REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
February 26, 2014
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

A full day pre-Board session was held on February 25, 2014, including discussions on the Principles and Options of the new GPE Funding Model and on the Case for Investment for Replenishment in preparation for the Board meeting on February 26, 2014.

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

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

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT

1.1 H.E Mr. Sérigne Mbaye Thiam welcomed all participants to the meeting of the Board of Directors (the "Board"). He informed the Board that the Interim Chair, Ms. Geeta Rao Gupta, was unable to attend the Board meeting and that she had asked him as Chair of the Governance, Ethic, Risk, and Finance Committee to chair on her behalf. The Minister noted that he had been unable to attend the pre-Board meeting due to important prior engagements. However, he was briefed on the discussions. H.E. Mr. Thiam reflected on the pre-Board discussions and noted the importance of reaching decisions on both the principles and options for the GPE Funding Model, as well as on the targets for replenishment. Following his introduction, Minister Thiam extended a special welcome to the incoming Chair of the Global Partnership for Education, Honorable Julia Gillard.

1.2 In her opening remarks, Honorable Julia Gillard thanked Minister Thiam for giving her the opportunity to address a few words to the Board. She shared her motivations for taking on the role as Chair. She explained how education had played a major role in her life and how much she appreciated the opportunities in education afforded her by her parents. In the same vein, Ms. Gillard stated that education has been the policy area closest to her heart. She spoke about her career, which had included positions as Education Minister and Prime Minister. These positions had enabled her to extend her focus on learning quality, better outcomes, and new funding systems. Ms. Gillard concluded that she was thrilled to join the Global Partnership at a very pivotal and critical time and that she was confident about achieving a successful replenishment in partnership with the Board.

Meeting Objectives and Outcomes

1.3 Following the Chair's remarks, Minister Thiam, Interim Chair, reflected on the principles and options for the GPE Funding Model presented by the Secretariat. He explained that the new approach emphasizes aid effectiveness principles, in particular the importance of country ownership. He stressed the urgency of reaching a decision on the overall approach and resolving specifics on eligibility and the allocation formula. Given that the Replenishment was only a few months away, he further explained the need for the Board to make a key decision on funding targets and move onto the next stage of the Replenishment process.

1.4 The Interim Chair noted that the agenda had changed and took the Board through the revised agenda for the meeting. He summarized the meeting objectives. The Board would first receive the CEO's opening remarks, consider the revised agenda, and approve the report of the Board meeting held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The remainder of the meeting would be spent further discussing and making decisions on the new GPE Funding Model and the Replenishment Strategy, approving a modification to the program implementation grant allocation to Yemen, and any further business that might arise.

Overview of Agenda and Approval of Meeting Report

1.5 The Interim Chair tabled the revised agenda for the meeting and requested comments. None were received.

1.6 The Interim Chair requested approval of the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on November 18-19, 2013 (BOD/2014/02 DOC 05). Comments received from Donor 3 had been incorporated into the Board Meeting Report and had been recirculated to the Board. There were no further comments raised.

Decision:

1.7 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/02-05 — Approval of Meeting Report: The Board of Directors approved the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held in Addis Ababa on November 18-19, 2013 (BOD/2014/02 DOC 05).

2. REMARKS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2.1 Alice Albright, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), stated that today was an important day for the Global Partnership for several reasons. These included the arrival of the new GPE Chair, Julia Gillard, and the historic decisions the Board would be making about how the Global Partnership would operate in the future and about what its level of ambition would be over the next four years and into the post-2015 goals era.

2.2 The CEO noted that the Secretariat has had a rich history with significant growth in terms of breadth and potential in recent years. The Global Partnership is preparing to seize the opportunities to make further gains in access to education, to address the learning agenda, and help shape the global debate on education in the post-2015 goals era.

2.3 The CEO noted the increase in attention to education in achieving development outcomes and stressed the need to move forward on a number of development indicators.

2.4 The CEO further observed that the Global Partnership was at the tipping point in education. It has a choice to embrace a new way of doing business, to be bold and ambitious with developing country partners and other partners towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in acquiring the resources to achieve those goals over the next four or five years. Or, the Global Partnership can continue to carry on with the current funding model, which is not likely to deliver strengthened systems of scale and leverage the commitments and innovation that the sector needs.

2.5 Concerning the Secretariat's position on the new Funding Model, the CEO indicated that the new model is the beginning of the new way of doing business. It draws on the best of Results-Based

Financing and recognizes the fundamentally local, in-country dimensions of a quality education, and the very central role that the developing country partners play in reaching goals.

2.6 The CEO stated that the Board has a similar opportunity with supporting the Replenishment and thereby also setting the Global Partnership on a pathway of doing business in a new way.

2.7 The CEO invited the Board to move forward with the Funding Model as a way of making the Global Partnership "fit for purpose."

