



TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS – TERMS OF REFERENCE INTELLECTUAL SERVICES

French Development Agency

5 Roland Barthes

75598 Paris Cedex 12 - RCS PARIS B 775 665 599

Telephone: + 33 (0)1 53 44 31 31

Concerning the service

**Feasibility Study for an AFD-Financed Operation in
Nigeria in Social Protection, Health Financing and
Systems Strengthening**

SUMMARY

1. Background and Rationale	3
2. Objectives of the Assignment	3
3. Scope of Work and Key Tasks	3
6. Risk Assessment	11
7. Financing Plan and Instrument Scenarios.....	11
8. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL).....	12
9. Methodology	12
10. Deliverables (with quality criteria and validation).....	12
11. Provisional Workplan and Schedule.....	13
12. Team Composition and Qualifications	13
13. Data, Ethics, and Safeguards.....	14
14. Reporting, Meetings and Communication	14
15. References (data sources and dates)	14

1. Background and Rationale

Nigeria faces persistent, multidimensional poverty and some of the world's highest maternal, newborn and child mortality rates. Social protection (SP) coverage and health insurance for the poor and vulnerable remain limited; out-of-pocket expenditure still dominates total health spending. The Government has embarked on macro-fiscal reforms and is updating its national SP policy framework, with growing attention to shock-responsive social protection (SRSP) and to scaling health insurance for vulnerable groups through the Basic Health Care Provision Fund (BHCPF) and the National Health Insurance Authority (NHIA). Development partners, including the World Bank, are active in cash transfers and systems building (e.g., NASSP-SU).

Against this backdrop, AFD is considering a financing operation to (i) expand coverage of the poor and vulnerable to essential health services, (ii) support targeted safety nets with human-capital and livelihoods co-measures, and (iii) strengthen institutions and data systems—especially linkages between health financing and social protection via the National Social Register (NSR). This ToR commissions a feasibility study to guide AFD's project preparation and instrument choice (including the potential use of Programmatic Budget Financing).

2. Objectives of the Assignment

Overall objective. Provide AFD with robust context specific, technical, public financial management (PFM) and fiduciary, institutional and operational feasibility study to decide on the scope, design and financing instrument for a Nigeria operation aligned with Government priorities and procedures and complementary to partners' programmes.

3. Scope of Work and Key Tasks

The Consultant will deliver analyses and scenarios across three technical components plus cross-cutting workstreams.

3.1 Component 1 (C1) – Increase the enrolment of the most vulnerable people in the health insurance system to increase access to quality healthcare, with a particular focus on women, children and forcibly displaced persons

The feasibility assessment should focus on the following aspects:

Number of potential beneficiaries: estimate the coverage achievable through cost adjustments on the one hand, and through a substantial increase in funding on the other, while also considering the absorption capacity of both the health insurance system and the healthcare delivery system (supply side).

Sustainability and system resilience: assess, in coherence with actuarial studies done by other partners on the NHIA (GiZ, Gates Foundation...) the long-term viability of coverage for vulnerable populations and the overall sustainability of the system, which will require increased domestic financing.

Gender mainstreaming: ensure the integration of gender-related considerations to the health insurance system to reduce inequalities in access to social provisions and strengthen women's empowerment in targeting, transfer modalities, safety and dignity, participation, and accountability.

Gender equality and social inclusion: identify gender and inclusion issues such access barriers faced by women and girls specially the most vulnerable ones (e.g., ID/NIN requirements, distance from primary health centers, lack of respectful care, risks of GBV), and propose corrective design measures for mitigating risk of exclusion/marginalization (such as registration campaigns for women and adolescent girls, fee waivers, and strengthened community support).

Targeting mechanisms: examine the feasibility of progressively adopting the National Social Register (NSR) as the single reference tool (in connection with Component 3), and assess its ability to differentiate beneficiaries across socio-economic categories, including informal sector workers.

Verification mechanisms: identify the most effective approach to ensure traceability between disbursed funds and the beneficiaries actually covered.

Sustainability and exit strategy: propose credible post-project financing pathways (federal and state budget allocations, compliance of BHCPF with 1% of the CRF, performance-based transfers), reforms in provider payment mechanisms, and a phased exit of development partners.

