



## CO-CREATION WORKSHOP REPORT

# Advancing Educational Solutions: Research for Scaling Education Innovations in Emergencies and Fragile, Conflict and Violence- affected areas of Burkina Faso, Ghana and Nigeria

**8-9 July 2025**

**Venue:** Conference Hall, Centre for the Study of the Economies of Africa (CSEA), Mabushi, Abuja. Nigeria

# Executive Summary

The Co-creation Workshop, held over two days at the CSEA Conference Hall, Mabushi, Abuja, brought together key education stakeholders to collaboratively strengthen the design, implementation, and evaluation of Education in Emergencies (EiE) innovations within fragile and conflict-affected areas (FCA). The co-creation phase provided an intensive platform for shared learning, dialogue, and technical training.

The workshop aimed to enhance participants' capacity in embedding Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI), Research Ethics, and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) principles into educational programs and research. Sessions were led by representatives from the Federal Ministry of Education, National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC), and the Centre for the Study of the Economies of Africa (CSEA), among others.

Training on GESI, facilitated by Dr. Tunner Itari, emphasized the need for intersectional, gender-transformative approaches that avoid tokenism and are integrated across all stages of research and program delivery. Dr. Emenike Umesi's session on DRR emphasized the critical role of education in resilience building and crisis response, while highlighting local challenges such as insecurity, weak infrastructure, and donor dependency. Dr. Olakunle Akinsola's presentation on research ethics in FCAS reinforced the importance of consent, context sensitivity, and data protection.

The sessions were highly interactive, with case studies, real-world scenarios, and audience reflections anchoring theoretical insights in practical realities. A regional risk assessment of Borno State was also presented, informing geographic prioritization for future educational interventions.

The workshop concluded with a collective commitment to deepen cross-sectoral collaboration, institutionalize ethical and inclusive practices, and drive scalable solutions to reduce educational exclusion in FCV contexts. Participants left empowered with new tools and strengthened resolve to transform education systems in crisis-affected regions.

# Acknowledgement

**The Centre for the Study of the Economies of Africa (CSEA)** wishes to thank all individuals and institutions whose dedication and contributions made the Co-Creation Workshop on “Advancing Educational Solutions: Research for Scaling Educational Innovations in Emergency and Fragile, Conflict and Violence-affected areas (FCV)” a success. **This work was supported by the Global Partnership for Education Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (GPE KIX), a joint endeavour with the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada.**

We would like to express our gratitude to Federal Ministry of Education, Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), the National Commission for College of Education (NCCE), the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) and other important government agencies who have contributed greatly to us in terms of strategic insights and technical support.

Special thanks go to the distinguished facilitators, Dr. Tunner Itari, Dr. Emenike Umesi, Dr. Olakunle Sunday Akinsola, Dr. Babagana Modu, and the other experts whose presentations and training sessions enriched the capacity-building process and inspired collaborative solutions.

Finally, we acknowledge the commitment of civil society organizations, international development partners, education innovators such as KABHUDA and HOHVIPAD, and all participants who actively engaged in discussions, shared field experiences, and contributed to shaping actionable strategies for Education in Emergencies.

# Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	2
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	3
<b>INTRODUCTION TO THE CO-CREATION WORKSHOP</b>	5
Purpose and Structure	5
Objectives of the Co-creation Workshop	5
Participant Recap and Introduction Techniques	6
<b>DAY ONE: TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2025</b>	7
1. Introduction	7
2. Presentations by Education Innovators	8
2.1 KABHUDA (Kanem-Borno Human Development Association)	8
2.2 Presentation by HOVIPAD (Horn of Hope Vision for Peace and Community Development)	11
3. Presentation by Tikristini Olawale (Research Associate, CSEA) – Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning	13
4. Presentation by Dr. Adamu Ahmed Wudil (Research Fellow, CSEA) and Abdulkhalid Anda (Research Assistant, CSEA) on Stakeholder Mapping and Engagement Strategy	17
<b>DAY TWO: WEDNESDAY, 9 JULY 2025</b>	21
1. Introduction and Participant Engagement	21
2. Training Session 1: Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) by Dr Itari Tunner	21
4. Training Session 3: Research Ethics in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Contexts (FCACs) by Dr. Olakunle Sunday Akinsola, NERDC	27
5. Training Session 4: Risk Assessment for Field Activities in Northeast Nigeria by Dr. Babagana Modu, Risk Assessment Officer (CSEA)	31
<b>REFLECTIONS AND CLOSING REMARKS</b>	35
<b>ANNEXES</b>	36



# INTRODUCTION TO THE CO-CREATION WORKSHOP

The co-creation workshop titled “Advancing Educational Solutions: Research for Scaling Educational Innovations in Emergency Contexts and Fragile Areas Affected by Conflict and Violence (FCV) in Burkina Faso, Ghana, and Nigeria” was held on the 8th and 9th July 2025. The workshop provided an interactive platform for multi-sectoral stakeholders to reflect deeply on the challenges and opportunities of delivering education in emergency contexts, within Nigeria's conflict-affected and fragile regions, especially in Borno state.

## Purpose and Structure

The co-creation phase was designed as an intensive, participatory learning and collaboration process. It aimed to strengthen the operational capacity of stakeholders through in-depth training and collaborative sessions. It featured a mix of expert-led presentations, participant reflections, ethical case discussions, and group interactions, allowing participants to co-create actionable strategies and contextual solutions for education in emergencies (EiE).

Sessions were structured thematically, each addressing a critical dimension of the EiE landscape: Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI), Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), Research Ethics in Fragile and Conflict-affected Contexts (FCACs), and Risk Assessment for Educational Planning. Each session was led by experienced facilitators and followed by interactive segments where participants engaged in real-life case reviews, shared experiences, and asked critical questions.

## Objectives of the Co-creation Workshop

### The workshop sought to:

1. Strengthen the capacity of government institutions, CSOs, INGOs, and education-focused stakeholders in designing, implementing, and evaluating EiE innovations.
2. Embed inclusive and context-sensitive practices across education responses, particularly with regard to gender, disability, and displacement status.
3. Deepen stakeholder understanding of the ethical principles and dilemmas in conducting research within FCV environments.
4. Promote integration of disaster risk preparedness into the design of educational innovations.
5. Facilitate the collaborative co-creation of scalable and sustainable interventions for improving access to safe, inclusive, and quality education.