3. DISCUSSION ON THE PRINCIPLES AND OPTIONS FOR THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP'S FUNDING MODEL (BOD/2014/02 DOC 06)

3.1 The Interim Chair directed the Board's attention to the new Funding Model. He reiterated the importance of coming to a consensus on the topic and requested the Secretariat take the floor and summarize the various aspects proposed for the new Funding Model. Whereas Secretariat staff had already provided the Board with a presentation on the need for a new funding model during the pre-Board meeting, Secretariat Senior Financial Officer, Padraig Power, emphasized the need for the Board to approve the following aspects of the Funding Model: the approach and principles; the eligibility criteria for access to program implementation grant funding that would determine the maximum number of countries that would be eligible to apply; and a needs-based allocation formula to determine an eligible country's share of available resources based on either Option 1 or Option 2 as outlined in the related Board paper (BOD/2014/02–DOC 06).

3.2 The Secretariat would need guidance on the way forward for the remaining components of the new Funding Model but the details would need to be determined by the Board another time, but no later than June. Specifically, these components included operational guidelines for the funding model related to the proposed requirements and incentives components of program implementation grants, including consideration of an ex-post and/or ex-ante approach to payment of the incentives part of the allocation, the minimum acceptable allocations and the consideration of available resources, largely dependent on the outcome of the Replenishment Conference in June, needed to help determine the Maximum Country Allocations (MCA). The Secretariat recommended deferring the operational issues to the Country Grants and Performance (CGPC) Committee and the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance (GERF) Committee.

Discussion:

The Board discussed each of the components of the Board decision separately.

3.3 *Approach and Principles*
Board members generally agreed with the approach and principles proposed by the Secretariat provided the language be made more specific. In the proposed model, Maximum Country Allocations (MCA) for program implementation grants have a fixed and a variable part. The fixed part is accessed by meeting certain basic requirements up front: quality Education Sector Plans, the availability of relevant data, and a firm commitment at the local level to provide financing for the implementation of the Education Sector Plan. The variable part is incentive-based and linked to transformational change at the sector level related to equity in access to education, efficiency in education and improved learning. Both the requirements and incentives are fully aligned and support GPE strategic goals and objectives.

3.4 *Eligibility*
Secretariat staff provided an overview of the proposed eligibility categories. Whereas eligibility for GPE funding under the old model was solely based on IDA categories, the proposed eligibility under the new funding model continues to focus on poverty, but also on education vulnerability, and

fragility. Low-income and lower middle-income countries are considered based on their economic classification and primary completion rate (PCR), further ensuring fragile states are eligible for program implementation grant funding. A Board member raised a query as to the effect of not including PCR in the eligibility categories, and the Secretariat clarified that if it was not part of the eligibility formula, seven countries would become ineligible and one country would become eligible (West Bank/Gaza).

3.5 There was broad support among Board members of the proposed eligibility for access to program implementation grants as it focused on the poorest and most fragile countries and continued to consider the primary completion rate, considered to correlate with poverty. Board members also expressed the need to remain as inclusive as possible and to keep an open mind on eligibility, but concern was expressed about spreading human and financial resources too thinly resulting in grants that are too small to have real impact. Further, the observation was made that countries excluded from Program implementation grants should still be able to access other types of financing.

3.6 Beyond eligibility, the Board recognized that the number of countries that actually receive grants may depend on the availability of funding and the existence of a ceiling on the amount of funding that is made available to each country. Therefore the countries included as eligible should be considered a maximum list. In this context, the Board expressed the view that there should continue to be a cap to avoid the risk of inequity and to provide funding access to a maximum number of countries, even though that may mean that a country with large needs may not have all of them met. Some Board members expressed the concern that without a cap, a few large countries would receive a substantial percentage of available funding under the proposed eligibility criteria, while there was also concern raised by one constituency that the cap may need to be increased.

3.7 Some discussion ensued about the IDA-defined category of small-island developing states regions. There was broad support among Board members for including these states into the eligibility criteria, considering the comparatively small investment for considerable returns. However, one Board member raised the question whether these states should be given access to innovative financing rather than Program implementation grants. The Board also discussed whether it should also allow in this particular category an exception for IDA eligible small landlocked developing states with similar development and education challenges–notably Bhutan which under the proposed eligibility categories would not be eligible for a program implementation grant. Secretariat staff responded by saying that the Board could still determine to include Bhutan in the category on an exception basis, or create a new category for IDA eligible small landlocked developing states. Secretariat staff had not included such a category because it does not exist at present within the existing eligibility criteria and there was no international definition of what constituted a “small” landlocked developing state..