3.2 Component 2 (C2) – Safety Nets with Human-Capital and Livelihoods Co-measures

In order to avoid duplication and to strengthen institutional capacity-building efforts and the tools already in place, the proposed approach would be to align the planned support with the ongoing work of the World Bank and the Government of Nigeria in designing an intervention for 2026. To do so, the World Bank has granted a funding to the Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Poverty Reduction to enhance the design and implementation readiness of a flagship safety nets program and system in Nigeria. As such, the feasibility study shall coordinate closely with the implementation of this grant through the appointment of a focal point who will be responsible for maintaining daily dialogue with the technical team, or the creation of a joint working group.

This intervention would focus on financing social safety nets and providing vocational training. Given the relatively high cost of training compared to other forms of support, as well as the differing profiles of beneficiaries, several coverage scenarios will need to be considered:

For the most vulnerable groups (acute situations), in particular pregnant and breastfeeding women: financing of social safety nets in the form of cash transfers, conditional on health center visits (antenatal consultations and postnatal care), combined with nutritional support for mothers and their children.

For chronically vulnerable groups seeking to develop livelihoods: cash transfers conditional on participation in public works or school enrolment of children, accompanied by vocational training support.

A pilot project in 2026, implemented in one or two states, would allow the model to be tested, evaluated, and adjusted prior to a broader rollout after 2027, following the elections.

The joint design work with the World Bank and the Government of Nigeria should focus on:

Implementation arrangements, with particular emphasis on operational partnerships and the involvement of communities and CSOs;

Institutional anchoring of the programme, including identification of the lead national implementing agency(ies), and local states if pilot projects are confirmed;

Number and categories of targeted beneficiaries and the best approach for targeting where there's a strong need to go towards a more "ward-based" social protection interventions;

Alignment with the World Bank's approach (linkages with existing programmes, co-financing arrangements, task delegation);

Gender and social inclusion dimensions: identify the gender and inclusion issue to be addressed when it comes to finance social safety nets (e.g. to what extent could directing social transfers to women increase the risk of domestic violence?) in order to not reinforce existing inequalities.

Assessment of barriers to access for vulnerable populations to the supported mechanisms (e.g. remoteness of service delivery points, requirement of identification documents), ensuring that:

- proposed social schemes remain accessible — for example, does the ID requirement risk excluding the most vulnerable?
- transfer amounts are sufficient to trigger meaningful change (cf. work by E. Duflo),
- human rights are safeguarded in programme delivery (confidentiality, privacy, avoidance of selection bias),
- conditionalities do not generate adverse side effects, particularly on children's schooling (e.g. increased psychological distress among adolescent girls).

Conflicts & Climate dimension: explore how to integrate conflict-sensitive approach and shock responsiveness and adaptation into social safety nets, opportunity to target forcibly displaced persons and consider the establishment of a contingency financing line.

3.3 Component 3 (C3) – Institutional and system strengthening on policy dialogue and sustainability

The government is already taking steps towards creating a budget line for launching a flagship government program to provide regular and shock-responsive adaptive safety nets to Nigeria's poor people. Given the enormity of the poverty challenge in Nigeria, the government expects external financing to complement its own resources, at least in the first few years. The government also expects technical assistance and external financing to continue improving the delivery system, particularly strengthening the Social Registry and promoting its usage by social programs and its interoperability with other government databases and systems.

The project aims at **bridging the existing gap between health insurance and social safety nets** by creating linkages between the two, notably with the usage of the National Social Register. System strengthening is essential so that these programs become more robust, better coordinated, and integrated into a long-term strategy. There is a need to align all reforms and structure the overall model, while continuing to build and reinforce institutions.

Many programs, including those targeted at the poor and vulnerable, often use their own registration and targeting mechanisms. Using the Social Register as a gateway for all social assistance and pro-poor programs will be more efficient by ensuring that the program beneficiaries are poor and vulnerable and also by reducing the cost of data collection across multiple programs. As systems mature, the data from the Social Register, when combined with beneficiary registry from the programs, can help identify coverage gaps and duplication of programs or benefits, which can be used to channel resources more efficiently. Placing the Social Register in a central agency could remove existing institutional barriers (real or perceived) toward access to the tool.

Building up on the policy dialogue that the World Bank is leading, and using the same coordination mechanism as defined in C2, the feasibility study should examine how technical assistance could help:

NSPP advocacy and budget tagging: map reforms and coalition (WB, UN, NGOs); propose AFD contributions (economic case, Social Protection budget tagging, state-level adoption).