## **Participant Recap and Introduction Techniques**

The workshop opened each day with creative warm-up activities led by the moderator, Mrs. Gift Ojima. Participants were invited to introduce themselves by stating their names with a descriptive adjective (e.g., 'Gifted Gift', "Resilient Rahila") and sharing what they wanted to be remembered for. This set an energetic and inclusive tone, reinforcing the workshop's participatory ethos and emphasizing shared ownership of outcomes.

# DAY ONE: TUESDAY, 8 JULY 2025

## 1. Introduction:

The first day of the co-creation workshop commenced at 10:28 AM with an opening address by Gift Ojima, who moderated the day's proceedings. She emphasized that this phase would be more practical and collaborative, hence the need for renewed introductions to accommodate new participants.

To foster interaction, Ms. Gift introduced the “Adjective-Name-Legacy-Meal” technique, requesting each participant to describe themselves with a unique adjective, state their name, and share what they had for dinner the previous night. The lively introduction round created an inclusive and participatory atmosphere, with representatives from diverse organizations including the National Commission for Mass Literacy, KABHUDA, NEMA, NCCE, UBEC, FME, HIVE Africa, and Illuminating Minds Initiative, among others.



## 2. Presentations by Education Innovators

### 2.1 Opening Remarks

Mr. Umar Hassan, Senior Program Manager at KABHUDA, delivered an extensive presentation covering the organization's history, mission, sectoral focus, and interventions. He highlighted KABHUDA's core mandate to deliver multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance across the Kanem-Bornu region and its incorporation in 2007.



#### Key achievements included:

- 46 projects are implemented across Borno, Adamawa, and Yobe states.
- Projects covering education, WASH, food security, health, and third-party monitoring.
- Successful non-formal education interventions that transitioned learners into formal schooling.
- Collaborations with donors such as UNICEF, FHI 360, WFP, ActionAid, and others.
- Implementation of Accelerated Education Programs (AEP) and Girls for Girls (G4G) projects.
- Vocational training and distribution of dignity kits to adolescent girls.



Mr. Hassan emphasized challenges including limited funding, short project durations, and difficulty accessing remote communities. He called for improved sustainability planning and deeper partnerships, especially with state-level actors.

## Question and Answer Segment:



Following Mr. Hassan Umar's comprehensive presentation on KABHUDA's educational innovations and field experience, the session moderator, Mrs. Gift Ojima, opened the floor for questions and reflections. The discussion was both constructive and forward-looking, drawing attention to strategic partnerships, program enhancement, and local impact stories.

Hajia Larai the director of the education support services, who commended KABHUDA's work and inquired whether the organization had established formal collaborations with the state agency. Mr. Hassan responded that no such partnership had yet been formalized, but he welcomed the opportunity to explore collaboration after the workshop. This suggestion was strongly supported by the participant, who encouraged KABHUDA to work more closely with the state's mass literacy efforts, especially given the agency's capacity to provide vulnerability kits and learning materials to displaced and out-of-school learners.

She also sought clarification on the composition of the dignity kits distributed by KABHUDA. In response, Mr. Hassan explained that the kits typically included sanitary pads, bathing soap, toothpaste, and toothbrushes, tailored specifically to meet the hygiene needs of adolescent girls in crisis-affected areas.

Mrs. Opara from the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) then emphasized the need for closer coordination between NGOs and State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs). She noted that improved coordination would prevent duplicated efforts and enable more seamless implementation of projects in conflict-affected communities. Mr. Hassan acknowledged this recommendation and affirmed KABHUDA's intention to strengthen its engagement with SEMA in Borno State, aligning with broader disaster risk and education planning frameworks.

In a more reflective inquiry, Dr. Tunner Itari asked Mr. Hassan to share a success story illustrating the real-life outcomes of KABHUDA's non-formal education programs.



Mr. Hassan narrated the story of a male learner who, after enrolling in one of KABHUDA's non-formal education programs, transitioned into the formal school system, advanced to tertiary education, and eventually became a police officer. This story met with audible appreciation from participants and served as a powerful testament to the transformative potential of inclusive education interventions in fragile settings.

In conclusion, the Q&A session not only clarified aspects of KABHUDA's operations but also provided actionable suggestions for strengthening institutional linkages, ensuring resource complementarity, and documenting success to inspire greater investment in out-of-school children initiatives.

## 2.2 Presentation by HOHVIPAD (Horn of Hope Vision for Peace and Community Development)

Mr. Ransome, The Executive Director of HOHVIPAD, presented on the organisation's educational and peacebuilding activities in Adamawa, Taraba, and Borno states.



### Key highlights included:

- Registration in 2015 following the humanitarian crisis.
- Projects with Creative Associates and FHI 360, including the enrolment of over 10,000 children and school renovations.
- Emphasis on adolescent life skills, WASH in schools, dignity kits, and inclusive education for the physically challenged.
- Strong community engagement through stakeholders' coordination meetings and effective mapping.

He stressed that their projects were supported by Shah Trust USA, FHI 360, and Creative Associates. Despite successes, sustainability and project continuity remained persistent challenges.

## Question and Answer Segment:



The question-and-answer segment following HOHVIPAD's presentation brought to light several strategic concerns and practical suggestions from participants.

Mr. Umar inquired about the sustainability of HOVIPAD's interventions, particularly what happens after donor funding ends. In response, Mr. Ransome acknowledged that sustainability and project continuity are significant challenges for the organization. He explained that while the team integrates community ownership and stakeholder meetings into project design, the short funding cycles and limited internal resources make it difficult to sustain interventions over the long term without ongoing support.

Mrs. Opara, a representative from the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), advised HOHVIPAD to connect with State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs) in their areas of operation. She noted that many NGOs work in isolation, which can lead to duplication of projects, misaligned efforts, and inefficient use of limited resources. She emphasized that building relationships with SEMAs would improve coordination, ensure that interventions complement existing government efforts, and make implementation more seamless.

In addition, the NEMA representative and others urged HOHVIPAD to actively collaborate with other NGOs and relevant government bodies such as Ministries of Education and Mass Literacy Agencies. These partnerships, they noted, would not only enhance the reach and effectiveness of their programs but also support data sharing, prevent overlap in services, and strengthen institutional memory, especially for innovations aimed at enrollment, retention, and transition of learners in fragile and conflict-affected areas.

