GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP *for* EDUCATION

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS 19-20 November 2012, Paris, France

INTRODUCTION

Following a half-day information session and working dinner in which participants discussed next steps on the Global and Regional Activities program, governance issues, and the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015, the Board of Directors held a meeting on 19-20 November 2012 in Paris, France.

The agenda for the meeting can be found on the Global Partnership for Education ("Global Partnership" or "GPE") website.[1] A list of participants is found in **Annex 1**.

This report presents a summary of the issues discussed and the decisions approved.

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT

1.1 Carol Bellamy, Chair of the Board of Directors, opened the meeting and thanked UNESCO for hosting the meeting at its headquarters.

1.2 As the first item on the agenda, the Chair requested approval of the report from the face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors in Berlin on 7-8 June 2012, which had previously been circulated to the Board of Directors.[2]

1.3 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/11-01 — Approval of Meeting Report:** The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Berlin, Germany on 7-8 June 2012 (BOD/2012/07 DOC o1).

2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT

2.1 Bob Prouty, Head of the Secretariat, updated the Board of Directors on matters subsequent to the distribution of the Report of the Secretariat (BOD/2012/11 DOC 02).

[1] http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Board/Paris-2012/BOD%20Agenda_Paris2012.pdf
[2] http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Berlin%202012/meeting_report/Board_Meeting_Report_Berlin2012.pdf

Secretariat budget utilization

2.2 The utilization of the Secretariat budget was at 26% and was projected to be on target for the remainder of the year. Pending the finalization of the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan, the Secretariat might submit a supplemental budget request.

Program implementation grant disbursements

2.2 Disbursements for program implementation grants were predicted to reach US$380 million for 2012, which was in line with 2011.

Secretariat activities

2.3 The ongoing activities of the Secretariat included increased country visits by the Country Support Team, development of a country-level process guide as well as terms of reference for Coordinating Agencies, Supervising Agencies, and Managing Entities. Twelve education plan development grants and four program development grantshad been approved by the Secretariat. The Global Good Practice Team conducted workshops to inform and improve practices in reading, textbooks, and early childhood education, and was providing support for the development of a community of practice in numeracy. The Resource Mobilization and Board Services teams provided support to the Strategic Plan Working Group on the development of the Strategic Plan and implementation plan, provided support for fundraising for basic education, provided support for the Education First Initiative and the first Africa constituency meeting in Accra, Ghana. The Communications and External Affairs team provided communications and media support for the Education First Initiative, maintained and improved the GPE website, provided support for UN General Assembly press and social media, and produced an annual report for the Global Partnership. The Finance, Portfolio and Administration team supported the Finance Advisory Committee (FAC), conducted an annual review of indicative allocations, and developed a GPE trust fund financial forecast.

Report on misuse

2.4 As previously reported, Kenya repaid themisused funds in full, and the Kenyan education sector implemented measures to prevent repetition of fund misuse. In Lesotho, an issue had arisen regarding funds that were meant to be used to construct four schools that had not been built. The amount was estimated to be between US$256,000 and US$326,000, which would be repaid to the Global Partnership. The Supervising Entity would conduct a mission to Lesotho shortly to finalize this decision and an update would be given to the Board of Directors.

Reflections of the Head of the Secretariat

2.5 There is a need to improve communications and to strengthen the dialogue between the Secretariat and the Board of Directors; to facilitate developing country partner voices in decision-making; for the partnership to embrace innovation and facilitate dialogue in new areas,

including child labor and disability; and to enable a successful transition to a new Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

Discussion

2.6 Some Board members asked if there were other options other than to request a reimbursement, including a reissuing of the contract. Mr. Prouty responded that reimbursement seemed the best way forward since the contracts for each of the four unfinished schools were projected to be held up in court proceedings for some time. Rather than wait for the court decisions, it was recommended that the money be reimbursed to the Global Partnership.

2.7 Some Board members provided suggestions to improve the dialogue between the Board of Directors and the Secretariat, including more audio-conferences (accompanied by carefully prepared papers with clear decisions), greater discipline on the part of the Board of Directors to make decisions, and providing a seat on the Board of Directors for the new CEO. One Board member suggested the possibility for greater decision-making autonomy of the Secretariat, and particularly of the CEO.

2.8 A few Board members expressed concern with the possibility of the Secretariat requesting a supplemental budget increase, particularly in the current global economic climate. The Secretariat was encouraged to seek efficiencies and be very clear in justifications for any increases.

2.9 Board members also noted the need for the partnership to focus on mutual accountability, particularly in light of the division of roles and responsibilities with regards to the Strategic Plan.

3. STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-2015

Implementation Plan

3.1 Geeta Rao Gupta and Jesper Andersen, co-Chairs of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG), and Charles Tapp of the Secretariat presented an update on the Strategic Plan and on the progress to date on the Implementation Plan (BOD/2012/11 DOC o3).

3.2 The presentation came after a working dinner the night before in which Board members had the opportunity to informally discuss certain elements of the implementation plan. A summary of the discussion was presented. The centrality of the country-led model was reaffirmed. There was widespread agreement that in practice there was not a tension between the country-led model and GPE priorities, indeed, they were complementary. Flexibility and pragmatism in GPE processes was desirable and every context was different. Greater dialogue on education sector plans should occur and the outcomes of the dialogue should also inform the deliberations of the FAC and the Board of Directors. More progress needed to be made on greater alignment of funding modalities. There was no support for mandating the different members of a Local Education Group, however, there needed to be stronger guidance and active

encouragement of more diverse participation at the country level. The final strong theme that emerged from the dinner discussion was that significant strengthening and support of Local Education Groups was required in order that they remain technically and strategically strong.

3.3 The co-chairs outlined some observations from the SPWG about the implementation plan, noting that it was a work in progress, the deliverables were incomplete, and the SPWG would be requesting written comments from Board members before 30 November 2012. The deliverables should be framed in as simple a way as possible, in order to be measureable. However, theSPWG wanted to ensure ownership through a thorough consultation process. The greatest risk for the implementation plan is a lack of partner engagement.

3.4 The Secretariat outlined the process to date in the development of the Strategic Plan. The SPWG agreed that it was premature to look at budget implications, so they structured the deliverables as a block with the aim of having budget implications detailed in further iterations. The Technical Group on Indicators submitted a draft paper to the SPWG, which raises the question of whether the indicators should be mandated across the partnership, and what level of additional resource implications for measuring against new indicators the Board of Directors is willing to consider.

3.5 The feedback received to date pointed strongly toward not being proscriptive, which means that mutual accountability is very important. Different definitions of “value for money” exist across the partnership. Further consultations are needed, particularly from developing country partners.

3.6 A risk framework for the Global Partnership is important, which needs to be “owned” by the Board of Directors.

Discussion

3.7 Board members supported the proposed process moving forward, and agreed to the goal of receiving a simple and clear implementation plan by the end of February 2013, noting that the plan would be a “living” document that would evolve over time. Members agreed with the notion of opting in, in order to ensure broad participation, and to make the partnership’s priorities clear. However, some members noted that it would be necessary to think through the opting in process, including how to ensure that partners with real expertise and interest are able to contribute, particularly entities that are not currently members of the partnership.

3.8 Board members expressed support for using theimplementation plan as a tool to encourage strengthened innovation mechanisms, including through communities of practices, which might build collaboration across constituencies. There was wide support to increase the role of the partnership in knowledge production and dissemination, with a limited role for the Secretariat. Some members noted the importance of leveraging already-existing mechanisms, with the Secretariat serving as a platform for information sharing. There was support for the dissemination of ideas and best practices at the country level.