3.8 While the Board was generally in favor of allowing Bhutan to be eligible for a program implementation grant, several Board members expressed concern about adding the country to the small-island developing states category on an exception basis. Arguments included that creating exceptions would undermine the principles of criteria and definitions of the proposed funding model. Another Board member added that if Bhutan were included as an exception, other countries may seek such an exception, too. In addition, a Board member noted the IDA small-island developing states category is structured by region rather than individual states. Adding a country would change the model. The Secretariat clarified that the category would be IDA eligible small landlocked developing states and would be defined as those with a population of less than 1 million, meaning this would only apply to Bhutan at present.

3.9 On a related note, one Board member noted that Guyana is included in the small-island developing states category because of its inclusion in a small-island developing states region but does not really fit since it is neither small nor an island. However, rather than exclude a country based on strict definitions, the argument was made that the Board should consider countries’ abilities and treat

them differently based on specific considerations. It was noted the Board had made an exception for Timor Leste in the past.

3.10 Aside from program implementation grants, the Board recognized the importance of innovative financing mechanisms, and requested the Secretariat further explore the possibility of such a vehicle, including determining eligibility criteria and how these funds would be made available. The analysis should include the possibility of leveraging funding. The Secretariat noted it would require external assistance to carry out this assessment of various innovative financing options due to its current staff workload. The Board shared similar sentiments about the Secretariat pursuing a potential role for the Global Partnership in humanitarian contexts.

3.11 The Interim Chair concluded there was no real objection to the eligibility criteria proposed by the Secretariat but requested the Secretariat consider comments and concerns made by the Board and amend the decision language accordingly, and to incorporate the category of IDA eligible small landlocked developing states into the eligibility categories recognizing that this would add Bhutan to the list of eligible countries for Program Implementation Grants.

3.12 *Allocation Formula*
The Board continued to discuss the two allocation formulas presented for consideration. While appreciating the sophisticated formula outlined in Option 2 in the Board paper, Board members considered it too complex. Instead, the Board unanimously favored the allocation formula in Option 1 for its central focus on education, it being evidence-based, and its simplicity and clarity to the general public. However, several Board members requested additional factors be built into the formula for determining an eligible country's share of available resources. Specifically, it was requested to include consideration of rural populations and lower secondary education completion rates into the formula, and if possible, to include a better emphasis on girls' education than the Gender Parity Index. Some Board members did express concern that Option 1 did not focus enough on education quality. There was also the concern about the role of other external aid. The Board agreed that it should not be a negative in terms of a higher or lower allocation. Instead, the Global Partnership should leverage external aid.

3.13 Board members again underscored the importance of having a ceiling or "cap" with respect to the maximum amount of funding that could be made available to a country eligible for a program implementation grant. A cap is not meant to deny a country the amount of funding it needs to meet its needs. Rather, it is to ensure equity and address the issue of supply and demand. Also, it was mentioned that large countries may also receive other external aid, and that the Board may view allocations in terms of funding regions in countries, rather than large countries in their entirety per se.

3.14 It was further recognized that the level of the cap should take into account the level of available funding based on the outcome of the Replenishment Conference in June. At the same time, it should take into account the real needs of countries.

3.15 Board members endorsed the idea of the Secretariat working with a Board committee to analyze the appropriate funding ceiling. One Board member strongly recommended not establishing a cap prior to the Replenishment Conference to potentially mobilize more funding from donors. Moreover, with a successful replenishment, a cap may not be needed.

3.16 Secretariat staff clarified that any cap established would be separate from and not affect the allocation formula. Instead, a potential option would be to base the ceiling on the level of available resources: the more resources become available, the higher the ceiling can be in order to have sufficient funding to provide minimum allocations, and to still be available to all eligible countries.

3.17 The Interim Chair declared consensus on Option 1 with the understanding that other factors and criteria proposed by Board members be integrated into the formula by the Secretariat. Board members requested the Secretariat keep it informed of progress.

3.18 *Requirements and Incentives*
On the issue of the requirements and incentives related components of the indicative grant allocation, several Board members noted the final decision language should take into consideration the work done by the Board the previous day on the issue. Interested Board members had come to a consensus that all program implementation grants would benefit from a requirements and incentives portion. The actual percentage should be determined centrally, not at country level, and apply to all grants. Most Board members favored a percentage between 25 and 35% of the indicative allocation. The consensus was also that it might not be desirable to fix percentages equally between the components of equity, efficiency, and learning within the variable part. With respect to the timing of the distribution of the variable part, while there was a clear preference to make it available when agreed incentive requirements have been met (ex-post approach), some room should be left for an ex-ante approach depending on the country context. One Board member noted the increased work load on staff in an ex-post approach. Last, it was agreed that an independent assessment/verification is needed in the grant process but it should be based on a particular country's selected indicators.