In conclusion, the session reflected the need for greater coordination, institutional engagement, and strategic planning to ensure that the gains from education innovations like those led by HOHVIPAD are sustained, replicated, and embedded into formal systems.

### 3. Presentation by Tikristini Olawale (Research Associate, CSEA) – Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning.

Tikristini Olawale, a research associate at the Centre for the Study of the Economies of Africa (CSEA), presented on strengthening the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) components of education innovations, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected settings. She also covered research ethics, the theory of change, and the importance of data-driven design and assessment in education interventions.



Using both global statistics and Nigerian-specific data, Tikristini illustrated the urgent need for better education programming in emergency contexts. Referencing UNESCO and UNICEF estimates, she noted that one in five children globally live in conflict-affected areas, and Nigeria alone accounts for approximately 19.7 million out-of-school children, a figure that disproportionately affects girls and other vulnerable groups.

She emphasized that while education innovations such as those presented by KABHUDA and HOHVIPAD are commendable, evidence on their effectiveness remains limited. This makes MEL indispensable for understanding not just whether interventions are working, but how and why they succeed or fall short.



**Tikristini differentiated monitoring from evaluation:**

- Monitoring, she explained, is a continuous process that tracks project inputs, activities, and outputs to inform timely improvements.
- Evaluation, on the other hand, is periodic and summative, designed to assess outcomes and impacts, typically at key milestones or the end of the project lifecycle.

She introduced the concept of Theory of Change, describing it as a structured, logical framework that outlines how and why specific interventions are expected to produce change. A log frame (logical framework matrix) is often used to operationalize this theory, helping practitioners visualize and document project inputs, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and final impacts. Tikristini stressed that a well-articulated theory of change is vital for measuring success and ensuring program accountability.

In terms of data collection and analysis, she advocated for a mixed-methods approach that combines qualitative and quantitative research. She outlined key qualitative tools (e.g. key informant interviews, focus group discussions, document reviews) and quantitative tools (e.g. structured surveys and statistical analyses). For analysis, she identified software packages such as R, STATA, and SPSS, which CSEA routinely employs in its MEL activities.

**She also highlighted the importance of:**

- Situational analyses to understand context-specific challenges and opportunities.
- Stakeholder mapping to identify key actors, partners, and influencers.
- Baseline assessments to establish a point of reference for tracking progress.

Tikristini contextualized her points within the broader EiE research project involving Nigeria, Ghana, and Burkina Faso. For Nigeria, she noted that CSEA's contribution began with a desktop literature review, which culminated in a situational analysis used to shape the co-creation process. This process, she explained, is designed to build a transnational team of gender and inclusion-sensitive researchers and foster joint evidence generation with local innovators and policy stakeholders.

She concluded her presentation by underscoring that MEL is not an afterthought, but rather an integral part of project design, implementation, and scaling. Embedding MEL early ensures that educational innovations in emergency contexts are not only impactful but also replicable and sustainable.



## Question and Answer Session:



The question-and-answer segment following HOVIPAD's presentation brought to light several strategic concerns and practical suggestions from participants.

The session transitioned into an interactive Q&A segment, during which participants asked pointed and insightful questions, while also offering constructive suggestions.

Mr. Kande inquired about the specific tools CSEA uses for data analysis, to which Tikristini responded that they utilize a range of statistical software, including R, STATA, and SPSS, depending on the nature of the project and the complexity of the dataset.

Mrs. Florence asked whether a baseline assessment had been carried out at the beginning of the current education innovation project. Tikristini explained that CSEA conducted a desktop literature review, which provided a comprehensive situational analysis. This analysis served as a baseline study, guiding the co-creation process and helping frame the metrics for impact assessment.

A robust conversation then emerged around the state of education data in Nigeria, with participants expressing concern over the limited availability of up-to-date, locally-owned datasets. Several participants echoed the importance of developing a national data portal, referencing tools like NEMIS (National Education Management Information System) and the NEDI portal currently under development by the Federal Ministry of Education.

Suggestions were made for greater collaboration between NGOs and key government agencies, including the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), and the National Population Commission (NPC). Participants proposed that these institutions should standardize data collection, ensure regular dissemination of education statistics, and maintain a centralized and accessible repository for education-related research and project outcomes.

Mr Giwa from UBEC noted that the agency publishes an education report every four years, with the most recent edition released in 2022. She expressed concern that other agencies, including the NPC, often rely on data projections that may not reflect on-ground realities.

There was a general consensus on the need for CSEA to forge institutional partnerships with ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) to ensure that MEL findings are integrated into national policy and institutional memory, rather than remaining solely in donor reports or academic silos.

Participants also emphasized the importance of data sovereignty, noting that while development partners often generate valuable data, Nigeria must invest in its own systems to generate, manage, and disseminate high-quality education data for long-term planning.

Dr. Edafe added that the proposed NEDI portal could serve as a centralized hub for consolidating MEL data and facilitating knowledge sharing across sectors and states. Another contributor highlighted the SEMIS departments in each state as key actors in maintaining the integrity of state-level data.

Mrs. Florence further recommended that the National Population Commission be involved in subsequent stakeholder workshops, given its mandate to conduct national censuses and collect population-level data that affects school planning and infrastructure allocation.

## **4. Presentation by Dr. Adamu Ahmed Wudil (Research Fellow, CSEA) and Abdulkhalid Anda (Research Assistant, CSEA) on Stakeholder Mapping and Engagement Strategy**

Dr. Adamu opened the afternoon session with a comprehensive presentation on stakeholder mapping in the context of Accelerated Education Programmes (AEPs). He identified a wide range of actors, including government agencies such as the Ministries of Education, NGOs, donor organizations, and community-based structures. He emphasized the pivotal role of government, especially through evidence-based policymaking, in shaping responsive and inclusive education interventions in fragile and conflict-affected (FCV) areas.



Dr. Adamu also outlined the stakeholder engagement strategy, stating that the ongoing co-creation workshop itself was a vital mechanism for fostering meaningful collaboration. He elaborated on the community entry protocol used in the field, underscoring the importance of engaging traditional leaders early in the process to secure local support and credibility. He commended the role of Prof. Babagana in facilitating access and clearances. Cultural considerations, such as restrictions on male access to female-only spaces, were acknowledged, with proactive steps being taken to deploy female personnel in such contexts.