3.9 Board members generally agreed that the partnership should encourage developing country partners to commit to protecting, and when possible increasing, domestic expenditures for basic education, with an exception for countries in emergency. However, while there was recognition that it would not be good practice to allocate financing to countries that had decreased their domestic support to basic education, there was also a reluctance to stipulate that an increase in domestic expenditures for education should be a condition for receiving program implementation funding. The Board widely agreed that the Global Partnership must monitor how domestic financing progresses, should ensure the financing is effective, and that funds are spent on education. However, the Global Partnership should view domestic financing as a trajectory rather than a threshold, due to the varying financial positions of different partners. One Board member suggested shifting the focus of implementation grants to targeted funding, including targeting the priority areas of the Global Partnership that are included in the education sector plans.

3.10 Some members suggested that the Board of Directors look into whether the Global Partnership should have stronger guidelines to avoid displacement of other external financing (such as IDA). They noted that prior discussions regarding external aid to education had focused on additional financing rather than leveraging, or improving the effectiveness of current financing, and future discussions should include both.

3.11 Board members agreed on the necessity of defining value for money across the partnership, taking into account different contexts, and assessing (the right) results with respect to costs. Economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity are important benchmarks in measuring value for money. A political dimension would necessarily be associated with any eventual definition.

Indicators

3.12 Margaret Koziol, co-Chair of the Technical Group on Indicators, presented the group's findings that the collection of the indicators is feasible, but that data collection will require financial investment. The Technical Group requested input from the Board of Directors over whether they should conduct an exercise to determine costing implications for each of the indicators for the Secretariat and the partnership in general, including proposals for who among the partnership can support particular costs. She emphasized the importance of creating a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities for the implementation of the Strategic Plan in general, and the indicators in particular.

Discussion

3.13 Some Board members suggested a phased approach for delivery on indicators, particularly in light of possible cost implications, in order to prioritize the indicators and to achieve a balance between investment and results. Establishing a long-term agenda and proxies would be helpful in moving the process forward. In an effort to encourage country ownership, the process should utilize countries' own systems as the default whenever possible.

3.14 Board members emphasized that the Strategic Plan implementation process needs to be country-owned, and the Local Education Groups should facilitate a discussion over the issue of whether or not to mandate the indicators and make them a part of the regular planning and budget processes. Others noted that if the Board of Directors does not mandate implementation of the indicators for the goals and objectives, there will need to be extensive capacity-building in order to make the indicators operational.

3.15 Board members agreed that the partnership should work to endorse and catalyze action towards monitoring and evaluating the indicators. In many countries, even basic indicators are missing and it would be important for the partnership to measure progress in developing these. It was also widely agreed that partners can include the collection of additional indicators as they choose, particularly to meet the targets set out in the Education Sector Plans, and that building synergies with data-collecting organizations, including UIS, would be important for collecting new data. Board members emphasized utilizing existing reporting mechanisms rather than having parallel reporting systems.

3.16 Board members endorsed the suggestion for the Technical Group to develop a costing plan for the indicators, which would include a timeline as well as a strategy for prioritization of core indicators. One Board member requested that the costing plan should take a cost-benefit approach; some indicators might cost a great deal but have a large benefit and a wide impact for the partnership.

3.17 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-02—Finalization of the Strategic Plan Implementation Plan: The Board of Directors:

a. notes the work to date of the Strategic Plan Working Group on developing an implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015;

b. requests the Strategic Plan Working Group, working with the Secretariat, to:

   i. continue its consultation of GPE partners to contribute to the development of the implementation plan; and

   ii. finalize the implementation plan, including possible amendments to the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Secretariat budget, and deliver it to the Board of Directors as soon as possible but no later than 28 February 2013, for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled;

c. urges all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible; and

d. requests the Secretariat to deliver to the Board of Directors, no later than the next face-to-face Board meeting in 2013, a risk management framework for review by the Board of Directors.

4. SPOTLIGHT ON THE PARTNERSHIP

4.1 Princess Laurentien of the Netherlands, UNESCO Special Envoy on Literacy for Development, and Chair of the Reading & Writing Foundation, gave an overview of education issues from her perspective as a literacy spokesperson. She discussed the importance of stimulating demand for learning, rather than focusing on supply. Demand cannot be created from the top-down. Even while access has improved (75% of children in Sub-Saharan Africa attend school), completion rates remain low.

4.2 The Princess proposed making the community the center of content-generation for learning, thereby creating a learning ecosystem. She suggested trying a radical approach of focusing on illiterate people within a community, and investing in possible galvanizers in order to overcome bottlenecks. She proposed a strategy of "frugal innovation", in which the producer focuses on overlooked consumers and reduces complexity in production with a low-margin and high-volume business model. In the context of learning, the local community becomes the market, and as they become engaged, through telling oral stories, talking, and creating locally-generated content, people start to earn and learn.

4.3 The Princess noted the goal of 100 million more children reading by 2015, each of these million children armed with a book to inspire pride, and to act as an anchor for interaction, exchange and confidence.

4.4 The Princess also suggested "flip development", which involves innovating in developing countries, and bringing the lessons learned to Europe, because Europe also struggles with literacy problems. She noted her goals of 100 million books in developing countries, and 100 million books in Europe, in order to show that literacy is binding, and does not sit only in one part of the world.

5. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND PLEDGE MONITORING

Resource Mobilization

5.1 Charles Tapp of the Secretariat reported and requested input on the current resource mobilization strategy and targets (BOD/2012/11 DOC 05). At its first replenishment conference, held in Copenhagen in November 2011, the Global Partnership committed to raising US$2 billion for the Global Partnership for Education Fund (the "GPE Fund") and a further US$5.5 billion in other external aid to basic education. The fifth objective in the Strategic Plan emphasized the Global Partnership's support for increasing the amount and effectiveness of financing for basic education, both externally and domestically. The Secretariat was confident that the Partnership would reach replenishment requirements, but they would require more focus on resource mobilization if the goal is to be exceeded.

5.2 The demand for financial support from the GPE Fund is outstripping supply. At the same time, the global funding marketplace is struggling as bilateral donors pull out of priority countries and education funding, and cut aid budgets overall.

5.3 The Secretariat requested input from the Board of Directors on a number of issues surrounding resource mobilization, including whether the partnership should focus only on increasing support to the GPE Fund or whether it should encourage and advocate for broader financing to the sector; the potential of emerging donors and the possibility of co-financing with new partners as a way of bringing them into the partnership; whether or not to create a separate fund for innovative financing; the feasibility of earmarking for certain GPE priorities, if earmarking would lead to a net increase in support of the GPE Fund; the issue of innovative financing, including the potential for the Financial Transaction Tax in a number of countries to be delivered to education; and the need for accurate data and a compelling narrative.

5.4 The recent partnership with Her Highness Sheikha Moza of Qatar's Educate a Child Initiative represents a possible case study for engagement with new partners. The Initiative was launched in Doha, Qatar on 14 November 2012. The partnership with Educate a Child already includes co-financing programs alongside the Global Partnership program implementation grants in Chad, South Sudan and Sudan, to a value of US$45 million. A further eight to ten additional GPE developing country partners will be considered for additional co-financing by Educate a Child in 2013, including the Democratic Republic of Congo, Yemen and Mauritania.

5.5 The Secretariat is already considering plans for the next replenishment and has developed a preliminary timeline. The replenishment should be held in late 2014, a host country should be decided by May 2013, core sponsors should be on board by November 2013, and policy and financial targets should be decided by May 2013. As a next step, the Secretariat will develop a full resource mobilization strategy for the next face-to-face Board meeting in May 2013. The Secretariat will request feedback for proposals in March 2013, and will share early drafts with the Board of Directors.