NSR strengthening: define TA for digital management, deduplication/cleaning, dynamic updates, data sharing across sectors, and usability by health insurance; data protection; leverage ID4D project.

4. Financial Instrument – Program Budget Support

For the components C1 and C2 of this financing operation, AFD is contemplating the use of a budgetary financing instrument, and more specifically a “Program Budget Support” (“*financement budgétaire de programme*” in AFD’s internal terminology)¹.

The use of a budgetary financing instrument such as “Program Budget Support” (PBS) involves specific assessments and due diligence, which will need to be incorporated in the feasibility study.

Please note that in accordance with the AFD approach to budget support, a separate fiduciary risk assessment of the Republic of Nigeria will be conducted, based on a simplified PEFA methodology. **The results of such fiduciary risk assessment will need to be taken into account in performing these consultancy services.**

4.1 Potential Implementation Arrangements

Three main possibilities are envisaged under a PBS approach. The choice of instrument depends on the Government needs (Federal Ministry of Finance and Federal Ministry of Budget and Economic Planning, as well as Federal Ministry of Health and Social Welfare and Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Poverty Reduction) and the development challenge to be addressed.

Option A: Classic PBS

Each year, AFD and the relevant Government entities would agree on a list of expenditures or activities drawn from the Program. These expenditures would contribute to the Program objectives, as measured by its indicators. They would be validated by the Government of Nigeria and transcribed in the budget as clearly identified line items. The agreement of both parties would be formalized during an annual review looking at implementation progress over the past year and upcoming tasks for the months ahead. This process would follow the normal steps of the budget preparation timeline.

The expenditures themselves would be committed, verified and paid according to national public financial management procedures complemented by procedures drafted with the lead institutions (wherever the official text is not precise enough to ensure organization efficiency). For PFM areas presenting deep weaknesses, AFD and the lead institutions will work to define mitigation and capacity-building measures to ensure a smooth use of funds.

The AFD funds would be used to finance the eligible program expenditures according to one of three mechanisms: (i) refinancing of eligible program expenditures, (ii) budget line advances replenished in accordance with the actual execution of the relevant budget lines and (iii) disbursement into a specific revenue account reserved for the sole purpose of financing the eligible program expenditures.

The program financial statements and/or the output financed would be verified yearly (scope to be determined). The objective of this verification will be to assess the respect of national PFM procedures by the implementing agencies and accuracy of the accounting records. Independent verification of the financed outputs could also be considered to focus the dialogue on whether results and value-for-money have been achieved. Subject to a review by AFD, audits could be carried out by national institutions (Comptroller and Office of the Auditor General for the Federation of Nigeria). The conclusions of the audit would help determine how to adapt the risk management framework and capacity building. The discussion of its conclusions would be an integral part of the annual program review and condition for subsequent disbursements.

Option B: Results-based PBS

¹ Please refer to Schedule 1 for a description of this instrument.

The result-based approach is similar to the PforR (Program for results) approach of the World Bank.

Like classical PBS approach, a results-based approach finances and support borrowers' programs. Result-based financing can support entire programs or sub-programs, new or existing ones, as well as programs that are national or subnational, sectoral or multi-sectoral in nature. As with classic PBS approach, they require the authorities to design – with the support of the donor – a full-fledged program including a strategic document, a multi-year budget framework and an institutional framework for coordination and decision-making.

Unlike classical PBS approach, a result-based PBS disburses upon achievement of program results. Instead of disbursing the funds *ex-ante*, based on the budget adopted by the authorities, result-based PBS disburse *ex-post*, based on the achievements of specific targets. These targets – called “disbursement linked indicators” (DLIs) - are derived from the program objectives and indicators and agreed upon during the preparation phase of the Program. DLIs therefore generally target an output (e.g. construction of helipads for emergency response), an institutional action (e.g. conducting climate change vulnerability assessments in 5 river basins) or an outcome (e.g. the average response time of the disaster response task force is lowered to 30 minutes). Each DLI can carry its own financial weight – so that if a DLI is missed it does not block the disbursement of the totality of the funds. The financial weight attributed to each DLI should reflect the incremental costs associated with its implementation (most notably for DLI targeting an output or outcome) or the its strategic impact to the program overall success (for DLI targeting an institutional action). Additionally, a result-based PBS can also include an initial advance of funds (capped at 20% of AFD's financing) – disbursed upon adoption of the first program-aligned budget – to provide the necessary financial space to start the program.