Following the presentation, a participant, Christabel Omolade raised concerns about the apparent exclusion of people with disabilities in both workshop participation and project design. She urged a more inclusive approach that also looks beyond the Ministry of Education. Another participant, Mrs. Dutse, echoed these concerns, recommending active engagement with the National Commission for People with Disabilities (NCPD) and requested clarification on the official project start date.

Dr. Adamu acknowledged the limitations of the current project scope regarding disability inclusion but assured that the matter had been noted for future integration. He also explained that inter-agency meetings had occurred beyond the Ministry of Education and promised a follow-up presentation on project timelines.

UBEC's representative flagged the absence of the newly established agency for out-of-school children (KAOS), advocating for its involvement. Dr. Adamu accepted the oversight and promised corrective action.

Ms. Christabel further inquired about the extent to which community inputs shaped the development of data collection instruments, questioning whether a bottom-up or top-down approach had been used.

In response, Dr. Adamu explained that data collection was being carried out across multiple countries, with NGOs and enumerators playing key roles in tailoring the tools to local contexts. Dr. Edafe added that all participants would be invited to an upcoming questionnaire validation workshop.

Dr. Chima raised a question about challenges in securing cooperation from local communities during data collection. Dr. Adamu acknowledged this issue and highlighted the engagement of local NGOs as an effective strategy for overcoming community-level resistance.

## Session on Data Collection: Methodology and Lessons Learned



**Abdulkhalid Anda** presented on data collection and lessons learned from previous surveys. He started with an interactive segment, asking for a show of hands from participants with field data collection experience.

Khalid described the development of data checklists to prevent omission of key elements. He then differentiated between quantitative and qualitative instruments. For quantitative methods, he mentioned surveys (or “protocols”), structured observations, Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), and telephone interviews. For qualitative methods, he outlined Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant Interviews (KIs), and In-Depth Interviews (IDIs). The distinction between KIs and IDIs was clarified through participant interaction, with KIs targeting experts and IDIs gathering beneficiary perspectives.



Khalid explained the various digital tools available CSEA employs for data collection and management, including KoboCollect, SurveyCTO, Google Forms, Qualtrics, and Tangerine. He recommended Tangerine for education-specific data due to its ease of use. He noted that tools like Google Forms lacked real-time update features, making SurveyCTO more suitable for dynamic environments.

For analysis, Khalid highlighted software like Stata, R, NVivo, MAXQDA, and Dedoose. Excel was intentionally excluded due to its limited reproducibility. He emphasized that funders now demand replicable analytical pipelines, describing codes as a “public good,” as stated by the World Bank. The ability of NVivo and Dedoose to go beyond simple coding to support traceability and reproducibility was noted.

The session, thereafter, moved to the discussion of ethical and legal requirements, particularly informed consent employed by CSEA. Khalid advocated for verbal consent where written formats may intimidate respondents. He suggested embedding consent into questionnaires, such as asking “Are you comfortable with us asking you questions?” He differentiated between consent (for adults) and assent (for minors), which must be granted by guardians. IRB (Institutional Review Board) approvals were emphasized as essential for any qualitative research, with particular attention to timing due to certification delays.

Participants asked whether IRB approvals applied to government agencies and if they were required annually. **Dr. Edafe** clarified that IRB was project-specific and not restricted to the health sector. She added that while government agencies may not always need IRB, academic institutions and national ethics bodies were valid approval channels.

## **Field Experience and Technical Challenges**

The **EMEC** representative inquired about hardware protection for surveys, to which Khalid responded that tablets were used, and paper tools were avoided. **Dr. Edafe** added that GPS tracking ensured enumerators remained within target areas and technical officers were available for device-related support.

**Adamu Benjamin of HIVE Africa** asked about how to handle participants who withdraw consent mid-way. Dr. Adamu responded that ethical provisions allow for this and would be respected. Benjamin also raised concerns about linking training to the actual research context. This was deferred to a subsequent presentation.

**Christabel** brought up the ongoing debate on incentives for participants. Dr. Edafe stressed that providing gifts might raise unrealistic expectations, and thus no incentives were given for this particular project.



## Insights from Project Implementation

Dr. Adamu presented insights from the ongoing AEP research project. He confirmed a mixed-methods approach supported by Kobo tools. He emphasized that informed consent remains a legal and ethical requirement and clarified that operating under a government mandate may obviate the need for IRB in some contexts.

He acknowledged security risks in FCV areas and suggested risk mitigation strategies like remote interviews, partnerships with local actors, and real-time enumerator tracking. He shared lessons, including the need for early stakeholder engagement, reliance on localized research teams, and effective communication channels for data quality assurance.

Dr. Adamu presented the project's 24-month timeline, target FCV areas in Nigeria, donor organizations, and collaboration with the LUMINA initiative. He provided quarterly activity snapshots and discussed expected outcomes including:

- Generation of evidence on AEP, Social Emotional Learning (SEL), and Gender-Responsive Programming (GFP)
- Development of scalable models for reintegration into national education policy

## Q&A and Reflections



Mr. Umar Hassan from KABHUDA urged that research findings should translate into actionable projects. Dr. Adamu responded that while the study identifies gaps and models, implementation would rely on stakeholders like KABHUDA and the World Bank. Dr. Edafe emphasized that the Policy Learning Working Group (PLWG) was launched precisely to integrate findings into policy frameworks.

Other participants stressed community ownership, sustainability, and managing expectations. A participant invoked Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) as a model of collaborative engagement. Plan International and NEMA representatives echoed the

importance of trust, transparency, and visible impact to ensure data integrity and long-term community cooperation.

# DAY TWO: WEDNESDAY, 9 JULY 2025

## Introduction and Participant Engagement.

### Training Session 1: Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) by Dr Itari Tunner



Dr. Tunner Itari opened her session with a definition of Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI), stressing its centrality in addressing educational inequalities in fragile and conflict-affected contexts. GESI, she emphasized, involves identifying and dismantling barriers encountered by marginalized populations - especially women, girls, and persons with disabilities. She explained that girls constitute the majority of out-of-school children (OOSC) in such contexts and underscored how inclusive programming significantly improves educational outcomes.