3.19 With respect to domestic financing, Board members noted the importance of systematically tracking domestic financing and governments should demonstrate a clear commitment to funding education, with the mechanics informed by the country context. With respect to external financing, concern was expressed that there is no mechanism to prevent other external donors from reducing their funding based on GPE grants. Further analysis is needed on monitoring and leveraging domestic and external financing.

3.20 With regard to countries not being able to provide data when required to demonstrate they have met targets, a Board member noted countries could receive support to improve their data collection and monitoring. Secretariat staff confirmed it can provide countries with assistance in this area.

3.21 Several Board members emphasized that the process for developing operational guidelines should include close consultation with parties that are responsible for implementation at the country level and engage countries for practical feedback. Indicators should be determined at the country level and implementation built on country processes. However, while country-level actors should be consulted on context to create ownership and workability, the operational guidelines should be finalized by the Global Partnership. With respect to learning, the appropriate Board committee should look at both evidence and practical experiences.

3.22 Several Board members objected to delegating authority to the Country Grants and Performance Committee to approve the operational guidelines to be developed by the Secretariat stating that final approval authority should remain with the Board.

3.23 *Minimum and Maximum Country Allocations*
In discussing Maximum Country Allocations (MCA), while recognizing some countries have large needs, Board members reiterated their unanimous support for a ceiling to avoid a small number of countries absorbing most of the funding, but requested further analysis to determine the appropriate level. Further thought should also be given to the minimum country allocations to ensure impact.

3.24 The Board agreed that the Secretariat should work on an analysis of the cap in consultation with the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee for a decision by the Board prior to the Replenishment Conference. The analysis should consider various pledging scenarios. In addition, pledging scenarios need to consider an understanding of how pledges or contributions are defined and

how they will be counted towards the amount of available resources. For example, should the analysis of available funding only include firm pledges made this year, or should it also take into account anticipated pledges further along in the 2015-2018 Replenishment Period? The projected pipeline and an analysis of current grants also need to be considered.

3.25 The Interim Chair concluded that based on Board comments, Secretariat staff would work with interested Board members on acceptable decision language for the Board's consideration in the afternoon.

4. PRESENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP'S REPLENISHMNENT STRATEGY 2015-2018 (BOD/2014/02 DOC 07)

4.1 The Interim Chair reminded the Board of its decision at the Addis Board meeting in November 2013, calling for an ambitious replenishment of the GPE Fund to allow the Global Partnership to deliver "more than business as usual." He emphasized that with only a few months away from replenishment, the Board needed to take key decisions on the funding target for the GPE Fund, and provide guidance on the Case for Investment and support for replenishment funding targets.

4.2 Charles Tapp, Manager of the External Relations and Partnership Team ("PERT"), presented the Global Partnership's Replenishment Strategy. He explained that three core messages will be delivered during the campaign:

- the importance of education as an essential ingredient enabling countries to make progress in most areas of human, economic, and social development;
- the value of the Global Partnership–the power of partnership and systemic approaches; and
- the stakes of replenishment–building on the momentum of success and addressing remaining challenges.

4.3 He stressed that over the last decade, tremendous gains in GPE developing country partner countries have been realized and that it is time to build on that momentum. More and more developing countries that are GPE partners have increased their own domestic investments into their education systems. If donors do not step up in the same way, the commitment of our developing country partners to investing further in education would be undermined. Despite progress, major challenges remain: 57 million children are out of school and 250 million children lack basic literacy and numeracy skills.

4.4 He also mentioned that the new funding model will impact the replenishment campaign. GPE eligibility will still be needs-based but all GPE funding will be incentivized for performance. This new funding model will allow the Global Partnership to leverage additional funding (domestic and external co-financing) and will also increase the efficiency, effectiveness, alignment and equitable allocation of education sector funding. The new funding model drives accelerated progress in fragile and conflict-afflicted states, reduces the number of out-of-school children, improves learning outcomes, addresses gender disparities, improves teacher effectiveness, provides comprehensive system-wide improvements, and spearheads a long overdue data revolution.

4.5 The Manager, PERT, presented the GPE value proposition, and referred to it as a model of unique collaborative development. He explained that creating sustainable education systems needs to be done collectively.

4.6 He thanked the Board for its insightful comments on the case for investment and advised that the Secretariat would be incorporating many of them into the final version.

4.7 The Manager, PERT, introduced different possible GPE Fund targets (US$3 billion–US$4 billion) and their respective impact on the number of children benefiting from basic, primary and lower secondary education On the spending side, a target of US$2.5 billion is required to sustain allocation levels for developing country partners met under the first replenishment period, and an additional US$700 million will be needed to cover carry-over, operational, and GPE process-related expenses (e.g., education program development grants, Supervising Entity and Managing Entity fees, etc), for a total US$3.2 billion. He noted that civil society is advocating for a total of US$4 billion for replenishment, which means US$1 billion a year.