The program results and expenditure framework would be verified yearly. The objective of this verification will be to assess if the DLI have been met and if the government duly implements its commitments with regard to the program expenditure framework. The first objective would be served by recruiting an Independent Verification Agent (IVA) to verify the state of completion of each DLI, based on the data and information compiled beforehand by the authorities. The second objectives would be met by reviewing the approved budget and its implementation report against the program expenditure framework to verify that (i) budget appropriations reflect the initial program expenditure framework and (ii) budget execution is broadly in line with initial projections.

Result-based PBS tend to lead to greater development effectiveness by creating a mutual accountability between public authorities and AFD. The focus on results can lead to greater development effectiveness and significantly the use of overall public expenditures. This instrument could enhance the efficiency of the program to achieve tangible, sustainable and visible results for the population and communities.

Option C : Mixed PBS

Alternatively, a PBS can combine the two approaches. A portion of the financing (e.g. 80%) is scheduled to be planned, budgeted, disbursed and implemented according to a classic PBS approach. The rest (e.g. 20%) is allocated to DLIs as in a result-based PBS (especially for “soft” or institutional activities).

This can sometimes be a good middle ground if both parties want to increase performance but some DLIs are difficult to formulate – notably when the exact link between certain output and outcome are hard to gauge (how many helipads are necessary to decrease average emergency response under 30 minutes ?). It nevertheless require to combine the verification mechanism of both approach (program financial audit + independent verification agent) which can be a bit more costly and time-consuming.

The mixed approach is similar to IPF (Investment project finance) with DLIs the World Bank sometimes deploy in its client countries.

4.2 Tasks related to the PBS appraisal

Program credibility and expenditure framework

This part of the assessment aims at verifying that the program (i.e. components C1 and C2) is “fully-costed, fully-budgeted and fully-financed” and that the aid results in “additionality”. Indeed, the funds granted have to come *in addition* to the funds already mobilized by the Government of Nigeria, meaning that resources allocated for the sector significantly increases, thanks to the PBS.

The expenditure framework must highlight the expenditure required to achieve the expected results of the program, with a clear distinction between their nature (purchase of works, goods and services, human resources costs, etc.) and all sources of funding to meet it (state budget allocations, external financing, sometimes user payments, etc.)

Please note that to the extent that a contingency envelope (cf. Section 3.5 below) is integrated into the program, **such contingency envelope should be integrated into the expenditure framework** (including the program expenditure reallocation mechanism, in the event the contingency envelope is activated). More generally, the overall PBS structuring should take into account such a potential contingency envelope.

In this regard, it is expected from the consultants to work closely with the relevant Nigerian authorities to:

- ❖ **Review the budget structure and classification**: the assessment should begin by tracking budgetary information available on the economic category and programmatic composition of expenditures (the share of the Program’s expenditures that is allocated to salaries, operating and capital spending). A **proper classification** allows the tracking of expenditures according to (a) administrative units (line departments, local entities, etc.), economic categories (recurrent, capital spending), functions (i.e by sector: health, fire services, etc.) and government programs, subprograms, projects, activities. The consultants will also identify how the Program funds could be protected by an **earmarking mechanism**.
- ❖ **Assess the program’s financial sustainability and funding predictability through a MTEF**: this step is essential to define the capability of the government to finance the Program (from various funding sources, internal and external) regarding the overall fiscal situation in a multi-year perspective. The consultants will work closely with the relevant Nigerian entities on the **formulation of a medium-term expenditure framework** (MTEF) for the Program. This would involve making projections of both expenditures and their sources of financing for each year of the Program. The composition of the MTEF according to the economic classification allows to measure parts of the expenditure program that would become permanent (and therefore could affect the financial sustainability in the medium term). The consultants are also invited to assess the adherence of the expected expenditure and its execution to the government’s priorities, by measuring expenditures out-turn compared to those approved in the budget law.

Definition of the results framework (and verification protocol):

Programs supported by result-based approaches require a well-defined result framework, with clearly defined indicators that the State can monitor, measure and report on routinely.