She addressed a common misconception, that focusing on women excludes men, by clarifying that gender equity benefits both genders and that sustainable change requires

including men in advocacy and program implementation. She reinforced this with data, explaining that global GDP could rise by USD 12 trillion if gender parity were achieved.

She addressed a common misconception, that focusing on women excludes men, by clarifying that gender equity benefits both genders and that sustainable change requires including men in advocacy and program implementation.

She reinforced this with data, explaining that global GDP could rise by USD 12 trillion if gender parity were achieved.

Dr. Itari highlighted gender-specific and shared vulnerabilities: girls face educational deprioritization, early marriage, and exclusion, while boys are more exposed to child labor and violence. Shared vulnerabilities include trauma and food insecurity.

GESI, she noted, must be embedded from project design through data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Data must be disaggregated not just by gender, but also by disability, age, and context. She stressed intersectionality, understanding how gender intersects with poverty, displacement, and disability to create compounded barriers.

She discussed gender-sensitive strategies for community entry, such as involving women in meetings with community leaders, scheduling flexible interviews for women, and including female enumerators. She then introduced the MacArthur Foundation's Gender Continuum, which classifies projects as GESI-unaware, GESI-aware, or GESI-transformative.

The presentation explored organizational and structural challenges in implementing GESI, such as poor monitoring, lack of skills, and weak institutional frameworks. Dr. Itari concluded with a discussion on ethical dilemmas, such as managing interviews that involve survivors of gender-based violence, emphasizing the importance of the "do no harm" principle and trauma-informed research protocols.

## **Q&A and Interactive Segment**

**During the Q&A, participants actively engaged with the session content:**

- Askiru (NEMEC) said he would pause the interview and return later if a participant experienced distress.
- Mr. Isiaka emphasized empathy, stating he would listen actively and suspend the session.

Umaru (KABHUDA) suggested referring the respondent to specialized services.

Dr. Tunner affirmed that all responses were valid and highlighted the importance of building organizational referral systems. Furthermore, respondents shared personal stories about experiencing gender biases.

- Anthony Bisong shared a personal story about gender bias in his community development project.
- Dr. Edafe recalled challenges in accessing externship opportunities due to perceived gender norms.

- Ms. Christabel narrated a story where poor access to water contributed to high divorce rates, linking it to gender-based violence and broader structural inequalities. She noted a significant drop in divorce rates following intervention and UNICEF's involvement

Dr. Itari also recounted a personal experience of gender exclusion in her family, where only male siblings were consulted for a biographical work despite her qualifications.

In an open exchange:

- Mr. Kelvin asked how to address discriminatory inheritance laws. Dr. Itari responded that culture is constructed and can be changed one person at a time.
- A representative from AIV Africa raised cultural norms limiting girls' education. Dr. Itari responded that if educated women are beneficial in marriage, they should also be valued in upbringing, it must be mutual.
- Ms. Christabel pointed out that while teaching is considered "a woman's job," men should also be encouraged to enter the field, avoiding superficial gender quotas that compromise competence.
- Dr. Edefe asked about the difference between gender equity and gender equality, and Dr. Itari provided a clear explanation of the two concepts. Gender equality refers to providing equal opportunities with dignity, while gender equity involves recognising diverse needs and circumstances to ensure fairness.
- Henry asked why equality is difficult to achieve despite widespread awareness. Dr. Itari noted cultural resistance and the lack of institutional gender mainstreaming policies.
- Dr. Adamu suggested that ethnicity must be added to the conversation. Dr. Itari agreed and framed it within the concept of national identity.
- Anthony Bisong asked how the USD 12 trillion estimate for achieving gender parity was calculated. Dr. Itari explained it is based on economic projections assuming increased female participation in the workforce and leadership.
- Mrs. Christabel questioned whether unpaid domestic work counts economically. Dr. Itari affirmed its value but argued that women can and should contribute beyond domestic spaces.
- Dr. Edefe raised an ethical issue: what if a woman gives data, but her husband later objects? Dr. Itari clarified that a woman above 18 can validly provide consent.

The session ended with animated contributions from multiple participants on how research institutions, accreditation agencies, and field organizations can promote gender equity more deliberately. Dr. Itari challenged participants to commit to applying GESI principles within their organizations and communities.



# 3. Training Session 2: Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Education in Emergencies (EiE) by

**Dr. Emenike Umesi, Director of Human Resources, NEMA**

**Dr. Emenike Umesi** began by establishing the foundational concepts of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), noting that DRR encompasses risk identification and assessment, the development of early warning systems, preparedness planning, and strategies to reduce community vulnerability. He emphasized that DRR goes beyond infrastructure, it is also about equipping communities with the knowledge and ability to respond effectively to crises.



**He outlined five pillars of effective DRR:**

1. Risk identification and mapping (knowing where threats exist)
2. Early warning systems (scientific and traditional, such as unusual animal migration or water markers)
3. Preparedness drills (ensuring people know what to do during a crisis)
4. Infrastructure strengthening (e.g. addressing unsafe road systems like "monkey bridges")
5. Community-based disaster planning (involving locals in risk assessment and mitigation)



**Dr. Emenike** then transitioned to the relationship between DRR and Education in Emergencies (EiE). He presented EiE as a critical lifeline, particularly in FCV contexts such as northeastern Nigeria. He recalled the story of a young girl in an IDP camp who lost her mother and was raped four times while fleeing, underscoring the urgent need for both educational and psychosocial support.

He argued that if children are not in school during conflict, they are more vulnerable to recruitment into violent groups, referencing the Skolombo children as an example. He urged that intervention must occur while they are still children; otherwise, society will face even greater challenges when they become adults.

**Dr. Emenike highlighted challenges faced by EiE initiatives:**

- Persistent attacks on schools.
- Lack of psychological services for affected children.
- Over-reliance on donor-driven "envelope budgets" due to inadequate state funding.
- Lack of teacher training for FCV contexts.
- Difficulty accessing marginalized groups like children with disabilities.
- Gender inequalities and rising poverty levels.

**He proposed integrating DRR principles into the Nigerian education system, including:**

- Training students and teachers on early warning systems
- Embedding preparedness and resilience training into the curriculum
- Prioritizing safety, security, and psychosocial support as foundational to education delivery

**Dr. Emenike** also presented the Comprehensive School Safety Framework (CSSF), advocating for safer schools through a holistic approach combining risk education, emergency response protocols, and community engagement.