4.8 The Manager, PERT, asked the Board to consider the appropriate target for the GPE Fund, whether it should be a specific number or a range – high, medium and low. The concern with a range is that the low number usually becomes the target. He encouraged the Board to be ambitious, stating that US$3 billion is achievable, US$3.5 billion a stretch, and anything below US$3 billion an undesirable outcome.

4.9 The Manager, PERT, concluded by summarizing the next steps:

- launch of the Case for Investment (mid-March).
- campaign push through to June 26;
- support from the Champions;
- publication of the pledging framework (end of March/early April);
- regular coordination with colleagues in Brussels; and
- constitution of a leadership group among donors and developing countries.

The Secretariat Chief Executive Officer then asked Board members to approve a replenishment target for the GPE Fund of US$3.5 billion plus US$ 500 million in innovative financing.

5. DECISION ON THE PRINCIPLES AND OPTIONS FOR THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP'S FUNDING MODEL (BOD/2014/02 DOC 06)

Decision:

5.1 The Interim Chair then asked the Board to consider the amended decision language prepared by the Secretariat based on Board comments earlier during the meeting and conversations with interested Board constituencies. An additional point raised was the need to re-examine roles, accountability and costs related to Supervising and Managing Entities. It was noted this had been a recurring request in recent years. Several Board members asked for additional revisions to different components of the decision.

5.2 After a lengthy discussion, the Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2014/02-06—Global Partnership for Education Funding Model for the 2015–2018 Replenishment Period: The Board of Directors:

i. endorses the approach and principles for the revision of the Global Partnership for Education Funding model for the 2015-2018 period as set out in BOD/2014/02 Doc 06 and discussed at the Special Board Meeting;

ii. approves the eligibility categories to determine the maximum number of countries that may be eligible to access Program Implementation Grant funding as set out in BOD/2014/02 Doc 06; and endorses the principle that prioritization of allocations may be required if available resources are insufficient to fund all eligible countries at a minimum acceptable allocation level as outlined in Point VI of this decision;

iii. approves the "Needs" based allocation formula to determine an eligible country's share of available resources based on the formula outlined in Option 1 of BOD/2014/02 Doc 06, that shall be further modified to incorporate factors related to lower secondary education, girls, and rural situations;

iv. requests the Secretariat to develop the necessary operational guidelines related to the requirements and incentives for review by the Country Grants and Performance Committee for recommendation to the Board in advance of the Replenishment Conference. The Board further requests the Secretariat to:

   a. further develop the data and analytical requirements;
   b. further specify the requirements in order to ensure that GPE financing is additional to other financing;
   c. further analyze the appropriate size of the variable part of the MCA and whether the size should be the same for all countries or adjusted to contexts, recognizing that the Board is comfortable with a range of 25-35%. The Board agrees that the variable part will apply to all program implementation grants;
   d. building on existing experiences and consultations with local education groups, in particular agency partners; identify what conditions need to be in place for different types of ex-post arrangements to work and related criteria for when ex-ante may be considered, noting that the Board has a preference for ex-post arrangements where country circumstances permit; and
   e. ensure that monitoring and verification mechanisms for the requirements and incentives are properly addressed in the guidelines;

v. requests the Secretariat to accelerate consideration of options for innovative finance mechanisms and GPE's potential role in humanitarian and complex emergency contexts;

vi. requests the Secretariat to further analyze the minimum acceptable allocations and the consideration of available resources that should be used for determining the Maximum Country Allocation, and to present this for review by the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee for recommendation to the Board. The Board further notes that the analysis will include:

   a. consideration by end of March of the implications of a potential increase in the level of the cap on overall allocations based on various replenishment scenarios; and
   b. consideration by the June Board meeting of implications of innovative finance mechanisms for eligibility and allocation of resources; and

vii. requests the Secretariat to assess, for consideration by the Country Grants and Performance Committee, the potential impact of the implementation of the new funding model on the role and responsibilities of the Supervising and Managing Entities, coordinating agencies, and the Local Education Group.

6. DISCUSSION AND FINAL DECISION ON THE REPLENISHMENT STRATEGY

The Interim Chair opened the discussion.

6.1 Board members were generally supportive of proposals and thanked the Secretariat for the quality of the document. They supported the vision but recommended a review of some of the core messages. A majority of Board members noted that the messages should be consistent with the Global Partnership's strategy. It was noted that the Case for Investment would be stronger if it had specific references to the post-2015 Agenda, especially since the Global Partnership had been identified as demonstrating good practices by the High Level Panel. The contributions of the Global Partnership in gpoing the final mile in reaching the MDGs should be highlighted.

6.2 Board members also recommended to communicate more on achievements and on the repositioning of the Global Partnership, including its emphasis on data quality, learning, fragile states, and girls, among other things. Some Board members suggested core messages should focus on access, learning and early childhood education. The message and certain definitions (such as cross-stakeholders/loan buy-downs) should be clarified for advocacy purposes.