Discussion

5.6 Board members supported the development of a detailed resource mobilization strategy, and noted the need to conduct a more sophisticated analysis on financing for education. They further emphasized support for a professional and equipped resource mobilization team within the Secretariat.

5.7 Board members generally supported the timing and outline for the next replenishment. One Board member noted the need to generate excitement and activity across GPE partners in support of the next replenishment and resource mobilization efforts.

5.8 One outstanding question included the role of potential new partners and the possibility for the partnership to be more innovative, flexible and broad in terms of its resource mobilization efforts. One Board member requested that the strategy include ways to identify approximate amounts of money that could be raised from new and different partners, both for the GPE Fund and for basic education in general.

Pledge Monitoring

5.9 The Secretariat noted in its paper (BOD/2012/11 DOC 06) that in order to raise funds for basic education, it is important to monitor and report on the delivery of the financial and policy pledges made by 60 GPE partners at its Pledging Conference in November 2011.

5.10 The Secretariat requested a number of things from Board members to assist with the monitoring of pledges made at the Pledging Conference, including ownership of the concept and process; reaffirmation of the importance of monitoring pledges and a request for a report to be delivered in 2013; acknowledgement and increased awareness of the current challenges to effective monitoring; agreement with the timeline; and a request to call on all partners to cooperate with the process to deliver the pledge monitoring report.

5.11 In addition to existing data from surveys from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics and the Global Partnership, the Secretariat will primarily rely on partners to report on their actions and delivery to date. The Secretariat will undertake a survey and conduct follow-up interviews to ensure that all partners are represented. The pledge monitoring report will cover 2012.

5.12 The Secretariat acknowledged that there are several challenges involved in successfully delivering this pledge monitoring report, including a lack of data on implementation of national education plans; the fact that submission of collective pledges by civil society and private foundations make it difficult to track ownership of the pledge; differing methodologies used by donors to define basic education and count Official Development Assistance for education; potential low response rate by developing country partners to the survey; differing levels of substantive detail in pledge statements; recognition that it may take a while to get all the data; and an understanding that surveys will need to be tailored to each partner.

Discussion

5.13 There was general support for the need to report on pledges from the pledging conference. Board members noted that the partnership needs to show that it does what it says it will do and that subsequent replenishment campaigns would be driven by this evidence.

5.14 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-03—<u>Pledge Monitoring Report</u>: The Board of Directors:

a. requests the Secretariat to produce a comprehensive report on the status of fulfillment of the pledges made by partners at the GPE Pledging Conference in November 2011 and deliver it to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting; and

b. calls on all partners to provide the required information to the Secretariat in a timely manner upon request.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION

6.1 The Board of Directors met in executive session to receive an update from the executive search firm, Russell Reynolds, on the recruitment process for the Chief Executive Officer.

7. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE: SESSION 1

7.1 Camilla Helgø Fossberg, Chair of the Financial Advisory Committee, assisted by Padraig Power, Senior Financial Officer and FAC Liaison, presented the report of the FAC (BOD/2012/11DOC 07).

Annual Commitment of Funds and Revision of the Indicative Allocation List for Program Implementation Grants

7.2 The issues of the annual commitment of funds for program implementation grants and the revision of the list of the indicative allocations were presented together as they were interrelated.

7.3 The FAC Chair reminded the Board of Directors that the list of indicative allocations for program implementation grants was approved in January 2011 and is subject to an annual review by the FAC. It had been agreed by the Board of Directors previously that the current list would be in effect for Round 1 of 2013 and any changes would only take effect from Round 2 of 2013.

7.4 The FAC Chair outlined the countries that would be added to the list, removed from the list or decreased to zero, based on readiness to apply and eligibility. The Secretariat requested an extension of the eligibility of Djibouti, Nigeria, and Uzbekistan to apply for a program implementation grant beyond Round 1 of 2013, as such eligibility was due to expire based on being categorized as IDA iii for two consecutive years. The FAC did not recommend this request.

7.5 The language of eligibility for Small Island Developing States was clarified, to ensure that it only applied to IDA-eligible countries.

7.6 The Secretariat presented the results of the financial forecasting exercise, and noted the FAC's recommendation of moving to annual commitments. The Secretariat expects demand for funding to rise in 2013. As a result, the Board of Directors' ability to commit funding might risk being delayed under the current approach of committing funds for the entire allocation, as the trustee cannot commit funds it does not have. With annual commitments, there would be a closer alignment between donor flow of funds and country needs. When moving to this system, it would reduce the risk of delaying starting a program and should still ensure that countries would have the cash when needed. The risks would be a reduction in predictability for countries, and the need for making a tough decision if the expected contributions were not made in the timelines envisaged, and a country still had needs. The best way to manage the predictability risk is by securing additional donor contributions, or for donors to pay contributions earlier.

7.7 The FAC's recommendation was to keep existing levels for indicative allocations, due to the very high demand (and projected demand) for program implementation grants, and the stable or potentially positive donor funding situation. It is important that funding be predictable and to reduce the amount after one year can lead to uncertainty and disruption, and can affect the Global Partnership's reputation. It was noted that this approach would result in a projected shortfall of US$330 million in the next two years based on the value of projected grant approvals and contributions. This shortfall can be managed by moving to annual commitments and thus spreading out the commitment of funds into later years. This means that the shortfall of funds will have to be raised in the next replenishment period.

7.8 Keeping allocations at the current level and moving to annual commitments of funding, there is a greater risk of shortfall, so the Global Partnership will need a mechanism for prioritizing funding going forward. The FAC requested that the Secretariat provide a recommendation on guidelines for prioritization and for describing clearly the basis on which the Board can approve funding for program implementation grants.

Discussion

7.9 Board members generally expressed support for the decision to move to annual commitments for program implementation grants. Board members called it a sensible approach to manage scarce resources, and noted that they understood the risks, including managing the funding unpredictability. Some Board members noted that this action would allow the GPE Fund to move away from a large cash balance, which would make it easier to make the case for replenishing the GPE Fund with additional resources.

7.10 Several Board members requested that the Secretariat present an update on financial forecasts every six months to assess the risks involved in this action, and the Secretariat agreed to do so. One Board member also requested the Secretariat to closely track pipeline flows and share this information with the Board of Directors. They also requested clear guidance on the method used to prioritize countries for funding allocations, should the GPE Fund have a shortfall in cash and be unable to meet its grant allocation commitments in full, and asked if the FAC had examined this issue.

7.11 In general, Board members were supportive of maintaining current indicative allocations for program implementation grants.

7.12 The following decisions were approved:

> **BOD/2012/11-04 – <u>Commitment of Trust Funds for Program Implementation Grants</u>:** The Board of Directors decides that allocations for program implementation grants to be funded from the Global Partnership for Education Fund after 1 January 2013 shall be committed by the Trustee in annual installments up to the maximum amount approved by the Board of Directors as follows:
>
> a. an initial commitment of the amount of the first year's budget in the approved proposal; and

b. subsequent commitments, pending availability of uncommitted funds, based on the request for commitment of funds submitted by a Supervising or Managing Entity which outlines the current availability of funds for each program implementation grant under their supervision or management and projected funding needs for the subsequent twelve-month period.

The Board of Directors will continue to approve allocations for the full term of proposals received.