**He called for:**

- Teacher welfare prioritization in conflict zones
- Use of indigenous languages in disaster communication (emphasizing Hausa as a complete language system)
- Increased use of technology for remote learning and information dissemination
- Policy reforms and coordination between education, emergency, and security stakeholders

## Q&A and Interactive Segment

During the discussion, participants shared insights, posed critical questions, and pushed for clarity:

- The Executive Director, KABHUDA, shared a reflection from his experience as a teacher in an IDP camp, affirming that “education is a lifeline,” and that some children first encountered education in those camps.
- Ms. Christabel posed a poignant question: “Why should a child have to go through crisis before accessing education?”

She further observed that some children in IDP camps are reluctant to return home because those environments feel safer or more stable.

**Dr. Emenike** responded by acknowledging that many families have lost their homes, livelihoods, and communities. In such cases, the IDP camps become their default social environment. He noted that returning home may feel like entering a void, especially for women and children who experienced trauma.

In addition, **Dr. Olakunle Akinsola** emphasized that any form of learning must be accompanied by a secure and conducive environment.

Mrs. Christabel built on this by stressing the need to empower women. She stated that women in displacement situations often show stronger resilience and adaptability, and empowering them contributes directly to community recovery.

**Dr. Emenike** stressed that for any educational intervention to succeed, three conditions must be met:

- i. A secure and accessible location
- ii. Trained and willing teachers
- iii. Institutional and donor funding

He acknowledged that while donors step in due to state failures, sustainability remains a concern, especially when exit strategies are not well-planned or locally owned. He listed additional recommendations such as:

- i. Enhance funding allocations for DRR and EiE integration
- ii. Empower local NGOs and communities to take ownership
- iii. Strengthen data collection and monitoring frameworks
- iv. Institutionalize gender inclusion in humanitarian education responses

**Dr. Edafe asked:** How does NEMA decide whether to rebuild schools after floods or insurgent attacks? **Dr. Emenike** clarified that NEMA is not a first responder for school infrastructure. Their role is advisory, they assess damage and recommend actions to the relevant state or federal ministries. For example, in Imo State, communities relocate during floods but lack proper planning for educational continuity.

**Moses Adejo** challenged the notion of always being reactive: “Where is Nigeria proactive in DRR?” Dr. Emenike admitted frankly: “The solution to Nigeria’s problems is political will.” He noted that solutions exist (e.g., dredging silt from riverbeds to prevent flooding), and agencies like NiMET provide forecasts, but implementation depends on leadership priorities.

**Anthony Bisong** raised concerns about sustainability: “What is being done to prevent the recurrence of Skolombo boys in the North?” **Dr. Emenike** acknowledged the lack of conscious policies to manage unattended children. He recommended a localized foster system similar to what exists in the US.

**HOVIPAD’s Director** asked what lessons have been learned from recurring terrorist attacks and whether reintegration efforts are working. Dr. Emenike expressed that even though Nigeria has intelligence on insurgent movements, action is often stalled, again pointing to political inertia.

**HIVE Africa Head** pressed for practical strategies to strengthen disaster prevention and political accountability. Dr. Emenike responded that National NGOs are often excluded from policymaking despite being key players. Also, they rely heavily on international donors rather than influencing the national humanitarian architecture. He encouraged national NGOs to establish formal engagements with national agencies to shape policies and build resilience from within.

## 4. Training Session 3: Research Ethics in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Contexts (FCACs) by **Dr. Olakunle Sunday Akinsola, NERDC**

**Dr. Olakunle Akinsola** opened his presentation with an apology for missing the previous day’s sessions. He emphasized how his presentation aligned perfectly with the preceding themes on education, gender equity, and disaster response. His core message revolved around why ethics is not only important but indispensable when conducting research in FCV environments.



He began by defining Research Ethics as the moral principles guiding researchers in the planning, conduct, and reporting of research. He stressed that ethical considerations become more sensitive in fragile and conflict-affected settings due to power imbalances, trauma histories, and vulnerabilities of populations.

**He grounded his presentation in the Belmont Report's three foundational principles:**

- i. Respect for Persons – Upholding autonomy and ensuring informed consent
- ii. Beneficence – Minimizing harm and maximizing benefits
- iii. Justice – Ensuring equitable selection of participants and fair distribution of research benefits

Going further, Dr. Akinsola identified several unique ethical challenges in conducting research in FCV areas:

- **Informed Consent:** He explained that securing informed consent is complex where participants are illiterate, traumatized, or distrustful. In such contexts, researchers must ensure comprehension, voluntary participation, and respect for cultural norms. He emphasized using verbal consent, especially in phone interviews, and ensuring the use of community gatekeepers to improve trust.
- **Security and Safety:** He shared a personal field experience where safety was compromised and advised researchers to have exit strategies and remain alert to security dynamics. Safety also applies to participants who may face threats or retaliation after providing information.
- **Power Imbalance:** Aid dependency can result in coercive participation. For instance, participants may feel obligated to provide data out of fear of losing aid. Researchers must ensure they do not exploit or manipulate these dynamics.



- **Data Protection and Confidentiality:** Dr. Akinsola emphasized the importance of safeguarding personal data, particularly in FCV settings where exposure could lead to physical harm or social exclusion. He stressed the need for:

- i. Secure storage of data
- ii. Anonymization of sensitive information
- iii. Respect for participant identities, especially in GBV-related studies

**He noted that researchers must:**

- i. Understand the local context
- ii. Acknowledge how their identity and biases may affect data collection
- iii. Create a duty of care plan for field teams
- iv. Ensure cultural appropriateness in tools and methods
- v. Develop contingency plans for interruptions and insurgencies

He also emphasized the importance of training local research assistants on ethics and trauma-sensitive approaches. The use of remote tools, such as digital surveys and phone interviews, was encouraged in high-risk areas, but must still be implemented ethically.

Dr. Akinsola introduced a hypothetical case:

**“Imagine you are leading a team conducting research on Gender-Based Violence in an IDP camp.”**

**He posed questions:**

- What are your obligations?
- What if a respondent breaks down emotionally?
- How do you ensure their safety?

