govt?
5b. If yes, please list them.
- 6. Which MDAs are responsible for implementing each or all of the N-SIP programmes in your state?
7. What impact have the social protection programmes made in the lives of beneficiaries in your state?
8. What are the challenges of the N-SIP implementation in your state, and how can they be addressed?
9. Are you aware of the 2017 National Social Protection Policy (NSPP)?
10. Does your state have a home-grown social protection policy? Please, specify.

Annexure VII**Participants at the Zoom Meeting Held on Tuesday, April 27, 2021
(11:30am - 12:10pm)**

S/n	Name	Designation	Organisation
1	Mr. Leo Atakpu	Deputy Executive Director	ANEEJ
2	Ms. Sandra Eguagie	Program/ M&E Officer	ANEEJ
3	Yimave Gyangyang	Stakeholder Engagement & Social Safety Net Manager	NASSCO
4	Dr. Oscar E. Ubhenin	Host	Consultant