BOD/2012/11-05 – <u>Revision of the Indicative Allocation List for Program Implementation Grants</u>: The Board of Directors:

a. approves the revised list of indicative allocations for program implementation grants 2012-2014 set out in Annex 9 of the Report of the Financial Advisory Committee (BOD/2012/11 DOC 07), which shall be in effect for the second round of funding in 2013 and the first round of funding in 2014; and

b. replaces the statement of eligibility for program implementation grants as set out in footnote 1 in the Needs and Performance Framework (BOD/2012/01 DOC 01) to:

"The following countries are eligible: (i) those that are currently classified, or have been classified as IDA Category i or ii in the past two years; and (ii) those that are currently classified as IDA category iii and are Small Island Developing States (as defined by the United Nations) or fragile states (as defined by the World Bank).";

c. requests the Secretariat to post the new approved indicative allocations list on the GPE website and advise the relevant Local Education Groups accordingly; and

d. requests:

i. the Secretariat to develop and provide to the Financial Advisory Committee options on:

-a description of the eligible resources available for allocation from the GPE trust funds; and

-criteria for prioritizing allocations for program implementation grants, should there be a shortfall in eligible resources compared to demand from countries; and

ii. the Financial Advisory Committee to provide its recommendation on the items in d.i. to the Board of Directors at the first face-to-face Board meeting in 2013.

Ethiopia request for an above the cap indicative allocation

7.13 The FAC Chair advised that Ethiopia made a request to apply for a program implementation grant for up to US$200 million, which was above their current capped indicative allocation of $US100 million. The FAC Chair advised that although the request was

strong, based on good results for Ethiopia in the past, the FAC did not support Ethiopia's request, because it would necessitate either increasing the shortfall or reducing funding to other countries. This decision had been communicated to the Local Education Group in Ethiopia.

Allocations for Program Implementation Grants

7.14 The FAC Chair presented the FAC's recommendations for program implementation grants for Burundi, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan and the remaining textbook component for Sudan.

7.15 The FAC recommended that the Board not approve Tajikistan's application. The FAC noted an overemphasis on construction in the proposal, and not enough focus on learning outcomes, which was a challenge in the country. The proposal also did not properly address the needs of minority populations. The FAC did commend the early childhood portion of the proposal, but suggested that Tajikistan send a revised application for the next round of funding. The FAC might consider a revised application early, if Tajikistan came forward with one.

7.16 Comments on each of the applications presented in the FAC Report would be communicated to the Local Education Groups.

Discussion

7.17 Prior to the commencement of the discussion, the Chair requested declarations of conflict of interest and received such declarations from UNICEF (co-Managing Entity for Chad and Managing Entity for South Sudan), UNESCO (co-Managing Entity for Chad) and the World Bank (Supervising Entity for Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan). The Board Chair noted that having a conflict of interest did not exclude these agencies from the discussion, but they were prevented from voting on the decision approving the grants. The Chair also noted that a delegation from the Democratic Republic of Congo was present.

7.18 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-06 –<u>Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the following allocations from GPE trust funds to be used for program implementation grants as described in the applications submitted for funding in the second round of 2012:

    a. **Burundi:**

        i. US$52,900,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the Belgian Development Cooperation serving as Supervising Entity;

        ii. US$400,000 for a supervision allocation; and

        iii. US$925,750 for an agency fee.

b. **Chad:**

i. US$40,140,000 for a three-year implementation period, plus US$2,408,400 for an agency fee to UNICEF serving as Managing Entity; and

ii. US$7,060,000 for a three-year implementation period, plus US$494,200 for an agency fee to UNESCO serving as Managing Entity.

c. **Democratic Republic of Congo:**

i. US$100,000,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;

ii. a supervision allocation of US$400,000; and

iii. US$1,638,000 for an agency fee[3].

d. **South Sudan:** US$36,100,000 for a three-year implementation period, plus US$2,527,000 for an agency fee to UNICEF as Managing Entity.

e. **Sudan:** US$25,800,000 for Component 2 (provision of textbooks), plus US$451,500 as an agency fee for the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity[4].

2. requests the Secretariat to include in its notification to each of the relevant Local Education Groups of the approval of the allocations, the Financial Advisory Committee's comments on the program set out in BOD/2012/11 DOC 07.

3. requests the Secretariat to provide to the Local Education Group in Tajikistan the reasons that the FAC did not recommend an allocation in response to its proposal, as indicated in BOD/2012/11 DOC 07.

Standards for Supervising and Managing Entities

7.19 The Strategic Plan speaks to the expansion of the number of agencies acting in the role of Supervising and Managing Entities and to also consider expanding the agency eligibility to including non-state actors. However, GPE partners have expressed concern about the expansion, as it includes new actors with different policies and procedures with which they are not familiar. The FAC thus considered the issue of how to ensure appropriate information was provided in order to determine that a particular Supervising or Managing Entity is suitable to supervise or manage GPE funding and related activities, recognizing the need for more

[3]US$6.4 million of this allocation is to be sourced from the ACP Catalytic Fund, to which no agency fee for the World Bank applies. The remaining US$93.6 million will come from the Global Partnership for Education Fund, to which a 1.75% agency fee applies.
[4]This allocation is in addition to the allocation to Sudan for a program implementation grant that was approved by the Board of Directors in decision BOD/2012/07-04.

information on existing eligible entities and the need to develop an approach for future eligible entities.

7.20 The FAC proposal involves a three-tiered approach: The first step includes a review of policies and procedures and is applicable to those currently eligible to be Supervising and Managing Entities, seeking to capture key information similar to Nordic Plus without duplicating Nordic Plus. The second step includes an institutional assessment and is applicable to those that become eligible should the Board take a decision for expansion. This step allows an entity access to smaller grants such as education plan and program development grants and grants under the Global and Regional Activities program, but not program implementation grants. The third step includes a grant level assessment and analyzes risks associated with larger amounts of grant money. This step is applicable only to those that become eligible should the Board of Directors take that decision and involves an assessment performed for each program implementation grant application, tailored based on risk.

Discussion

7.21 Overall, Board members thought that the three-tiered approach suggested by the FAC was sensible and supported the idea. One Board member emphasized the importance of ensuring that developing country partners maintain their voice in selecting a Supervising or Managing Entity.

7.22 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/11-07 – <u>Standards for Supervising and Managing Entities</u>**: In order to support the approval of the Board of Directors of:
>
> -the appointment of agencies currently eligible to be a Supervising Entity or Managing Entity for a grant funded by GPE trust fund resources (including program implementation grants, education plan development grants, program development grants and Global and Regional Activities grants); and
>
> -the expansion of eligible entities to serve as Managing Entities, as currently anticipated in the Strategic Plan 2012-2015,
>
> the Board of Directors:
>
> a. endorses the approach to be taken to the review and assessment of the relevant policies and procedures of potential supervising and managing entities as set out in Annex 4 of BOD/2012/11 DOC 07; and
>
> b. requests the Secretariat to develop guidelines for the review and assessment consistent with the approach as set out in paragraph a., for consideration by the Financial Advisory Committee and recommendation to the Board of Directors, no later than the first face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors in 2013.

8. CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND (CSEF)

8.1 David Archer, on behalf of the Global Campaign for Education, presented a proposal to strengthen civil society in the education sector (BOD/2012/11 DOC 11) after declaring his conflict of interest, as the Board member for Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International). UNESCO, the proposed Supervising Entity also made a conflict of interest declaration.

8.2 With respect to civil society engagement, the Global Partnership is "ahead of the game" compared to other global funds and initiatives, and with respect to the aid effectiveness agenda. He noted that the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) attempts to build a broader base for practical engagement of civil society in GPE processes, in order to secure policy change at the national level. The mechanism complements GPE support to developing country governments in developing their own strategic plans.