**He explained that researchers must:**

- Have support referrals ready (e.g. local psychosocial service providers)
- Adjust data collection tools to reduce harm
- Prioritize participant well-being over data targets

He ended with a strong reminder that **“Ethics is not a checklist; it is an ongoing commitment.”**

## Q&A and Interactive Segment



**The session was highly interactive, with thoughtful questions from participants:**

Mr. Obi raised a practical concern:

**“What do you do when data collection deadlines are approaching, but participants are not giving consent?”**

**Dr. Akinsola** responded that consent is non-negotiable, even under tight deadlines. He emphasized that negotiated consent can often be achieved through explanation and trust-building. He added that if consent is not granted, researchers should adjust methodologies, perhaps using desk reviews or secondary data.

**Hajia Larai** shared a strategy: ‘They send notification forms to community leaders ahead of data collection to reduce resistance’. She stressed the importance of clear information sharing and transparency with respondents.

**Dr. Akinsola** agreed, citing an example where he recorded conversations with prior consent to guard against future denials. He also mentioned that having duplicate copies of consent forms was helpful.

**Mr. Obi** followed up: “Can verbal consent over the phone suffice?”

Dr. Akinsola confirmed that verbal consent is valid, especially if the conversation is recorded and the purpose is clearly explained.

**A representative of HIVE Africa Head** brought up a contrasting view: “Some schools of thought believe consent is not needed for non-sensitive data.” He also mentioned that sponsors often do not adjust deadlines, putting pressure on field teams.

**Dr. Akinsola** acknowledged the pressure but urged caution. Where consent is not available, desk reviews, key informant interviews, and non-invasive tools can help. He warned against cutting corners that may compromise ethical standards.

**Mr. Obi** added an anecdote where a respondent initially resisted, but upon clarification of purpose, gave an affirmative response. This, he argued, counted as valid consent. Both Dr. Edafe and the UBEC representative agreed, emphasizing that active affirmation, even verbal, is ethically acceptable.

**Dr. Akinsola** ended by reaffirming that ethical research in fragile settings must prioritize:

- Safety and dignity of participants
- Researcher accountability
- Flexibility and context sensitivity
- Commitment to ongoing ethical reflection

He reiterated that policy-driven research, particularly for national education systems, must be rigorously ethical, contextually grounded, and collaboratively executed.

Mrs. Gift thanked him and invited participants to cheer, followed by an energizer led by Dr. Edafe before transitioning to the final technical session of the day.

## **5. Training Session 4: Risk Assessment for Field Activities in Northeast Nigeria by Dr. Babagana Modu, Risk Assessment Officer (CSEA)**



Dr. Babagana Modu began by providing background on the importance of risk assessment in fieldwork for fragile and conflict-affected areas, with particular focus on Northeastern Nigeria and Borno State. He explained that risk management is not simply a bureaucratic checklist, but a strategic tool for ensuring the safety of staff, communities, and research integrity.

He defined Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) using the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) framework. He then highlighted multiple categories of risks, including:

- Natural disasters (e.g. floods, droughts)
- Health emergencies
- Conflicts and insurgency

- Gender-based violence
- Displacements
- Operational and security risks

Dr. Modu introduced several data-driven tools used in assessing risks:

- Heatmaps and classification matrices
- Risk tracking dashboards
- GPS-enabled trackers for field staff
- Color-coded risk matrices based on probability and severity

He showcased a national risk assessment map of Nigeria (2024) that categorized states based on their exposure to humanitarian emergencies and security risks. He emphasized that:

- Borno, Yobe, and Adamawa were among the highest-risk zones
- States like Jigawa and Gombe were classified as lower risk, though still susceptible to criminality
- Movement from medium to high risk is dynamic and may occur quickly due to new events

He further zoomed into Borno State, providing a map of all LGAs, noting:

- LGAs closest to Sambisa Forest or Lake Chad have the highest risk levels
- Maiduguri and northern LGAs appeared relatively safer
- Areas facing threats from ISWAP, Boko Haram, and criminal groups are regularly reassessed

He described specific threat vectors:

- Illegal checkpoints manned by non-state armed actors
- Harassment by security agents
- Vehicle-borne and person-borne improvised explosive devices (VBIED/PBIED)
- Abduction and kidnapping of humanitarian staff
- Armed group extortion, robbery, and looting
- Accidents from over-speeding or evasive driving by NGO convoys
- Environmental and health hazards from dust, heat, and poor sanitation



**He linked risk to Education in Emergencies (EiE), explaining that:**

- Over 1 million children have been displaced in Borno due to the Boko Haram insurgency
- The collapse of public infrastructure, especially schools, severely hinders return-to-school efforts
- Some children first experience schooling only in IDP camps
- Teachers and humanitarian actors also face burnout and threats, requiring support

Dr. Modu stressed the urgency of integrating DRR into EiE, arguing that educational programming must include:

- Infrastructure resilience
- Contingency planning
- Security training for educators
- Safe school environments (physical, emotional, and social)

He further encouraged the dissemination of early warning alerts in indigenous languages, noting Hausa's versatility in the North.

**He listed next steps for risk reduction:**

- Training data collectors and research teams on risk protocols
- Developing community entry strategies
- Using GPS-tracked devices for field monitoring
- Formulating organizational security and evacuation policies
- Collaborating with state security architecture
- Presenting project intentions with cultural sensitivity

He concluded that how information is presented to stakeholders (e.g. community leaders) determines whether access will be granted or denied, and that risk mitigation is both technical and relational.

## Question and Answer Segment:



The session yielded a robust exchange of questions, clarifications, and contributions:

Anthony Bisong asked: **“How were thresholds used in determining impact and probability scores on the risk matrix?”**

Dr. Modu responded that the methodology was based on both quantitative data (e.g., number of incidents, displacement counts) and qualitative assessments from humanitarian field staff. The classification matrix was validated using local security reports.

HIVE Africa representative queried: **“What is the difference between 'possible' and 'likely' risks?”**

Dr. Modu explained that “possible” refers to risks that might occur under certain conditions, while “likely” implies a higher probability based on past frequency and present trends.

KABHUDA’s representative raised a concern: **“Why are only Gombe and Jigawa classified as low-risk when they also experience some violence?”**

Dr. Modu acknowledged that all states have risk, but classification is based on intensity, frequency, and spread of incidents. He also mentioned that lower-risk zones are not risk-free, and ongoing monitoring is necessary.