- ❖ If the P4R approach is endorsed, the consultants will be invited to design the results framework, by distinguishing DLIs. The number of DLIs should not exceed 8 and the matrix should remain clear and simple. It is expected from the consultants to also define the verification protocol, with an independent institution.
- ❖ If the classical PBS approach is chosen at the end of Phase 1, the consultants will work on disbursement modalities (refinancing of previously authorized expenditures, based on the expenditure framework could be an option).

Institutional Arrangements:

Institutional structure for Program implementation: given the nature of the Program and the multiple stakeholders involved, it is required to have a clear definition of roles and responsibilities for implementation. A special attention will be paid by the consultant team to (i) the mechanisms in place to ensure an efficient cross-entity collaboration, (ii) the need and how to formalize it (MoU between agencies?). An analysis of the institutional division of labor during the planning, programming, budgeting and monitoring of activities will be produced by the consultants. This analysis will highlight, for each step, the level of involvement of each actor (e.g. responsible, actor, consulted, informed etc.) and the possible areas of overlap or friction. It will pay special care to the existence, or absence, of interface between the line departments and other relevant stakeholders. In addition, the results of the fiduciary risk assessment mentioned above will also need to be taken into account.

Program Governance: the study will define the composition and responsibilities of the program governance structure.

Technical Assistance:

Finally, the consultants will propose a capacity-building plan outlining the priorities for technical assistance and local reinforcement. The plan will propose different type of assistance (local expertise, international expertise, diagnostics, training etc.) in relation to its goals and be fully costed.

The technical assistance could cover technical issues, PFM aspects and operational support during implementation, including for example (i) procurement management, (ii) financial and technical reporting, (iii) public investment management, (iv) internal controls and internal audit **and shall take into account the results of the fiduciary risk assessment mentioned above.**

The capacity building plan could also include capacity building and empowerment activities aiming at other key actors to ensure better performance of the program.

4.3 Tasks related to the PBS Implementation

The consultants will also facilitate the launch of the PBS by assisting in preparing key documents:

- The Operations Manual for the Program, describing the necessary operating procedures and protocols for the implementation of the PBS including – but not limited to – the template budgetary framework, reporting documents, implementation procedures and protocols between the relevant Nigerian stakeholders and AFD.
- Preparation of a Program Action Plan (PAP): The Program Action Plan reflects the actions that are to be undertaken by the Nigerian authorities to address key areas for improvement identified under the assessment. Based on the shortcomings identified in feasibility study,

the consultants will prepare a program action plan to fill the gaps and ensure a smooth implementation of the program. These actions can be of different types:

- Actions to increase the potential for the Program to achieve its results (including formal rules and procedures used to implement the Program);
- Actions to enhance the capacity and performance of the agencies involved in the Program;
- Risk-mitigating measures to address fiduciary, E&S concerns.
- Support to the production of the necessary programming and budgeting document such as the updated medium-term expenditure framework of the program, its first annual action plan, its translation into expenditures in the draft appropriation bill and the related procurement plans.
- Support and facilitation the institutional arrangements such as the setting up of technical and financial working groups created for the implementation of the PBS (e.g. monitoring committee for the implementation of the Program, etc.).

5. Cross-Cutting Workstreams (apply to C1–C2-C3)

- Governance arrangements: recommend a two-sector governance model (Health & Humanitarian/Social), a Project Steering Committee (MoF, MoHSW, MoHAPR, NHIA, NPHCDA, NSIPA/NASSCO/NCTO, selected states, AFD, WB), and a fit-for-purpose PMU (stand-alone vs. embedded in an existing PMU), with roles and decision rights; explore opportunities for the involvement of relevant civil society organizations (CSOs), particularly those engaged in the oversight of the BHCPF;
- M&E and results: design an integrated M&E system with a concise results framework (access, financial protection, nutrition, enrolment, equity, governance); propose verification protocols and data flow using NSR/NHIA/BHCPF platforms;
- Conflict sensitivity & access:

The conflict-sensitivity approach, which the AFD seeks to apply with the instrument 'Peace and resilience – Minka, but also more broadly across operations implemented in areas affected by crises and conflicts, revolves around the four following steps, which are to be carried out iteratively all along the project cycle:

1. Analyze the conflict context to identify conflict drivers;
2. Analyze the project's interactions with the context in order to "do no harm";
3. Work with AfD and the partners to develop a suitable monitoring and evaluation mechanism that can inform necessary adaptations to the intervention based on analysis before and during implementation to avoid negative impacts;
4. Recommend additional actions to unlock the project's positive potential in support of the resilience and/or social cohesion of populations vulnerable to crises and violent conflict.