8.3 Global Partnership funding for the CSEF will soon run out. The new proposal covers 2013–2014, and takes stock of cumulative experience and lessons learned from a comprehensive external evaluation. The CSEF greatly increases civil society involvement in effecting policy change, and helps to enlarge and increase diversity in the number and type of groups working together, including teachers unions, NGOs, the private sector, communications organizations, and social movement groups. The CSEF helps national coalitions to secure partnerships with governments and donors, because these civil society coalitions can exert pressure and influence local education sector plans and policies. Specific success stories were provided for Uganda, Bolivia, Senegal and Bangladesh, where coalitions contribute to policy change and development.

8.4 There were new elements of the proposal as a result of the external evaluation's findings including a focus on changing practice rather than on capacity-building; the addition of new partners including ActionAid, Oxfam, Plan, and Education International; ensuring that an agency on the Global Campaign for Education Board who also receives funds does not have a vote in allocation decisions; drafting a new monitoring and evaluation strategy; improving communications, particularly south-south; more focus around engaging GPE processes at the local level through the Local Education Groups; strengthening interregional activities in order to create opportunities for countries to share and learn from each other; and creating a mechanism for sustained capacity. The new proposal was developed with the intent of making sure it contributes to GPE processes and education reform.

8.5 The objectives of the proposal are about contributing to policy change and new practice. Within the proposal's summary budget, the bulk of the allocation is for Africa, but the net contribution amounts to less than one percent of GPE resources. Accountability is built in at the global, regional and national levels and decision-making is autonomous and independent.

Discussion

8.6 Board members agreed that the Global Partnership played a strong role in supporting a vibrant civil society in the education sector, and they recognized the Global Campaign for

Education's efforts in forwarding the agenda nationally and locally. Some members wondered how the Global Partnership could support civil society more generally, especially considering that some civil society organizations are more active and closely aligned with the priorities of GCE, but are not in a national coalition. One Board member suggested forming a sub-group for comprehensive engagement with CSOs in the partnership, in line with the bigger discussion about what it means to be a member of the partnership. Members appreciated the proposal's use of the Strategic Plan as a framework. Some suggested that it would be useful to add more on several of the priorities spelled out in the strategy, for example, support for learning and learning outcomes.

8.7 Members requested the inclusion of indicative indicators for the results, since some are hard to measure. They also encouraged civil society groups to help with the impact evaluation.

8.8 Some Board members wondered whether to allocate this funding to the CSEF specifically, or to civil society more generally. Some members noted that they would have preferred if the FAC had appraised and assessed the proposal first. Some members wondered how to guarantee sustainability over the long term for a broader civil society engagement, whether 1 percent is enough as an allocation, and whether there is the possibility of using another mechanism that facilitates broader engagement of other CSO actors.

8.9 Most agreed that the CSEF model deserved support and that a break in funding would jeopardize good work, however to fund this through other sources risked a proliferation of funding streams. Many Board members suggested funding the CSEF as much as possible under the GRA program, consistent with the GRA quality assurance process, to be brought back to the Board of Directors for final review based on those findings.

8.10 Board members expressed concern about the potential fees of a supervising entity for this allocation, and wondered about the value-add of the supervising entity.

8.11 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-08 — Civil Society Education Fund: The Board of Directors:

a. agrees that there should be continuity of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) with no break in the funding;

b. requests the Secretariat to conduct an expedited quality review of the CSEF funding proposal under the Global and Regional Activities process, including an assessment of the role and appropriate costs of the Supervising Entity; and

c. requests the Global Campaign for Education to present a revised proposal, taking into account the results of the quality review, no later than 11 December 2012, to be considered by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be held on 18 December 2012.

9. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE: SESSION 2

Launch of a Results-Based Financing Pilot

9.1 In December 2011, the Board of Directors approved the Needs and Performance Framework and requested the Secretariat to develop a paper on "top-ups." An initial top-ups paper was presented to the FAC for input at its meeting in Oslo in June 2012. Subsequently, from July to October 2012, a FAC Working Group on results-based financing developed a revised results-based financing approach.

9.2 Margaret Koziol, on behalf of the FAC Working Group assisted the FAC Chair in presenting the rationale for implementing a results-based financing pilot project. Such a project represents a way to promote learning outcomes and allow the Global Partnership to test innovative finance mechanisms. The Working Group's task was to decide whether or not such a project would be feasible and desirable, with operational questions and guidelines developed after the Board approved the FAC's recommendation.

9.3 The proposed pilot project focuses on learning outcomes for Round 2 of 2013. The FAC proposed that guidelines would be developed and approved by the FAC for April 30, 2013 and presented to the Board at its next face-to-face meeting. The pilot includes an increase to the Secretariat budget by US$125,000 for support costs.

9.4 To qualify for the pilot project, developing country partners as represented by the Local Education Group first decide whether they want to focus on learning outcomes. They then submit a program implementation grant application following normal procedures, but with an expression of interest in participating in the pilot, including a proposed list of indicators and targets. The Secretariat provides guidance on the application, including the proposed indicators and targets, and encourages partners to focus on outcome indicators, or system-strengthening indicators, depending on local needs and capacity. The program implementation grant application is subject to the normal review process, although if more countries express an interest in the pilot than slots available, the Secretariat can provide a selection of pilot countries. Indicators, baselines, targets and payout functions for the pilot are added to the standard agreement and the developing country partner track performance. An independent verification of results will also take place and if a country achieves its targets, it will receive the payout. If it does not, it will be eligible for technical support on learning outcomes.

9.5 There was broad support in the FAC for the proposal, with one member disagreeing on principled grounds. The FAC recognized that the project will incur significant transactional costs and detailed guidelines will need to be developed. Operational implications over the lifetime of the project will probably be between US$1.9 million and US$3.6 million, although 2013 costs will be limited to US$125,000 to cover additional Secretariat staffing. Pilot funds for payouts are expected to be US$50 million, which was factored into the financial forecast for the 2015-2017 period.

Discussion

9.6 There was general support amongst Board members for the pilot project and Board members were pleased with the focus on learning outcomes. There were a few reservations and comments expressed, however, with one Board member noting that if the partnership was tasked with selecting developing country partners to participate in the pilot, they should select strong candidates rather than going through a random selection process. Another Board member suggested that the Global Partnership might do better to collect further evidence from the experiences of other results-based approaches before piloting its own project, especially given the current financial forecast. Some Board members noted that developing country partners should receive technical support to identify gaps and problems related to learning outcomes at the beginning of the project instead of at the end if they failed to achieve their targets. Most Board members agreed with the need to be pragmatic and flexible and make sure that the indicators fit the country's needs.

9.7 Several Board members agreed with the need for careful consideration of the definition of results as well as the degree of control within the Local Education Group over the pilot, and a clear timeline for implementation and mainstreaming of the pilot, if appropriate. Another Board member noted that it might be useful to draw from the work of the Learning Metrics Taskforce in the development of the guidelines.

9.8 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-09 – <u>Launch of a Results-Based Financing Pilot</u>: The Board of Directors:

a. approves:

   i. the launching for the second round of funding in 2013 of a results-based financing pilot, focused on learning outcomes and based on the principles set out in Annex 5 of BOD/2012/11 DOC 07 (the "Pilot"); and

   ii. an increase to the Secretariat budget of 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013 of US$125,000 to cover the costs of a half a full time equivalent position to support the Pilot; and

b. delegates to the Financial Advisory Committee the authority to approve the operational guidelines for the Pilot, which shall be released by 30 April 2013 to allow countries to make an informed decision about whether they wish to participate in the Pilot in Round 2 of 2013.

Supervision Allocation Amounts in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States

9.9 The FAC Chair presented the proposal for analysis of supervision allocations, agency fees and other direct management costs for Supervising and Managing Entities, particularly as new agencies were taking on the Supervising and Managing Entity roles. It was recognized that the standard supervision allocation of US$100,000 a year was likely not adequate in fragile and

conflict-affected contexts. Because the analysis would take time to conduct, the FAC proposed an interim solution of offering a supervision allocation of up to US$200,000 a year, provided that a written justification and a costed plan were provided for grants from 2012 onwards.