Dr. Modu concluded by stating that risk mitigation requires proactive engagement with communities, stakeholders, and authorities. He also emphasized that:

- Risk cannot be eliminated, but it can be anticipated, managed, and adapted to
- Political will and coordination remain the biggest barriers to proactive disaster preparedness

# REFLECTIONS AND CLOSING REMARKS



At the end of the training session, Dr. Adedeji Adeniran, the Director of Research at CSEA, delivered the closing remarks, which transitioned the workshop to its final reflective session.

Building on the participatory energy that had characterized all three days, Dr Adedeji Adeniran began with a warm invitation for participants to describe their experience using one word or adjective, returning to the engagement technique used at the beginning of the workshop.

Participants responded with expressions such as “transformative,” “impactful,” “eye-opening,” “practical,” “enlightening,” and “collaborative,” underscoring the overall sentiment of deep learning, shared purpose, and cross-sector solidarity.

Dr. Deji emphasized that the significance of the workshop lies not in the event itself, but in the continuity of action beyond it. He charged participants to take the insights, tools, and strategies back to their organizations and communities; build on the connections formed during the workshop to drive collaborative programming; and Integrate EiE, GESI, DRR, and research ethics into institutional planning, funding proposals, and field interventions.

He concluded by reaffirming that every participant has a role to play in transforming Nigeria’s FCV education landscape, no matter how large or small the platform. His final words were:

“This workshop ends today, but our work is only just beginning. Let us return as bridges between policy and practice, between data and dignity. Thank you and see you soon.”

The session ended with thunderous applause and a shared sense of renewed commitment, officially bringing the co-creation workshop and capacity-building programme to a close.

# Annexes

## Agenda

### Day 2: Co-Creation Workshop

SCHEDULES	ACTIVITIES	SPEAKERS
9:00- 10:00am	Arrival of participants and registration	
10:00 – 11:00am	Stakeholder Mapping Stakeholder Analysis in Education in Emergencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of Government</li> <li>• Stakeholder engagement</li> <li>• Community Entry</li> </ul>	Dr Adamu/Edafe
11:00 – 12:00noon	Data Collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security Risk</li> <li>• Lessons learned from the past surveys</li> </ul>	Dr Deji/Adamu/Khalid
12:00 – 12:30noon	Tea Break	
12:30 – 12:45pm	Research Ethics	Dr Olakunle Sunday Akinsola (NERDC)
12:45 – 1:00pm	Project Plan	
1:00 – 2:00pm	Lunch/Networking/Closing	



## Agenda

### Day 3: Co-Creation Workshop

SCHEDULES	ACTIVITIES	SPEAKERS
9:00 – 10:00am	Arrival of participants and registration	All participants
10:00 – 11:00am	Training session: Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion	Dr Tunner Itari
11:00 – 11:30pm	Tea Break	
11:30 – 12:30pm	Training session: Risk Assessment	Dr Babagana
12:30 – 1:30pm	Disaster Risk Strategy	Dr Emenike Umesi, Director, HR, NEMA
1:30 – 2:30pm	The State of Accelerated Education Programme	Dr. Garba Gandu Director, Curriculum Development Centre
2:30 – 3:00pm	Lunch/Networking	
3:00 – 4:00pm	Closing Remarks & Way Forward Lunch/Networking	

# List of Participants

Day 2

S/N	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	ORGANIZATION	PHONE
11	Farahyel Anthony M.	HOHVIPAD	07060972946
12	Hassan Umar	KABHUDA	08029438608
13	Dr. Abubakar Tijani	MOE – Borno State	08028882322
14	Kalamu A. Umar	MOE – Borno State	08167769566
15	Adepeju Hussein Giwa	UBEC	08188057383
16	Dr. Babagana Modu	FME	09038694680
17	Christabel Omolade	IIWY/NSF	09077779131
18	Kefas Pavalis Gamboro	KefasCareFoundation	08020791349
19	Mohd Y. Askira	KARHUNDA	07067357563
20	Tukur Idris	NCCE/ABJ	08068926703

21.	Ngonu Peace Chinaza	NCCE	07033968567
22	Mrs. M.U. Khalid	NMEC	08036026031
23	Habu Kande	AIPFF-Africa	08118809834
24	Dr. Abdulrahman Y.	NCCE	08059285392
25	Ayodele Joshua T.	Illuminating Minds	08032355405

# List of Participants

Day 3

S/N	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	ORGANIZATION	PHONE
1	Dr. Babagana Modu	Uni. Maiduguri	08067069969
2	Farahyel Anthony Manza	HOHVIPAD	07060972946
3	Ransom Stephen	HOHVIPAD	08035478288
4	Hassan Umar	KABHUDA	08029438608
5	Christabel Omolade	IIWYL/ NSF	090777779131
6	Ayodele Joshua	Illuminating Minds	08032355405
7	Adamu Benjamin A.	AIPFF-Africa	08039737843
8	Habu Kande	AIPFF-Africa	0811880983
9	Siaka A. Kelly	FME	08035460455
20	Dr. Itari Turner	Baze University	08090980380



11	Lami Ishaya Dutse	NCCE	08167769566
12	Chawai Florence	PLANE	07082381186
13	Comfort Odumu	NEMA	08030829424
14	Kelvin Esemwenre	Tenece PROFESSIONAL Service LTD	08062432915
15	Samuel Oluwashola E.	FME	09038694680
16.	Ngonyu Peace Chinaza	NCCE	07033968567
17	Adepeju Hussein Giwa	UBEC	08188057383
18	Tukur Idris	NCCE/ABJ	08068926703
19	Dr. Abdulrahman Yahaya	NCCE	08059285392
20	Umar Ibrahim M.	NMEC	08035971748
21	Okwuchukwu Stanley	AIPFF-Africa	08064308288
22	Maryam Umar Khalid	NMEC	08036026031
23	Dr Olakunle Sunday Akinsola	NERDC	0703647255

# Selected Photographs from the sessions DAY 2 and 3















## Link to all images

### DAY 2

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1DgClpQO4nuidCki7Wx\\_IKpyUjW\\_yIdFZ?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1DgClpQO4nuidCki7Wx_IKpyUjW_yIdFZ?usp=drive_link)

### DAY 3

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/10N4k9SjOiQSVv3jRfT6qNPSjnook1TKm/view?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/file/d/10N4k9SjOiQSVv3jRfT6qNPSjnook1TKm/view?usp=drive_link)