6.3 Regarding the replenishment target, some Board members suggested that US$4 billion is not feasible and sought more guidance from the Secretariat. Many Board members recommended the removal of a target for innovative financing and loan buy-downs. There was strong support for the planned focus on domestic financing and how the Global partnership could leverage such financing Some Board members also recommended that the replenishment target call for more IDA funds for education.

6.4 Board Members felt that the targets and outcomes of the replenishment, as presented, did not go far enough and a greater focus on the impact on children was essential. Learning outcomes were seen to be weak and there needed to be greater specificity on what the process indicators on equity would actually lead to in terms of e.g. girls and disabilityBoard members were generally comfortable with an ambitious target over the replenishment period 2015-2018, though stressed that a significant amount of work was required to ensure an adequate case had been made as to why to invest in GPE as opposed to other options.

6.5 After some discussion on this particular issue, the Board determined to focus on making a decision on the replenishment target and not to approve specific targets on the outcomes and key messages for the Case for Investment. Based on Board guidance, the Secretariat presented a revised decision.

6.6 The Interim Chair thanked the Secretariat and Board members for the quality of the discussion.

Decision:

6.9 The following amended decision was approved:

BOD/2014/02-07—Replenishment: The Board of Directors approves a funding target of US$3.5 billion for the Global Partnership for Education Fund for the four-year replenishment period of 2015-2018.

7. MODIFICATION TO PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ALLOCATION FOR YEMEN (BOD/2014/02 DOC 08)

7.1 The following Board member declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision on a modification to the program implementation allocation for Yemen: UNICEF (Supervising Entity for Yemen).

7.2 Padraig Power, Secretariat Senior Financial Officer, explained that as a result of non-approval of the proposed Financial Procedures Agreement (FPA) using UNICEF's "Special Account" modality during the February 10, 2014 GPE Board audio-conference, UNICEF identified three options for the Board so that the approved grant to Yemen could proceed: (i) the GPE Board reconsiders and approves the FPE SE special account agreement for specific use in Yemen, (ii) an alternative entity is identified that can take on the Supervising Entity role on short notice and (iii) UNICEF, with agreement form the government of Yemen, would assume the SE role as part of its program of cooperation with the government of Yemen.

7.3 The Senior Financial Officer noted that the Secretariat believes that the only viable option that would address the concerns of the interested Board members in terms of UNICEF's accountabilities and responsibilities, while also avoiding a further lengthy delay and disruption to the program in Yemen, was the third option. It was further noted that under the proposed implementation arrangements, UNICEF would be performing a role that had elements of both a Managing and Supervising Entity arrangement

Discussion:

7.4 Board Members were generally supportive of the third option but requested that the decision be revised to ensure that this change in modality was supported by the government of Yemen and that it should not be considered as a precedent for future program implementation grants. One Board member expressed regret that an alternative SE/ME had not been identified, while there was a consensus that clarification on the existing roles, responsibilities, accountability and terminology of Supervising and Managing Entities was a priority. Due to the exceptional circumstances, and the length of time elapsed since the grant was approved, Board members considered that it was important to avoid further lengthy delays and disruption to the program in Yemen.

7.5 The CEO stressed that she had had a positive discussion with the Minister of Education of Yemen, and had explained the delays in starting the grant due to the extensive negotiations of the Financial Procedures Agreement. She further outlined her commitment to working out the issues surrounding roles, responsibilities, and terminology of SEs and MEs.

Decision:

7.6. The following amended decision was approved:

BOD/2014/02-08— <u>Program Implementation Grant Allocation – Yemen</u>
In reference to its decision (BOD/2013/05-05 –Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants), the Board of Directors amends paragraph J (ii) of the decision as follows:

i. with a recognition that this would not set a precedent for future Board decisions, the Board of Directors approves a program implementation grant allocation of US$72,600,000 to Yemen, subject to confirmation from the government of Yemen, for a four-year implementation period with UNICEF serving as both a Supervising and Managing Entity using the Country Program of Cooperation Modality, and in accordance with the implementation arrangements outlined in Annex 1 of BOD/2014/02/DOC 08;

ii. the Board further approves US$1,000,000 for a Supervision Allocation and US$5,808,000 for an agency fee; and
iii. the Board recognizes the necessity to review the existing roles, responsibilities, accountability, and terminology of Supervising and Managing Entities as a priority.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Notice of Next Board Meetings

8.1 The Interim Chair informed the Board that the Secretariat had received a letter from the Ministry of Education of Uganda, in which the Ministry commits to increase the national education budget in the future. The Board had required such a letter during the November 2013 Board Meeting.