9.10 The FAC Chair clarified that for grants approved in 2012 using a supervising entity mode (Burundi, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo), a separate application for the increased supervision allocation could be submitted to the FAC for approval. Grant applications submitted in 2013 would include costed plans where applicable, and would be reviewed by the FAC for final approval by the Board of Directors.

Discussion

9.11 There was strong consensus from Board members that it was time to reach an agreement on agency fee structure. Board members agreed that the Secretariat should develop an analysis of management costs associated with GPE business and the constraints involved with moving to a cost-recovery model. Board members expressed a desire to have a greater understanding of supervision allocations and agency fees, noting that costs would vary across countries. There was recognition that some countries had the capacity to manage the grant allocations with little oversight, so that Supervising Entity's workload was not as heavy. In other contexts, especially in fragile and conflict-affected states, operating costs of the Supervising Entity could be high. However, such high fees could have the ultimate effect of taking away funding from substantive, on-the-ground work. Board members noted that the requested analysis could help define what was required in each context and clarify what services were included under different types of fees.

9.12 One developing country partner Board member noted his country's experience of being unable to sign their GPE grant agreement due to high Supervising Entity costs, which required many months of negotiation. Members inquired about the timeframe for the proposed analysis, noting that it should be done as soon as possible, and should include case studies.

9.13 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-10 – <u>Supervision Allocations and Agency Fees</u>:

1. The Board of Directors:

a. confirms that a standard supervision allocation of up to US$100,000 per year is available for Supervising Entities supervising program implementation grants;

b. approves an exception to the standard supervision allocation in fragile and conflict-affected states (as defined by the World Bank) for Supervising Entities supervising program implementation grants of an amount up to US$200,000 per year provided that:

i. the grant was approved after 1 January 2012; and

ii. the Supervising Entity provides a written justification and costed supervision plan

-as part of its application package; or

-for those grants approved in 2012, as a separate request for approval by the Financial Advisory Committee.

2. The Board of Directors requests:

a. the Secretariat to conduct an analysis of the costs associated with supervision and management of program implementation grants, in both fragile and non-fragile contexts, and provide:

i. an update to the Board of Directors at its next face-to face meeting on the progress of the analysis; and

ii. a recommendation to the FAC, no later than 30 June 2013, on:

-a possible change to the standard supervision allocation amount; and

-guidance on agency fees and other direct management costs.

b. the FAC to provide a recommendation to the Board of Directors on this issue at the second face-to-face Board meeting in 2013.

10. GOVERNANCE ISSUES

10.1 The Chair and Secretariat provided a paper in advance of the meeting that set out some options regarding changes to the composition and number of seats on the Board of Directors (BOD/2012/11 DOC 10), which were discussed at the pre-meeting on 18 November 2012.

10.2 The Chair noted that, although the Global Partnership modified its governance structure two years ago, it was clear in the lead-up to the current meeting that a number of new important governance issues had arisen. She presented a draft decision that established a working group, suggested the establishment of an additional developing country seat for Africa on a temporary basis, and indicated a number of areas for further work.

Discussion

10.3 There was broad support for the creation of a Governance Working Group. Many Board members noted that the Working Group should be small and manageable, with five or six people only, and should include representation from each constituency category. Board members agreed that many streams of governance decisions should fall under the Group's work, including the constituency discussion, the roles and responsibilities of the Chair and the incoming CEO, and issues arising from the Evans review. The Chair confirmed that she would send draft Terms of Reference for the Working Group as soon as possible following the meeting.

10.4 The Africa 2 Board Member noted that his constituency had governance and communications challenges in managing a group of 16 members that would soon grow to 18. Adding another African constituency would allow them to better address important problems, like out-of-school children. Others noted that every group had differing contexts and conditions,

and the Board of Directors should try to be flexible in accommodating groups with varying access to resources and means of communication.

10.5 Some Board members suggested caution in changing a governance structure that was still very new, and that had not been sufficiently tested. Some also noted that a temporary change might be premature until an adequate analysis could be performed. A proper analysis would allow a thorough assessment of the problem and ensure appropriate recommendations for action. Many members requested a revised decision that excluded any temporary measures, and that added an explicit reference to the need for reviewing the Africa constituency representation.

10.6 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-11 — Governance Review:

1. The Board of Directors requests the Chair to establish a Governance Working Group, which includes membership of at least one member from each of the constituency categories.

2. The Board of Directors requests the Governance Working Group to review the Global Partnership governance structures and provide recommendations regarding possible changes. The review shall consider, but not be limited to the following:

    i. the issues raised in the paper proposing amendments to the Charter (BOD/2012/10 DOC 03);

    ii. the representation of African partner countries, new and emerging donors, United Nations agencies, and the private sector and private foundations on the Board of Directors;

    iii. clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the Chair, the Chief Executive Officer and the Board of Directors and its committees in decision-making;

    iv. procedures for making decisions outside of face-to-face meetings;

    v. increasing the voice of developing country partners in the governance structures; and

    vi. issues arising from the Evans Working Group.

3. The Governance Working Group shall provide recommendations on representation of constituencies on the Board of Directors no later than the next face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors.

11. ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED CONTEXTS

11.1 The Secretariat presented a proposal for strengthened engagement in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, based on partners' broad experience in the field (BOD/2012/11 DOC

09). The guidelines were drafted in consultation with INEE, and the decision was discussed in the FAC meeting in Washington in October 2012. They included guidelines for accelerated support in emergency situations that were presented to the FAC (Annex 10 of BOD/2012/11 DOC 07).

11.2 The Secretariat noted that 19 of the Global Partnership's current developing country partners are fragile states, and this number will continue to rise. The proposed guidelines are consistent with Strategic Plan Objective 1 on fragile states. They include different measures and support depending on the specific context of the country in question (emergency, recovery and post-crisis).

11.3 The guidelines include the need for transitional education sector plans that identify short-term (three years) priority actions while building capacity towards a full education sector plan. They also state that the default modality for program implementation in a fragile or conflict-affected context should be to use a Managing Entity.

11.4 The Secretariat reviewed the accelerated funding guidelines, which provide for up to 20% of the indicative allocation to be made available for emergency and recovery activities if three conditions are met: the country is already eligible for program implementation grants, there is a humanitarian appeal including education, and the grant is additional to other funding for education in emergencies, which was supported by the FAC. Following the one-year grant, the country would then go through the normal application process for the remaining 80% of the indicative allocation, possibly with a Supervising or Managing Entity, giving the country a year to work on the transitional education plan, to develop processes with the Local Education Group.

Discussion

11.5 Board members acknowledged that the number of fragile states applying for program implementation funding was rapidly growing and that the partnership needed instruments to adapt to unpredictable situations. However, many Board members noted that the guidelines seemed designed for countries in emergency, rather than for fragile contexts in general. Some Board members did not think that a Managing Entity should be the default mechanism, but rather that the plan should account for long-term capacity building, and that it should assess resilience as well as risk. Where a Supervising Entity already existed, Board Members noted that implementing through a new Managing Entity was not necessary, but rather Supervising Entities should be encouraged to be flexible enough to deal with emergency situations.

11.6 Members suggested forming a reference group to work with the team in refining the guidelines, which should be brought back to the Board of Directors no later than the first face-to-face meeting in 2013. The Chair encouraged Board members to indicate their interest to the Secretariat, so work can begin. The Board Member for Multilateral Agency 3 (Multilateral and Regional Banks) further noted that the World Bank has a community of practice that deals with engagement in fragile contexts and the Secretariat should work with them to make sure their recommendations are in line with ongoing action around the issue.