The information derived from the context analysis should help identify the conflict factors that the AFD-funded project could unintentionally exacerbate, and the cohesion factors that the project could contribute to support and reinforce.

To that end, the analysis seeks to address the following questions:

- What are the main dividing lines within the context/sector, and how could the project affect them (positively or negatively)?
- Who are the actors, locations, and initiatives that have an interest in or contribute to ongoing tensions and are likely to be reinforced by the projects (dividers)? What actions could reduce their impact?
- Who are the actors, places, and initiatives that foster social cohesion dynamics (cohesion factors) and could be supported by the project (connectors)?

- What resource transfers and power dynamics could arise around the appropriation, control, or diversion of project-related resources?
- What lessons have been learned from past interventions / in the sector regarding the impact of projects

Additional requests:

- Integrate hard-to-reach areas, security constraints, and the specific vulnerabilities of the North/Northeast into geographic targeting and implementation choices;
- Assess the feasibility of incorporating multidimensional vulnerabilities (poverty, natural disasters, security crises, and related forced displacement) into population targeting;
- Consider the establishment of a contingency envelope to support adaptive social protection programmes capable of responding to a variety of shocks.
- Climate, environment & biodiversity :
 - Biodiversity: exclusion lists for income-generating activities (IGAs) where relevant;
 - Health care waste: biomedical waste management safeguards (C1 service-delivery implications);
 - Low-carbon: encourage low-carbon livelihoods and explore the health system's decarbonisation trajectory;
 - Climate resilience: adaptive windows for climate-sensitive disease surges and shock response.
- Social, gender & human rights: ensuring a gender-sensitive and socially inclusive approach within the all the project's component. This should include an intersectional and gender analysis identifying the determinants of inequalities to be addressed by the project which take into account different forms of discriminations (socio-economic, age, localisation, ethnic, religious, etc.) embedded with gender-based ones in the Nigerian health insurance and safety nets context (access barriers such distance to PHCs or ID/NIN requirements; adequacy of transfer sizes (behavioural impacts);privacy/confidentiality and algorithmic bias;etc). Moreover, the analysis should also identify the institutional and organizational obstacles which could limit the implementation of gender-responsive and inclusive approach. The gender-based social norms among structural barriers could be considered as well. This analyse should bring out concrete operational recommendations for structuring a gender-responsive and inclusive approach within the three components of the project according the recommendations of OECD on gender equality and women empowerment, in order to build a DAC 1 approach in the intervention logic (include GBV risk mitigation). It will be useful to take into account any relevant recommendations produced or good practices promoted by the relevant international stakeholders on taking into account gender issues in the concerned domains. Nigerian feminist CSO should also be consulted during the feasibility in order to anchor and adapt the operational recommendations within the national context.
- Economics & political economy: articulate the project's contribution to a more inclusive and sustainable economic model (productive inclusion; decent work; low-carbon orientation).
- Governance & digital public infrastructure: address data-sharing, performance management, and a realistic decade-long partner exit strategy underpinned by increased domestic financing.

6. Risk Assessment

Identify and rate risks—including duplication and fragmented institutional arrangements, weak stakeholder participation across federal/state levels, transparency/accountability gaps, fiduciary and budget execution risks, security/access constraints, and macro-fiscal volatility—and propose targeted mitigation (coordination platform for SP, budget tagging, verification systems, adaptive windows, phased roll-out, independent spot-checks, etc.).

7. Financing Plan and Instrument Scenarios

- **Allocation by component.** Provide costed scenarios consistent with eligible programmes and absorption capacity; refine the financing plan by instrument scenario.
- **Instrument choice.** Feed into AFD's parallel assessment for **Programmatic Budget Financing** (including fiduciary risk, earmarking/assignment modalities, operating procedures, and TA envelope).
- **Partnering with the World Bank.** Set out the most suitable collaboration modality (strategic anchoring, co-financing, task delegation), including negotiation timelines if delegation is envisaged.

8. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)

Propose an MEL framework with a limited set of disaggregated indicators (sex, age, location, poverty status), baseline strategy, targets (where feasible), data sources (NHIA/BHCPF, NSR, facility HMIS, payment platforms), verification protocols, learning questions, and an evaluation plan for pilots. Illustrative outcomes include: increased insurance enrolment among the poor and PLW, ANC/PNC attendance, child immunisation, reduced OOPs and catastrophic health spending, improved inclusion, strengthened NSR quality and usage, and improved coordination between SP and health.

9. Methodology

The Consultant will propose a rigorous, mixed-methods approach combining: (i) document review; (ii) key informant interviews across federal and state stakeholders; (iii) service-readiness spot-checks at PHC level; (iv) financial and actuarial simulations; (v) geo-targeting analysis using poverty/IDP and service availability layers; (vi) gender and inclusion diagnostics; (vii) fiduciary risk assessment; and (viii) option appraisal with clear trade-offs. Stakeholder engagement must include civil society organisations, women's groups and professional associations. Ethical standards for data collection and privacy must be respected.

This service requires the combination of two types of expertise, e.g. a firm specialising in social protection and health financing and a firm specialising in public finance management and budget support.

The feasibility study will need to ensure effective dialogue and ownership among all stakeholders. It will need include clear mechanisms to facilitate dialogue, such as regular consultation meetings, participatory discussions, and transparent communication channels. The evaluation of proposals will take into account specific criteria related to the quality of dialogue facilitation, the methodology for stakeholder engagement, and the capacity to lead participatory workshops that foster shared ownership of the results.

10. Deliverables (with quality criteria and validation)

1. **Inception (Scoping) Note and kick off meeting** – methodology, detailed workplan, stakeholder map, data needs, risks/mitigation.
2. **Concept Note** – preliminary design orientations across all components: sector context and strategy, capitalisation from comparable projects, gender and inclusion analysis, multidimensional vulnerability analysis, preliminary description of components, preliminary design of PBS structuring (including possible expenditure framework and earmarking of budget expenses and AFD funds, fiduciary risk etc.) institutional capacity assessment and operating model options, M&E approach, risks (institutional, operational, environmental and social), and next steps.
3. **Detailed Project Document** – consolidates and expands the Concept Note; adds: final operating model (based on capacity analysis), financing plan and component allocations, governance arrangements, complete logical framework and M&E plan (with baselines/targets where available), final design of PBS structuring (including possible expenditure framework and

earmarking of budget expenses and AFD funds), fiduciary and procurement arrangements, safeguards summary, gender action plan, risk matrix with mitigation, and draft terms for technical-assistance deployment.

Validation process: AFD will have 14 working days to provide formal comments on each deliverable. The Consultant will have 7 working days to address comments and submit a revised version. This cycle may repeat until AFD issues written validation; only AFD can validate deliverables.

Quality criteria: clarity and readability; timeliness; respect of scope; operational usefulness of conclusions.

In addition of the deliverables, the study will organize and facilitate **appropriation workshops** to promote understanding and engagement with the proposed approaches and findings.

11. Provisional Workplan and Schedule

Assuming contract signature and kick-off in **November 2025** (exact date to be agreed):

Milestone	Due date from kick-off	Indicative window (Dec 2025 start)
Kick-off meeting & stakeholder alignment	Day 0	Early Dec 2025
Inception (Scoping) Note submitted	Day 5–10	Mid-Dec 2025
Concept Note submitted after field visits	Day 60	~6 weeks after kick-off (Feb 2025)
Detailed Project Document submitted	Day 80	~9 weeks after kick-off (March 2026)

Note: Validation cycles (14/7 working days) will be layered onto the above; the Consultant's Gantt should include buffer time for at least one full comment-response loop per deliverable.

12. Team Composition and Qualifications

The number of days of consultants on site in Nigeria will be a determining factor in the evaluation of bids. The team leader may be an international expert, but the study will need a national contact person or liaison to act as a focal point with a significant number of days spent in country.

A multidisciplinary team is required, including:

- **Team Leader / Social Protection–Health Financing Lead** (10+ years experience in SP and/or health financing; Nigeria or Sahel/West Africa experience desirable).
- **Health Financing & Insurance Expert** (5+ years of experience in benefit package costing, provider payment, BHCPF/NHIA familiarity).
- **Social Safety Nets / Productive Inclusion Specialist** (CCT design, SRSP, livelihoods, public works, payment systems).
- **Public Finance Management / Budget Support Specialist** (5+ years of experience in public finance management (if possible, in the health sector), programme budget support (including result-based approaches) design and implementation, fiduciary risk)
- **Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist** (GBV risk management, gender-responsive programme design in social protection and safety net, OECD-DAC recommendations on gender equality and women empowerment).

- **Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV) Specialist** (access in insecure areas; conflict-sensitive programming).
- **Institutional/Fiduciary & PMU Design Expert** (PMU mapping, fiduciary risk, procurement).
- **Data Systems/Digital Public Infrastructure Expert** (NSR/NIN integration, interoperability, privacy).
- **M&E Specialist** (results frameworks, verification protocols, learning agenda). Local expertise and/or an in-country relay are strongly preferred.

13. Data, Ethics, and Safeguards

The Consultant will comply with Nigerian laws and international good practice on data privacy and human subject's protections. All primary data collection requires informed consent; personally identifiable information will be minimised and secured. Environmental and social risks (including biomedical waste in C1 and any small-scale IGAs under C2) must be screened; apply exclusion lists as appropriate. Grievance redress and GBV/SEA/SH protocols must be described.

14. Reporting, Meetings and Communication

- **Start-up:** kick-off meeting with AFD and core government partners.
- **During assignment:** weekly or bi-weekly check-ins; brief aide-mémoire after state missions.
- **Submission:** deliverables in English (Word + PDF), with editable annexes (costing models, Gantt, logframe).
- **Ownership:** all outputs are AFD property; public dissemination requires AFD consent.

15. References (data sources and dates)

- WHO maternal mortality estimates (2020); Nigeria DHS 2018 and 2023–24; UNICEF zero-dose estimates (May 2025); WB *State of Social Safety Nets in Nigeria* (2025); FMoH **BHCPF Guidelines** (Sept. 2020); NHIA Act (2022); BHCPF budget and enrolment figures (2019–2025), as consolidated in the AFD briefing for this feasibility.

Schedule 1

Program Budget Support

✓ What is a program budget support?

Program budget support (PBS) is a type of financing through which the AFD direct funding to a specific program. By « program », AFD means a public policy or action plan in a specific sector which rests upon (i) a strategic document outlining the result chain and monitoring mechanisms including output and outcome indicators, (ii) a multi-year budget framework grouping both internal and external resources and (iii) a formal institutional framework for coordination and decision-making between the various parties involved in the program (line departments, service delivery units, MoF etc.). **The funds mobilized by the AFD under PBS are earmarked for specific budget items or activities of the program.**

✓ How does PBS work?

Before the beginning of the fiscal year, funds mobilized by AFD are planned and budgeted through the same cycle as national resources. PBS therefore encourages closer alignment between aid and the state budget and encourages the beneficiary to take a comprehensive look at its resources to avoid duplication. Throughout the planning and budgeting cycle, AFD can finance and provide technical assistance to reinforce the beneficiary capacities to plan and prepare its budget.

During the fiscal year, funds mobilized by AFD are committed and spent broadly through the same processes as national resources. PBS therefore encourage civil servants to develop the capacities needed to operate their national system (such as PFM, procurement, monitoring and evaluation) and not systems designed by donors within the confines of one-off projects. Prior to the launch of PBS and depending on the existence of a recent PEFA evaluation, the AFD and the beneficiary conduct an assessment of public financial management capacities and procedures within the implementing institution. The result of this assessment serves to either formalize key implementation procedures and design a technical assistance and a dedicated program action plan.

The objective of a program budget support is therefore threefold. It aims at (i) improving the alignment between the program, international aid and national systems (please see Table below), (ii) strengthening the implementation capacities of the relevant stakeholders, (iii) improve fiduciary and operational risk management.

DEGREE OF ALIGNMENT OF A PBS WITH NATIONAL SYSTEMS

		PROJECT AID	PBS
Planning	The financing follows national agreed strategies and objectives	Yes	Yes
Programming	The medium-term budget and expenditure framework include the financing.	Estimates only	Yes
Budgeting	The appropriation act include budget lines covered by the financing	Estimates only	Yes
Parliamentary control	Parliament vote on an appropriation act including the financing	No	Yes
Cash management	The funds are disbursed to the Treasury	No	In a specific account
Procurement	Procurement follow national laws, procedures and process	No	Yes
Accounting	Operations are registered in accounts and presented in financial reports and statements	No	Yes
External audit	Operations, reports and statements are audited and verified by national institutions	No	+ private audits
Reporting	The execution of the financing appears in national financial statements and reports	No	Yes