8.2 The Interim Chair reminded Board Members that the Replenishment Conference will be held in Brussels on June 26, 2014 and the next face-to-face Board meeting is scheduled for June 27–28, 2014 A High Level meeting on the post-2015 Agenda co-convened by UNESCO and UNICEF is scheduled to take place on June 25, 2014 at the same venue.

Developing Country Partner Constituencies Coordination Meetings

8.3 The Africa 3 Constituency informed the Board that developing country partners will prepare a proposal before the June face-to-face Board meeting regarding the possibility of receiving support for the developing country partner constituencies to have coordination meetings to prepare for future GPE Board meetings. He recalled that African constituencies have benefited from the support of such meetings since 2012. The next coordination meeting will be held in Burundi. He stressed that the objective of such a support is to improve collaboration and communication among Developing Country Partners to strengthen their level of engagement in the Global Partnership and its governance.

Uganda Anti-Homosexuality Act of 2014

8.4 Donor 1 voiced the concern of many donors over the anti-gay law adopted this week in Uganda. It was also noted that some donors have suspended their support to the Ugandan Government, but will continue to work with Ugandan NGO's and in the field of human rights. Donor 1 requested that the Global Partnership strive to ensure that the curricula of education in Uganda continue to be based on the global Human Rights Conventions and principles of equity.

Nigeria Attacks

8.5 Alternate Board member, Joseph O'Reilly, representing CSO 1, proposed a Board decision to condemn the fatal attack on a school in North Eastern Nigeria (which had occurred during the Washington Board meetings) and invited the Board to explore further how the Global Partnership can play a role in supporting global efforts to prevent violent attacks on education and improve protection.

Discussion:

8.6 This proposal was unanimously supported by Board Members. The Secretariat noted that it was the first time that the Board had been asked to consider this type of decision. Board members requested a few amendments to the proposed decision language, including a reference to the role of the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attacks. Some Board members broadened the discussion on the role of the Global Partnership in similar cases and opined Board decisions should not be driven by the news. It was recommended that the Board develop clear principles on how to address attacks against education rather than addressing tragedies on a case by case basis.

Decision:

8.7 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/02-09—<u>Nigeria Attacks</u>—The Board of Directors**:**

i. condemns the fatal attack on the Federal Government College of Buni Yadi, Yobe State, Eastern Nigeria;
ii. notes with concern that attacks on education occur globally and that the latest comprehensive survey of attacks on education documents a growth in their number and impact;
iii. asks the Strategy and Policy Committee to explore how the Global Partnership for Education as a partner of the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack can play a role in supporting global efforts to prevent violent attacks on education and improve protection, including by:
    a. highlighting the incidence and impact of attacks on education in conflict and insecurity among key actors and cultivate public support for safe education;
    b. promoting better systems for monitoring and reporting attacks on education;
    c. promoting effective programs and policy to protect education from attack, including prevention and response;
    d. advocating adherence to existing international law protecting education and the strengthening of international norms and standards as needed; and
    e. supporting efforts to end impunity for attacks on education by promoting a range of accountability measures.

8.6 There being no other business, the Interim Chair adjourned the meeting.

Annex 1

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Aheto-Tsegah, Charles	Ag. Director-General	Ghana Education Service	Ghana	Board Member Constituent of Africa 3
Albright, Alice	CEO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Andersen, Jesper	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Constituent of Donor 4
Archer, David	Head of Programmes	ActionAid	United Kingdom	Board Member Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Atchoarena, David	Director Teacher Development and Higher Education	UNESCO	France	Alternate Board Member Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Barton, Livia	Communications Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Beardmore, Sarah	Advocacy Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Bernard, Jean-Marc	M&E Team Lead	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Besier, Averil	Policy Manager	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Biney, Francis	Coordinator	Ministry of Education	Cote d'Ivoire	Constituent of Africa 2
Bogale, Solomon	Director	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Constituent of Africa 3
Bouapao, HE Lytou	Deputy Minister	Vice Minister of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Bourne, Jo	Associate Director, Education	UNICEF	United States	Acting Alternate Board Member Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Bridges, David	Donor Relations Officer for	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
	Europe			
Brinkhaus, Michaela	Officer for Primary Education	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5
Brown, Donal	Head, Global Funds Department	DFID	United Kingdom	Board Member Constituent of Donor 3
Buchan, Christina	Director	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada	Canada	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 3
Canelhas, Jose Luis	Advisor	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Cauldwell, Jonathan	Senior Adviser	UNICEF	United States	Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Cherevatova, Natalia	Operations Officer	The World Bank	United States	Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Christensen, Olav Rex	Sr. Public Finance Specialist	The World Bank	United States	Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Colenso, Peter	Executive Director, Education	The Children's Investment Fund Foundation	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member Constit Private Sector/Private Foundations
Coustère, Paul	Lead Education Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Cristofoli, Vigdis	Acting Section Head	Norad	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Dansie, Grant	Education Advisor	NORAD	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
De Jesus Soares, Dulce	Vice Minister for Preschool and Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
De Marcken, Natasha	Director, Office of Education	USAID	United States	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 6
Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Planification and Reform of Education	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Constituent of Africa 2