11.7 Some Board members noted the guidelines for accelerated support as groundbreaking work, noting that the 2011 Education for All Global Monitoring Report explicitly showed the need for such a framework. Board members supported the approval of these guidelines.

11.8 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/11-12 — Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations:** The Board of Directors approves the Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations as set out in Annex 10 of BOD/2012/11 DOC 07.

12. CHAIR WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

12.1 The Chair presented her work plan and budget to the Board for approval (BOD/2012/11 DOC 08) and addressed a few items for background information. For the first year of the position's existence, the Chair's budget was paid directly by the World Bank. The arrangement with UNESCO was put into place in the second year. The amount for consultants was used to help fund a report on innovative financing, the Evans Review of the Secretariat hosting arrangement, and to assist the Chair in preparing for presentations.

Discussion

12.2 Board members were generally supportive of the work plan and budget and appreciated the greater detail. They provided a few comments and suggestions, including a request for separate "salary" and "consultant" categories within the budget document, future work plans to be more focused on capacity-building of the partnership and outcomes related to the Board of Directors rather than on current deliverables and inclusion of governance work.

12.3 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/11-13 – Chair Budget:** The Board of Directors approves the Chair's budget of up to US$558,220 for the period of 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2013, based on the work plan presented in BOD/2012/11 DOC 08, Annex 1, which may be modified at a later date depending on the recommendations of the Governance Working Group.

13. ELIGIBILITY FOR PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

13.1 Board members expressed concern that Nigeria, Djibouti and Uzbekistan would all be ineligible after the first round of program implementation grant applications of 2013, based on maintaining IDA category iii status for two consecutive years. Nigeria represented a particular concern, given its large numbers of out-of-school children. The Secretariat noted that Nigeria planned to make an application for Round 1 of 2013 but were concerned that the application would not be of good quality due to the rushed circumstances.

13.2 There was support for extending the eligibility of Nigeria, Djibouti and Uzbekistan to allow them more time to develop a quality proposal for program implementation grant funding. Some Board members noted that, in the case of Nigeria, the partnership should provide encouragement to the country to improve its domestic funding for basic education during the grant application development process. Board members expressed the need for re-examining the criteria for determining eligibility.

13.3 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2012/11-14 – <u>Eligibility Review</u>:

1. The Board of Directors:

   a. recognizes that the current eligibility criteria for program implementation grants requires a review;

   b. requests the Secretariat to present its recommendations on possible changes to such eligibility criteria, including the financial implications, to the Financial Advisory Committee; and

   c. requests the Financial Advisory Committee to present a recommendation on this issue to the Board of Directors at its next face-to face meeting.

2. The Board of Directors decides, in the interim, to extend beyond Round 1 of 2013 the eligibility of Djibouti, Nigeria and Uzbekistan to apply for a program implementation grant, and requests the Secretariat to amend the revised indicative allocations list approved in Decision BOD/2012/11-05 to reflect this decision.

14. SPOTLIGHT ON THE PARTNERSHIP: PÔLE DE DAKAR

14.1 Richard Sack provided a brief background presentation on Pôle de Dakar and the role it plays in the educational sector analysis in Sub-Saharan African countries, which includes assisting in the drafting of sector strategies in the region, providing technical support to national teams responsible for drafting, gathering, and processing data for comparative analyses of African education policies.

14.2 Pôle de Dakar's three main activities include direct technical assistance, indirect support training programs, and the production of statistical and analytical work related to the monitoring of Education for All. The impact of Pôle de Dakar's work includes a reduction in the cost of a Country Status Report (CSR) plus model, a 25 percent efficiency gain between 2001-2004 and 2009-2012, and a wealth of analytical work conducted on CSRs and education sector plans in Africa.

14.3 Limits and challenges of Pôle de Dakar include the increasing country capacity to conduct CSRs and models, the possibility that CSRs are too standardized, overly academic or overly donor-driven, lack of participation in many joint sector reviews and lack of attention given to local context.

14.4 Recommendations for Pôle de Dakar moving forward included the need to decide on whether to focus on economic analysis or expand to other areas including institutional capacity or learning assessments, and the possibility that Pôle de Dakar could assist countries by providing advice and scientific legitimation for CSRs.

ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANT LIST

	Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
1	Aheto-Tsegah, Charles	Deputy Director-General	Ghana Education Service	Ghana	Constituent, Africa 3 (attending for the Alternate Board Member)
2	Alshafe, Nagi	President	Sudanese Network for Education for All (SNEFA)	Sudan	Alternate Board Member, Civil Society Organization 2 (Developing Country)
3	Ambühl, Hansjürg	Head of West Africa Division	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Switzerland	Alternate Board Member, Donor 1
4	Andersen, Jesper	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Constituent, Donor 4
5	Archer, David	Head of Education	ActionAid	United Kingdom	Board Member, CSO 1 (Northern/International)
6	Beardmore, Sarah	Replenishment Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
7	Bellamy, Carol	Chair of the Global Partnership for Education		United States	Chair
8	Benito Canelhas, Jose Luis	Advisor	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent, Asia &the Pacific
9	Bernard, Jean-Marc	Senior Education Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
10	Bland, Simon	Head, Global Funds Department	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Board Member, Donor 3
11	Boly-Barry, S.E. Koumba	Minister	Ministry of Education	Burkina Faso	Alternate Board Member, Africa 2
12	Bourne, Jo	Education Policy Team Leader	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Constituent, Donor 3
13	Brinkhaus, Michaela	Desk Officer for Primary Education	Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Germany	Constituent, Donor 5
14	Butler, Greg	Senior Director	Microsoft	United States	Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
15	Charton-Bigot, Hélène	Head of Gender and Human Development Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	France	Constituent, Donor 5
16	Christensen, Olav Rex	Senior Public Finance Specialist	The World Bank	United States	Constituent, Multilateral Agency 3 (Multilateral and Regional Banks)
17	Collins, Patrick	Team Leader, Basic Education	USAID	United States	Constituent, Donor 6

18	Crouch, Luis	Team Coordinator, Global Good Practices	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
19	De Marcken, Natasha	Director, Office of Education	USAID	United States	Alternate Board Member, Donor 6
20	Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Planning and Education Reform	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Constituent, Africa 2
21	Dos Santos Freitas, H.E. Bendito	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Alternate Board Member, Asia &the Pacific
22	Drummond, Peter	Managing Director	Russell Reynolds	United States	Observer
23	Dworack, Sandra	Policy Advisor	Oxfam Germany	Germany	Constituent, CSO 1 (Northern/International)
24	Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Constituent, CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
25	Feinberg, Nathalia	Head of Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Alternate Board Member,Donor 4
26	Fife, Paul	Assistant Director General	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	Norway	Constituent, Donor 4
27	Filipp, Robert	President	Innovative Finance Foundation	Switzerland	Observer
28	FocasLicht, Margarita	Acting Team Coordinator, Country Support Team	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
29	Fossberg, Camilla	Head of Education Section	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	Norway	Chair of the Financial Advisory Committee, Presenter
30	Fouilhoux, Monique	Special Consultant	Education International	Belgium	Alternate Board Member, Civil Society Organization 3 (Teaching Profession)
31	Freeouf, Michelle	Board Services Analyst	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
32	Gantenbein, Nicole	Education Policy Advisor	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Switzerland	Constituent, Donor 1
33	Gardiner, Amanda	Head of International Affairs	Pearson International	United States	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
34	Gazagne, Fanny	Education Policy Officer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	France	Constituent, Donor 5
35	Golden, April	Operations Analyst	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
36	Goudiaby, Gisele	Board Logistics	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
37	Grizzle, James	Education Officer	U.S. Delegation to UNESCO	United States	Observer
38	Gutiérrez, Francisco	Head of the Education Division	AECID	Spain	Constituent, Donor 2
39	Haba, Sharon	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Education	Rwanda	Board Member, Africa 1

40	Habibyar, Mohammad Shakir	Assistant to the Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constituent, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
41	Hamilton, Evelyn	Chief Planning Officer	Ministry of Education	Guyana	Constituent, Latin America &the Caribbean (attending on behalf of the Alternate Board Member)
42	HeimensVisser, Merel	Director	Reading & Writing Foundation	Netherlands	Assistant to Presenter
43	Heninger, Lori	Director	Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies	United States	Observer
44	Hertel, Ulrika	Programme Manager	Swedish International Development Agency	Sweden	Constituent Donor 4
45	Ingelstam, Lena	Assistant Director General, SIDA	Swedish International Development Association, Sweden	Sweden	Board Member, Donor 4
46	Jacques, Bonyoma	Conseiller Principal du Premier Ministre	Cabinet du Premier Ministre	Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent, Africa 2
47	Jahr de Guerrero, Karin	Senior Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
48	Jesaitis, Maren	Coordinator GCE Germany	Oxfam Germany	Germany	Constituent, Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International)
49	Kaboré, Ibrahima	Secrétaire Permanent	Ministère de l'Education	Burkina Faso	Constituent, Africa 2
50	Karimata, Atsushi	Senior Coordinator, Global Issues Cooperation Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Board Member, Donor 6
51	Karjalainen, Marja	Acting Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Alternate Board Member, Donor 5
52	Kelleher, Mike	Team Coordinator, Communications and External Relations	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
53	King, Elizabeth	Education Director	The World Bank	United States	Board Member, Multilateral Agency 3 (Multilateral and Regional Banks)
54	Koziol, Margaret	Policy Advisor	United States Agency for International Development	United States	Constituent, Donor 6
55	Kvitashvili, Alexander	Rector	Tbilisi State University	Georgia	Board Member, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
56	Laugharn, Peter	Director	Firelight Foundation	United States	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
57	Leliveld, Stefan	Project Manager	Reading & Writing Foundation	Netherlands	Assistant to Presenter

58	Lerer, Leonard	Senior Vice President	Innovative Finance Foundation	Switzerland	Observer
59	Lovegrove, Bernie	Executive Director	ASPBAE Australia	Australia	Constituent, Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International)
60	Malpica, Rocio	Senior Counsel	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
61	Mbuyamba, Jean-Paul	Advisor to the Minister	Ministry of Education	Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent, Africa 2
62	McLean, Hugh	Director, Education Support Program	Open Society Foundations	United Kingdom	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
63	Mesen, Michelle	Board of Directors Liaison	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
64	Mizuno, Keiko	Senior Advisor (Education)	Japan International Cooperation Agency	Japan	Constituent, Donor 6
65	Mowe, Kjersti	CSEF Communications and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	Norway	Constituent, Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International)
66	Munsya, Valère	CoordinateurProjet GPE en RDC	Ministry of Education	Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent, Africa 2
67	MwanguFamba, S.E. Maker	Minister	Ministry of Education	Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent, Africa 2
68	Naidoo, Jordan	Senior Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Constituent, Multilateral Agency 2 (UNICEF)
69	Nestel, Yona	Senior Education Advisor	Plan International Canada	Canada	Constituent, Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International)
70	Princess Laurentien of the Netherlands	UNESCO Special Envoy on Literacy for Development		Netherlands	Presenter
71	Okunev, Igor	Development Director	CICED Russia	Russian Federation	Constituent, Donor 6
72	O'Reilly, Joseph	Head of Education	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member, Civil Society Organization 1 (Northern/International)
73	Perez, Juan	Administrative Manager	Ministry of Education	Honduras	Constituent, Latin America &the Caribbean
74	Pessi, Jefferson	Coordinator	Education International	Belgium	Constituent, Civil Society Organization 3 (Teaching Profession)

75	Pinto, Nancy	Team Coordinator, Finance, Portfolio and Administration	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
76	Power, Padraig	Senior Financial Officer and FAC Liaison	Global Partnership for Education	Ireland	GPE Secretariat
77	Prouty, Robert	Head of Secretariat	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
78	Rao Gupta, Geeta	Deputy Executive Director	UNICEF	United States	Board Member, Multilateral Agency 2 (UNICEF)
79	Reissmann, Christine	Director, Global Initiatives Directorate	Canadian International Development Agency	Canada	Alternate Board Member, Donor 3
80	Ricoveri, Alessandro	Education Manager	European Commission	Belgium	Constituent, Donor 5
81	Rodrigues Lay, Melisa	Assistant	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent, Asia & the Pacific
82	Rombaut, Makadi	Directeur de Cabinet Adjoint du Ministère de l'EPSP	Ministry of Education	Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent, Africa 2
83	Roth, Martina	Director Education Strategy Research Policy	Intel Corporation	United States	Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
84	Sack, Richard	Consultant		United States	Presenter
85	Sagorsky, Tal	Senior Board Operations Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
86	Sanneh, Momodou	Deputy Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Education	The Gambia	Board Member, Africa 3
87	Santos, Lucrecia	Assistant	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent, Asia& the Pacific
88	Sarvi, Jouko	Practice Leader for Education and Chair, Education Community of Practice	Asian Development Bank	Philippines	Alternate Board Member, Multilateral Agency 3 (Multilateral & Regional Banks)
89	Schmidt, Caroline	Adviser	GIZ	Germany	Observer
90	Seeger, Anna	Education Advisor	GIZ	Germany	Observer
91	Seim, Olav	Director	UNESCO	France	Alternate Board Member, Multilateral Agency 1 (UNESCO)
92	Short, Adam	Head of Advocacy	Plan International	United Kingdom	Constituent, Civil Society Organizations 1 (Northern/International)
93	Siebes, Ronald	Deputy Head, Education Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The Netherlands	Constituent, Donor 1

94	Stockill, Jennifer	Policy and Programme Officer	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Constituent, Donor 3
95	Sturrock, Christine	Director, Sectoral Funds	Australian Agency for International Development	Australia	Constituent, Donor 2
966	Tahirou, Traore	Coordonnateur National	Coalition national pour l'education pour tous	Burkina Faso	Constituent, Civil Society Organizations 2 (Developing Country)
97	Takahashi, Akito	Deputy Director	Ministry of Finance	Japan	Constituent, Donor 6
98	Tanai, Farid	Advisor to the Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constituent, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
99	Tang, Qian	Assistant Director General/Executive Director	UNESCO	France	Board Member, Multilateral Agency 1 (UNESCO)
100	Tapp, Charles	Senior Replenishment Advisor	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
101	Taylor, Aleesha	Deputy Director - Education Support Program	Open Society Foundations	United States	Alternate Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
102	Thiam, S.E. SérigneMbaye	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Board Member, Africa 2
103	Tinning, Chris	Minister-Counsellor	Australian Agency for International Development	Australia	Alternate Board Member, Donor 2
104	Waples, Sally	Policy and Programme Manager	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Constituent,Donor 3
105	Wardak, H.E. GhulamFarooq	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Alternate Board Member,Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
106	Wijnroks, Marijke	Acting Director, Social Development	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Board Member, Donor 1
107	Wilmshurst, Euan	Director	Children's Investment Fund Foundation	United Kingdom	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
108	Yondon, Otgonbayar	Member of Parliament	Parliament of Mongolia	Mongolia	Board Member, Asia & the Pacific
109	Young, Grace	Financial Officer	The World Bank	United States	Trustee