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Alternate Board Member Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Feinberg, Nathalia	Head of Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 4
Fife, Paul	Asst. Director General	NORAD	Norway	Board Member Constituent of Donor 4
Focas Licht, Margarita	Regional Team Lead, Eastern and Southern Africa	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
French, Anne	Head of Education Policy Team	DFID	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Gantenbein, Nicole	Program officer education	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Gardiner, Amanda	Head of International Affairs	Pearson	United States	Board Member Constit Private Sector/Private Foundations
Gazagne, Fanny	Education Policy Officer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	France	Constituent of Donor 5
Gillard, Hon. Julia	Chair	Global Partnership for Education	Australia	Chair BOD GPE Secretariat
Gomer, Lisa	COO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Goudiaby, Gisèle	Events Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Guétin, Christine	Board Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Gutiérrez, Francisco	Head of Education Division	Spanish Agency for International Cooperation Development	Spain	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 2
Henfry, Sally-Anne	Consultant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Hyving, Stellan	Senior Policy Specialist	Sida	Sweden	Constituent of Donor 4
Ingvoldstad, Chie	Financial Analyst	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
Iwase, Keita	Diplomat	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Kaffouba, Toure	Director	Ministry of Education	Cote d'Ivoire	Constituent of Africa 2
Karimata, Atsushi	Senior Coordinator, Global	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Board Member

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
	Issues Cooperation Division			Constituent of Donor 6
Karjalainen, Marja	Deputy Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 5
Kennedy, Raymond	Policy and Programme Manager	DFID	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
King, Elizabeth	Education Director	World Bank	United States	Board Member Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Koziol, Margaret	Senior Policy Advisor	USAID	United States	Constituent of Donor 6
Lamot, Ed.	Senior Country Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Ledoux, Blandine	Country lead	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Lefebvre, Francois	Senior Financial Officer	World Bank	United States	Trustee
Leitner, Marian	Special Assistant to the CEO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Lindenthal, Roland	Head of Division	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Germany	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 5
Lorenzo, Veronique	Head of Unit DEVCO.B.4	European Commission	Belgium	Board Member Constituent of Donor 5
Manickchand, HE Priya	Minister	Minister of Education	Guyana	Board Member Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Mbow, Cheikh	Coordonnateur National	COSYDEP	Senegal	Board Member Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Mesen, Michelle	Developing Country Partnerships Officer	Global Partnership for Education	France	GPE Secretariat
Mirzoev, Khabib	Director	International Prezidental School	Tajikistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Moe, Siv	Deputy Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Naidoo, Jordan	Senior Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Acting Alternate Board

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
				Member Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Nasim, Mohammad	Planning and Evaluation Coordinator	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Nhan-O'Reilly, Joseph	Senior Adviser	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Nkaada, Daniel	Commissioner Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Uganda	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Africa 1
Palacios, Alejandro	Director, Special Projects	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Petrova, Daniela	Consultant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Power, Padraig	Senior Financial Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Saidov, HE Nuriddin	Minister	Minister of Education	Tajikistan	Alternate Board Member Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Samba, Madiana	Advisor	Education for all Sierra Leone Coalition	Sierra Leone	Alternate Board Member Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Sanchez, Sandra	Vice Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Honduras	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Siebes, Ronald	Head Education and Research Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Constituent of Donor 1
Sow, François	Head of Human Development Unit	French Foreign Ministry	France	Constituent of Donor 5
Stassen, Yvonne	Deputy Director for Social Development	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Board Member Constituent of Donor 1
Takahashi, Akito	Deputy Director	Ministry of Finance	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Tanaka, Shinichiro	Senior Advisor	Japan International Cooperation Agency	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Tapp, Charles	Senior Replenishment Advisor	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Thiam, HE Serigne Mbaye	Minister	Minister of Education	Senegal	Board Member Constituent of Africa 2
Tinning, Chris	Minister Cousellor (Development)	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Board Member Constituent of Donor 2
Van Dyke, Johanna	Board Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Van Fleet, Justin	Chief of Staff	Office of the UN Special Envoy for Global Education	United States	Observers
Vilsack, Christie	Senior Advisor for International Education	USAID	United States	Constituent of Donor 6
Wane, Michaelle	Sr. Board Assistant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Waples, Sally	Deputy Head, Global Funds Department	DFID	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Wolassa, HE Shiferaw	Minister	Minister of Education	Ethiopia	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Africa 3
Wolpe, Bruce	Chief of Staff	Hon Julia Gillard	Australia	GPE Secretariat
Xaymountry, Bounpanh	Acting Director General	Ministry of Education and Sports	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific