REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS DECEMBER 15-16, 2014 WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

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.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2014

The Board Chair, Julia Gillard, called the meeting to order at 8:40am.

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT

1.1 The Board Chair welcomed participants and thanked everyone, particularly the Board and Alternate members for their efforts during the Board Retreat. She extended a special welcome to the incoming Board members as well as technical advisors attending on behalf of their respective Board members. The Chair also thanked Board members who sent her their condolences over the hostage crisis in Australia.

1.2 Changes in Board membership since the last Board meeting were announced, and included: i) a new Alternate Board member for the Donor 1 constituency (Chantal Nicod, Head of West Africa and Education at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation); ii) a new Board member for the Donor 6 constituency (Hiroyuki Nagasawa, Senior Coordinator in Global Issues Cooperation Division at the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs); and iii) a new Board member for the Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia ("EEMECA") constituency (Mohammad Asif Nang, Acting Minister of Education, Afghanistan).

1.3 The Chair acknowledged Keita Iwase attending the Board meeting on behalf of Mr. Nagasawa as well as Hikmattulah Amin, developing country partner focal point for Afghanistan, representing Mr. Nang. The Chair also welcomed Claudia Costin, Board member for the Multilateral Agency 3, for attending the Board meeting for the first time, while also acknowledging incoming Board member for the Donor 6 constituency, Charles North (Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator at USAID) and Alternate Board member for the Donor 1 constituency, Ann-Françoise Paradis (Education Policy Advisor at the Belgian Directorate General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid).

1.4 The Chair thanked Minister Farooq Wardak, the outgoing Board member for the Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia ("EMECA") constituency, for his contributions to the Global Partnership. In her closing remarks, the Chair thanked the Republic of Korea for their generous offer to host the next GPE Board of Directors meeting and welcomed Mr. Kim and Mr. Yang from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs as observers. Observers were also welcomed, in particular Youth observers who were attending a GPE Board meeting for the first time.

Meeting Objectives and Outcomes

1.5 The Chair noted the need for a discussion on the decision arising from the Board Retreat on the strategic planning process. She also summarized the recommendations put forward by the three technical committees for Board decision such as the Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix for the Global Partnership, allocations for six Program Implementation Grants, the 2014 Secretariat Portfolio Review, and a proposal for continued support to civil society. She also explained that the meeting would address maximum country allocations for 2015 and 2016, expansion of organizations eligible to serve as supervising entities and managing entities and the Trustee Budget. The Chair advised that there would be an Executive Session exclusively for Board and Alternate members to discuss Alison Evans' Organizational Review and the response from the CEO, which included the Secretariat Work Plan and Budget.

Overview of Agenda and Approval of Meeting Report

1.6 The Chair reviewed the agenda for the meeting and requested comments. None were received.

1.7 The Chair requested approval of the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held in Brussels, Belgium on June 27-28, 2014 (BOD/2014/12 DOC 02). The Report had been circulated to the Board in July and received no comments. No comments were raised during the meeting.

Decision:

1.8 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/12-01 - <u>June 27-28, 2014 Board Meeting Report</u>: The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Brussels, Belgium on June 27-28, 2014 (BOD/2014/12 DOC 02).

2. STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2020

2.1 The Chair noted that the draft decision on the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 discussed during the retreat had been revised and included changes requested by the Board. The Chair reviewed the revised decision and requested comments. None were received.

Decision:

2.2 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/12-02 - <u>Strategic Plan 2016-2020</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. mandates the Secretariat to commence work on a five-year Strategic Plan (2016 – 2020) with the goal of preparing a Concept Note for Board approval in May 2015 together with a plan for consulting beyond the Board about the Strategic Plan;
2. a full draft of the Strategic Plan will be the subject of wide and inclusive Board consultation by October;
3. following a year-long process, the Board will be asked to approve the final Strategic Plan in December, which would be accompanied by an implementation plan and a results framework;
4. the Secretariat will anchor two main work streams for the Strategic Plan: (1) strengthening the GPE operational model; and (2) defining the mission, vision, principles, and prioritizing key objectives and areas of focus. The Secretariat will work with the GERF and the CGPC on work stream (1) and with the SPC on work stream (2); and

5. the Secretariat will draft work plans for both work streams by the end of January. The Coordinating Committee will provide the overarching reference for the strategic planning process, including approving the work plans for both work streams.

3. REPORT FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (BOD/2014/12 DOC 03)

3.1 Alice Albright, the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"), thanked Secretariat staff for their hard work putting together a successful Board Retreat. She welcomed and thanked, in particular, Karen Mundy, who had joined the Secretariat a few months ago for her ability to raise key issues for discussion over the next year in how to position the Global Partnership to drive progress toward achievement of the new sustainable development goals ("SDGs").

3.2 The CEO informed the Board that the Secretariat's focus following the June 2014 replenishment had been on the upcoming strategic planning process. She provided the following reflections on the state of the Global Partnership and which will have a significant impact on its strategic and organizational priorities: i) the Global Partnership's external operating context has evolved dramatically since the first strategic plan; ii) education has been impacted by violence and national instability; iii) significant portfolio growth and complexity has expanded the Secretariat's reporting and oversight requirements; iv) demands on the GPE business model are changing; v) the new Post-2015 agenda will require a significant ramp-up of financial resources; and vi) the Global Partnership continues to face a funding gap.

3.3 The CEO added that the Secretariat had taken stock by completing valuable reviews over the past months. The Results for Learning Report focused on overall progress in the education sector in member countries. The Portfolio Review had focused on the reporting of GPE grants and highlighted key challenges. The choice of grant modality made at country level needs to facilitate the strengthening of national systems and to apply the lessons learned from the Global and Regional Activities ("GRA") grants to the country work. Additional important reviews include the Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix, the review of the Secretariat by the U.K. Department for International Development, the Organizational Review of the GPE Secretariat, the preparation and taking stock for the strategic planning retreat, the CTO note and the DCP consultations. All these reviews and reflections provided valuable insights into how the Global Partnership can better deliver, and enhance value-added for GPE DCPs.

3.4 Taking into account the current state of the Global Partnership, the CEO highlighted the Secretariat's strategic and organizational priorities for 2015. With regard to strategic priorities: i) launch the new funding model, ii) focus on data and learning challenges, iii) secure sufficient resources to meet country demands, iv) initiate the strategic planning process, and v) include a common results framework for 2016 and beyond. With regard to organizational priorities: i) implement the findings of the Organizational Review; and ii) continue to refine Secretariat management and governance and the risk management process.

3.5 The CEO updated the Board on Secretariat and Partnership activities. She noted that the Secretariat had completed the first phase of the launch of the new funding model, including finalizing the grant application guidelines for the Education Sector Plan Development Grant ("ESPDG") and submitting the final Education Sector Plan Implementation Grant ("ESPIG") guidelines for approval by the CGPC. Three countries – Mozambique, Nepal, and Rwanda – are currently preparing to be the first to apply for resources under the new funding model. Concerning the Secretariat's focus on data and learning challenges, the Secretariat had launched the Data Hub which will increase the availability and relevance of data at the global and country level. The Global Partnership is also promoting the development of better approaches and practices for national education policies through the GRA program, has been heavily involved in the Learning Metrics

Task Force, and is leading the development of a proposal for an international platform for assessing learning ("IPAL").

3.6 In terms of resources, the CEO acknowledged new contributions by Canada and the Republic of Korea and welcomed the Republic of Korea as a new GPE partner. She pointed out the remaining funding gap of US$900 million and noted that the Secretariat will be redoubling its outreach efforts to close the gap in order to meet the original indicative country allocations target. The CEO also explained that without additional resources, allocations to lower middle income countries ("LMICS") will remain reduced, and that implementation of actual proposals on the humanitarian fund and leveraged financing would be on hold.

Misuse of funds

3.7 The CEO noted that no new cases of misuse of funds have been reported since the last face-to-face Board meeting.

3.8 She made reference to the Secretariat's administrative expenditures for the budget year of 2014 and noted that there had been no budget overage and that the Secretariat will be returning to the Trustee approximately US$210,000 of under spent funds from the 2014 budget.

Discussion

3.9 Board members thanked the CEO for a helpful and strategic analysis of the challenges facing the Global Partnership. Some Board members expressed concerns with the alignment of data at country level with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics ("UIS") data used by the Global Partnership. They stressed the importance of data collection being focused on country efforts. Others suggested the Secretariat develop a country reporting framework with key data requirements as a solution to the country data irregularities and data inaccuracies. Jean-Marc Bernard, Deputy Chief Technical Officer, explained that when the Secretariat is conducting comparisons across different GPE country partners, it is appropriate to use the international comparable data provided by UIS. Because of the discrepancies between the two data sources, the Secretariat uses the data provided by the country information systems when engaging at country level. The CEO expressed her intention of working strategically with UIS and not wanting to duplicate their work.

3.10 One Board member expressed concern about putting on hold the leveraged financing work as it presented an opportunity to increase the Global Partnership's funding base. The Board member asked the Board to reconsider the decision on cutting the contingency fund for leveraged financing. A member of the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance committee ("GERF") explained that the Committee's role was to implement the decision taken by the Board at its June 2, 2014 audio call outlining the different options that should be considered in the event there was insufficient funding for Program Implementation Grants. One of those options was the reduction or elimination of the contingency fund for leveraged financing and humanitarian/emergency situations. He did add that the decision could be revisited in the future depending on the financial forecast.

3.11 Board members recognized the need to raise additional funds due to the reduced level of available resources, but felt that pledges should not be conditional. Board members emphasized greater mutual accountability within the donor community in terms of the aid effectiveness agenda. The Secretariat should be more strategic in empowering developing countries to be in the driver seat. It was also noted that the Secretariat should focus on tracking domestic funding commitments and the requirements of the funding model, while not over-focusing on the variable part of the funding model, which only constitutes 30% of the funding.

3.12 A Board member noted that the risk management work was at the heart of the donor community's concerns. She stressed the importance of strengthening the Secretariat's operational capacities and systems in order to minimize fiduciary risks. She further noted the need to review the new funding model due to its complexity, impact on predictable funding and the weakness of institutions in many developing country partners. In her response, the CEO noted that the Secretariat's roadmap will be determined over the course of next year when the next Strategic Plan will be developed. The main drivers of the Secretariat's work will be the Global Partnership's strategic priorities and launching of the new funding model, but it will be contingent on resources and the Secretariat's headcount. With regard to reviewing the new funding model, the CEO explained that it would be premature to do so now before it was launched and experience gained as to its impact, but suggested that the issue be reviewed by the Country Grants and Performance Committee in the future.

4. REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, RISK AND FINANCE COMMITTEE ("GERF") – PART ONE (BOD/2014/12 DOC 04)

4.1 The Chair invited Minister Thiam as Chair of the GERF, to give a summary of the committee's report to the Board. The GERF Chair briefly reviewed the information items that were discussed during the Committee's meeting October 27-29, 2014 which included: the conflict of interest policy, the timing of a comprehensive governance review, the composition of the GERF, leveraged financing, and recommendations from Youth at the 2014 Replenishment Conference.

4.2 The GERF Chair also provided an introduction to the process and background for developing the risk policy and risk management matrix ("RMM"). He thanked the Secretariat for the intensive work performed and invited Lisa Gomer, the Chief Operating Officer ("COO"), to provide an overview of the risk policy and RMM as set out in BOD/2014/12 DOC 04, including Attachment 1. The COO highlighted the links of the risk policy and RMM with the strategic planning process and organizational review in particular. The consultation process had included an internal Secretariat staff survey, interviews with members of the Board and Board Committees, a cross Secretariat risk management task force and the advice of an international consultant with an expertise in risk management.

4.3 Through all of these consultations and discussions the most significant risks to the Global Partnership were identified and rated with regard to their probability and impact. The risks were categorized into four areas: strategic, programmatic, management/governance and financial/fiduciary. The GERF reviewed all of the risks, their respective risk ratings, risk owners and proposed mitigation measures and validated 29 risks. The one main change the GERF made to the RMM was to designate "risk owners". The draft RMM submitted to the GERF gave the Secretariat too much responsibility for owning and mitigating the risks. The GERF members agreed that the risk policy and RMM were the responsibility of all members of the Global Partnership and that risk owners should first and foremost be the Board, Board Committees and members of the Global Partnership. During the committee's discussions, they also identified four over-arching risks for the Board's consideration.

4.4 The GERF Chair emphasized the detailed work performed by the GERF in reviewing the RMM and the dynamic nature of the risks identified. These risks and their ratings will evolve over time and will be monitored and adjusted as necessary. The risk policy and RMM will also facilitate Board discussion on strategic issues.

Discussion:

4.5 The Chair invited comments on the information items reviewed by the GERF Chair.

4.6 Comments from Board members included much appreciation for the work of the Committee. Several Board members commented that the voice of Youth should be championed within the Global Partnership and the Board. A Board member representing civil society assured that their constituency will engage Youth at all levels, including in the Civil Society Education Fund.

4.7 Responding to a question regarding progress being made on leveraged financing, the Secretariat reported that work is ongoing in developing an overall policy and are continuing to work on developing a loan buy-down pilot with the Islamic Development Bank (IDB). The GERF Chair added that developing country partners with Program Implementation Grants could request as part of their grant proposal the use of some of their grant funds for innovative financing. It was also noted that leveraged financing should be discussed in the context of the strategic planning process and that it might be linked to DCP domestic financing pledges in a strategic way.

Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix

4.8 The Chair opened the discussion on the risk policy and highlighted the four overarching risks identified by the GERF which were: insufficient prioritization by the Board, an insufficient ability to demonstrate results and value added, insufficient clarity on roles and responsibilities among GPE actors, and a business model that is overly reliant on SEs and MEs resulting in a one-size-fits-all approach.

4.9 Board members strongly supported the risk policy and the RMM, thanking the GERF and the Secretariat for their excellent work. It was noted that both documents showed a balance between risk identification and management, which would strengthen operations and would help prioritize efforts and resource allocations.

4.10 Suggestions for improvement included greater clarification of roles and responsibilities of the constituencies and partners in the risk policy and who would report on risks when the Board was assigned as a risk owner. It was noted that roles and responsibilities in the framework may need to be revisited once work on the GPE operational model is completed and roles and responsibilities have been redefined. Greater clarity was also requested on how semi-annual reporting on risks would work. Several Board members suggested that the risk policy and RMM be an explicit part of the strategic planning process as they go hand-in hand.

4.11 Several Board members emphasized the importance of reviewing the RMM periodically and consulting with partners when developing implementation procedures in order to build on already existing procedures and not duplicate them. It was suggested that the decision language clarify who is responsible for reviewing the RMM. The GERF Chair clarified that the Secretariat will prepare a semi-annual monitoring report, and the GERF will look at the details and report to the Board.

4.12 The Chair summarized that the work on the risk policy and RMM is dynamic, and there is a clear relationship with the strategic planning process in terms of what comes out of that process on roles and responsibilities, which will need to be incorporated into the risk policy and RMM. She underscored the need to align with partner processes so duplication of efforts is avoided. She also acknowledged the need for a balance of fiduciary risk versus risk in other areas.

Decision:

4.13 The Board approved the following amended decision:

BOD/2014/12-03 – <u>Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. adopts the Global Partnership's Risk Policy as set out in Annex 2 to BOD/2014/12 DOC 04;

2. endorses the Risk Management Matrix as set out in Attachment 1 to BOD/2014/12 DOC 04 with the understanding that it will be reviewed and revised semi-annually by the Secretariat and submitted for evaluation to the GERF and any material changes will be reported to the Board.

5. REPORT FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE – PART ONE (BOD/2014/12 DOC 07)

5.1 The Chair invited Joseph O'Reilly, Chair of the Strategy and Policy Committee ("SPC") to present the Report from the SPC. He acknowledged the members of the SPC and reminded the developing country partner Board members of the vacancy on the Strategy and Policy Committee for a developing country partner representative.

5.2 The SPC Chair provided a brief overview of the work of the Committee since the last Board meeting, notably reviewing the revisions to the Strategic Plan Implementation Plan and the planning process for the next strategic plan, and recommending to the Board the approach for the second CSEF program. A summary of the SPC discussions during its October 9-10 face-to-face meeting was included in BOD/2014/12 DOC 07.

5.3 The SPC Chair invited Karen Mundy, Chief Technical Officer ("CTO"), to provide an overview of the revised Strategic Plan Implementation Plan. The CTO summarized the lessons learned from the original Implementation Plan and the steps involved to determine revisions to the Plan which had included broad consultation with GPE Partners and other stakeholders. Key revisions included streamlining the Implementation Plan to actions that could be completed by the end of the Strategic Plan period, including stocktaking and assessment of a new plan, and replacing the communities of practice ("CoPs") with technical reference groups ("TRGs"). The TRGs would primarily serve in an advisory capacity to the Global Partnership on its strategic objectives for the duration of the current strategic plan, with longer-term roles to be determined. Terms of reference, chairs, and focal points for the TRGs had been posted online.

5.4 The CTO provided an overview of the current status of GPE activities on each of the five strategic objectives, along with key actions and any deliverables for 2015, as outlined in BOD/2014/12 DOC 07. Regarding strategic objective 3 on learning, the SPC Chair added that the strategic objective is so broad that it is at risk of fragmentation. The problem is exacerbated by the absence of a Chair. He welcomed any nominations for the position and noted that the TRG for strategic objective 5 on finance is in need of a convener and lead as well. He invited GPE partners to join the TRGs.

5.5 The Chair thanked the SPC Chair and the CTO for their presentation and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion:

5.6 Board members were generally supportive of the revised Implementation Plan.

5.7 Regarding strategic objective 5 on finance, a Board member suggested that the related TRG in addition to delivering on the current strategic plan might also work on forward-looking issues such as how to better match the GPE Fund with developing country partner financing pledges, with partners possibly including the World Bank and developing country partner finance ministries.

5.8 Another Board member concurred with the importance of strategic objective 5 on finance and advocated for more active recruitment of a Chair for the TRG and a designated focal point in the Secretariat. He recommended proactive outreach and recruitment for all the TRGs to engage a wider community beyond the Board.

5.10 Board members observed that the reporting on the Implementation Plan included activities and updates on global activities and task forces, but lacked information on what the Global Partnership had individually achieved on its strategic objectives, for example on learning outcomes. One Board member noted the lack of reference to the various side events on thematic issues during the replenishment conference, which had brought together many partners on thematic issues.

5.11 The SPC Chair responded that the current strategic plan is not clear on how the Global Partnership is to achieve its objectives. Some objectives such as the one on fragile states are more in the control of the Global Partnership as they are about changing the way the Global Partnership works and funds in a particular context, in contrast to the strategic objective on girls, for example, which has a less clear path forward for the Global Partnership itself. The new strategic plan will need to improve what the Global Partnership itself can do to advance its strategic objectives with tools such as the new funding model's focus on equity, efficiency and learning, and new pieces of knowledge and learning generated from GRA-like activities. The CTO added that in the new strategic plan, TRGs should have a first player and self-organize so there is less pressure on the Secretariat.

5.12 A Board member advocated that the next strategic plan should include flexibility in funding in emergencies, strengthening national education sector plans so they will be sustainable, and widening national funding targets beyond traditional stakeholders. The latter would also help to encourage developing country governments to deliver on their pledges to increase education budgets.

5.13 The Board Chair called for a lunch recess. During lunch, Board members heard from Tina Tchen, Assistant to President Barack Obama and Chief of Staff to First lady Michelle Obama, on the Administration's commitment to global education, and in particular the First Lady's work on girls' education.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION

6.1 The Board meeting was resumed in executive session attended by Board members and Alternate Board members, including one incoming Board member who was present, the CEO, the COO, the Senior Operations Officer, the Resource Management Officer, and consultant Alison Evans. The executive session included a discussion of the Secretariat Organizational Review by Ms. Evans and the Secretariat Work Plan and Budget paper prepared by the CEO which included a response to the Review. The documents had been shared with Board and Alternate Board members on a restricted basis in advance of the meeting.

Decision:

6.2 During the executive session, the following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/12-04 – Secretariat Budget January–June 2015: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the amount of US$ 9,672,255 for the Secretariat's administrative budget for the period January through June 2015;
2. approves an additional headcount of twelve technical staff and two administrative staff;
3. approves a supplemental amount of US$323,750 for strategic plan preparation;
4. approves a maximum amount of US$350,000 for DCP constituency meetings as per BOD/2014/06-03;
5. requests the CEO to present to the Board at its last meeting in 2016 a review of the impact of the changes to the Secretariat against clear indicators; and

6. requests the Chair to compose a statement of explanation about the need for these changes to the Secretariat in light of the Global Partnership's evolution and the changing global environment.

6.3 At the end of the executive session, the Board Chair adjourned the meeting for that day.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2014

The Board Chair called the meeting to order at 8:35am.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 The Secretariat requested the Board's authorization of a statement in which the Global Partnership's Board deplores the terrorist attack on the Army Public School in Peshawar, Pakistan earlier that day which had killed 145 people -- 132 of them children. The Chair called for Board members' views, and it was apparent that the Board unanimously condemned the violence at a school and the tragic loss of life. The statement was endorsed unanimously and the Chair advised it would be posted on the GPE website shortly.

7.2 The Board Chair next alerted the Board to an endorsement she would request of the Board under Any Other Business for Project Everyone by Richard Curtis, a communications campaign aimed at having 7 billion people know about the Sustainable Development Goals within seven days of them being agreed in September 2015.

7.3 She also encouraged the Board to attend an event on Early Childhood Development co-sponsored by the Global Partnership in collaboration with the World Bank during lunch.

8. REPORT FROM THE COUNTRY GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE (BOD/2014/12 DOC 08 and 09)

8.1 The Board Chair summarized the recommendations from the Country Grants and Performance Committee ("CGPC") on the agenda and invited Ronald Siebes, Chair of the CGPC, to introduce the report of the Committee. The CGPC Chair provided a brief overview of some of the highlights of the Committee since the last Board meeting, including the approval of the Afghanistan response to the Board conditions for approval of a proposed material revision to its Program Implementation Grant, the approval of revised Education Sector Program Development Grant Guidelines, and review of the revised Guidelines for Program Implementation Grants.

Allocations for Program Implementation Grants (BOD/2014/12 DOC 08)

8.2 The following Board members declared a conflict of interest: World Bank representatives as the supervising entity for the proposed grant to Guinea, UNICEF representatives as the managing entity for the proposed grant to the Central African Republic; the Lao PDR representative for the proposed grant to Lao PDR; and the Guyana representative for the proposed grant to Guyana.

8.3 The CGPC Chair introduced the six grant proposals discussed by the CGPC and recommended for funding to the Board for approval.

8.4 Regarding the proposal from the Central African Republic, the CGPC Chair noted that the country had received an allocation under the accelerated funding guidelines in 2013 following a coup. The requested grant amount today represented the remainder of the maximum country allocation. He noted that the grant is responsive to the challenging environment in the country and includes various scenarios that can be implemented depending on how the situation evolves in the future. The grant focuses on communities, community teachers, textbooks, governance,

administration and civil works. The recommendation includes that the country report back on steps taken to address gender-based violence, as well as steps taken to increase domestic funding for education.

8.5 With respect to the Guinea proposal, the CGPC Chair noted that it builds upon earlier grants and is marked by collaboration with other funders. The grant's wide focus includes infrastructure, non-formal education, teacher training, learning material, literacy, and school grants, the latter which includes participatory oversight by the community. He noted that the grant does not address the Ebola outbreak, but that under the GPE Operational Framework for Effective Support in Conflict-Affected and Fragile States, Guinea may request revisions to the grant in the future if needed.

8.6 The CGPC Chair noted that the grant proposal from Guyana is well aligned to its education sector strategy and focuses on early childhood development and data. The proposal also includes a clear role for parental involvement of local communities.

8.7 On the Kenya proposal, the CGPC Chair noted that it includes a scale-up of activities and pilots by USAID and DFID and is focused on mathematics learning outcomes, but also aims at improving school management and accountability, financial management, governance, and data. The CGPC had noted the need for future dialogue with the Kenyan teacher's union.

8.8 With respect to the grant proposal from Lao PDR, the CGPC Chair highlighted its focus on school-based management and early-grade reading linked to mother tongue education, as well as improving financial management. The CGPC requested a report back from the government on the non-salary expenditures in the budget and how the budget will be increased in the coming years.

8.9 The CGPC Chair noted that the grant proposal from Nigeria was exceptionally strong, especially given the difficult circumstances and the complexities of the federal states' context and evidence that a good proposal requires time to develop. He recalled that the country's initial proposal in 2013 had not been recommended for funding by the then Financial Advisory Committee. The grant proposal's primary focus is on girls and female teachers and also addresses school-effectiveness, management information systems, and learning assessments.

8.10 The CGPC Chair concluded with a summary of the trends, issues, and added value of the Global Partnership identified by the CGPC in the grant proposals and outlined in BOD/2014/12 DOC 08.

Discussion:

8.11 Board members expressed support for all six proposals.

8.12 Regarding the Guinea proposal, Board members supported giving flexibility to Ebola-affected countries in terms of revising grants, including providing technical support, as needed. The CGPC Chair confirmed that the Guinea proposal will likely be implemented as is, but that the Guinea government may request changes to the program if needed. It was noted that schools are important in managing the Ebola campaign and that they should reopen when it is safe for children to attend.

8.13 Regarding the grant proposal for the Central African Republic, a Board member inquired about the managing entity arrangement and how it would be operationalized, and how the accelerated funding was linked to the preparation for this grant. The Secretariat responded that the situation is still volatile and there is a high level of insecurity. UNICEF as managing entity collaborates with NGOs to implement the program, and the Secretariat is in close dialogue with

UNICEF to see how implementation can progress. The program is implemented first in safer areas and progressively rolled out as other areas become more secure. The Interim Country Support Team Lead ("Interim CST Lead"), Margarita Focas-Licht, acknowledged there had been delays in implementing the accelerated funding program due to security reasons and the difficulty of getting personnel on the ground, but the pace of implementation has increased.

Decision:

8.14 There being no further comments, the Chair deemed the following decision approved:

BOD/2014/12-05 — <u>Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the allocation from GPE trust funds for the Program Implementation Grants as described in the applications submitted in the second round of 2014, summarized in BOD/2014/12-04 1 (c), subject to:
   a. availability of funds; and
   b. Board decision BOD/2012/11-04 on commitment of trust funds for Program Implementation Grants in annual installments.
   c. CGPC recommendations for funding include (all amounts in US$):

Table 1

Country	Supervising Entity/ Managing Entity	Allocation Requested	Allocation Recommended	Supervision Allocation[1]	Agency Fee % and Amount	Period	Funding Source
Central African Republic	UNICEF (ME)	15,510,000	15,510,000	n/a	8% - 1,240,800	3 years	GPE Fund
Guinea	World Bank (SE)	37,800,000	37,800,000	400,000	1.75% - 661,500	3 years	GPE Fund
Guyana	World Bank (SE)	1,700,000	1,700,000	200,000	1.75% - 29,750	3 years	GPE Fund
Kenya	World Bank (SE)	88,400,000	88,400,000	750,000	1.75% - 1,547,000	4 years	GPE Fund
Lao PDR	World Bank (SE)	16,800,000	16,800,000	500,000	1.75% - 294,000	4 years	GPE Fund
Nigeria	World Bank (SE)	100,000,000	100,000,000	600,000	1.75% - 1,750,000	3 years	GPE Fund
Totals		**260,210,000**	**260,210,000**	**2,450,000**	**5,523,050**		

2. requests the Secretariat to:
   a. include in its notification to each of the relevant Governments, LEGs through the Coordinating Agencies, and Supervising Entities/Managing Entities of the approval of the allocations and the expected timeframe for signing of the Grant Agreement, if applicable, the conditions, requests for report-back, and observations on the program as recommended by the CGPC and set out in BOD/2014/12 DOC 08, Table 2;
   b. provide to the CGPC an update at its next face-to-face meeting on the issues listed as "conditions" and "report back" in BOD/2014/12 DOC 08, Table 2.

[1] The Supervision Allocation amounts are all in line or less than the standard amounts as outlined in the guidance on Supervision Allocations approved by the Board in November 2013.

Roll-out of the new funding model

8.15 The CGPC Chair and the Interim CST Lead, elaborated on the roll out of the new funding model. Since the June 2014 Board meeting, the Secretariat had been in dialogue with the five countries that were originally expected to apply in Round 1 of 2015. Dialogue with these countries has fed into the development of the Guidelines for Program Implementation Grants. Since then, Liberia and Malawi had decided not to come forward in Round 1 of 2015. Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda remain on track to apply.

8.16 Because the three countries have not had sufficient time to prepare for the new funding model requirements, the Secretariat determined the need to assess whether any transitional adjustments to the new funding model requirements were warranted, and to discuss these with the CGPC. The Secretariat shared an assessment of the status of Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda with the CGPC, and the committee discussed the extent to which the countries would meet the new funding model requirements and any compensatory modifications at its November 4-6, 2014 meeting. The Committee agreed the countries were in a good position to prepare proposals based on the information received, as none of the identified shortcomings with regard to the requirements raised major concerns. The Committee would further consider the application progress in Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda in February 2015 when the Quality Assurance Review phase two would have been completed and indicators for the variable part of the grant would have been identified by the three countries. The Committee would also start looking at countries preparing to apply in Round 2 of 205, which might warrant similar flexibility in view of the short timeline between the Board's approval of the indicative allocations and the deadline for the submission of the proposals.

8.17 With respect to the variable part of the grant, the dialogue on sector plans includes the new funding model dimensions on equity, efficiency, and learning. There is a need to further elaborate how the indicators will be verified in order to access the variable part of the grant, as well as who decides if the variable tranche can be released, and how the variable part can be used. That conversation needs to be taken to the local education groups to adapt to different contexts.

Committee Oversight of Grant Portfolio (BOD/2014/12 Doc 08)

8.18 The CGPC Chair presented the recommendation which would ensure that all grant proposals in addition to program implementation grants would be reviewed and monitored by the CGPC, with the exception of grant proposals delegated to the Secretariat for review and approval. Under the current funding frameworks, that would include grants under the Civil Society Education Fund and the Global and Regional Activities ("GRA") program. He added that the recommendation would allow for holistic oversight of all grants, facilitating linkages between them, and maximizing impact.

Discussion:

8.19 Board members were generally supportive of the recommendations. One Board member noted that in the past, the Financial Advisory Committee had in fact reviewed GRA grants prior to Board consideration.

8.20 Responding to a question asking which grants are currently delegated to the Secretariat, the CEO noted they include smaller grants up to US$500,000, which include Education Sector Plan Preparation Grants and preparatory grants for Program Implementation Grants. The CGPC Chair added that the smaller grants are tracked by the CGPC.

8.21 The SPC Chair noted that the recommendation is a joint one with the SPC and that the SPC will continue to play a role in policy and strategy related grant windows and recommending funding priorities for the Global Partnership. In that regard, it will also oversee the process of preparing the new CSEF whereas the CGPC will consider and deal with the actual grant proposal.

8.22 A Board member requested the Secretariat to develop a note on how the Global Partnership can systematically ensure a value-add component in GPE grants.

Decision:

8.23 There being no further comments, the Chair deemed the following decision approved:

BOD/2014/12-06 – <u>Committee Oversight of Grant Portfolio</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. agrees that the Country Grants and Performance Committee's current responsibilities with regard to country-level grants be expanded to include all other types of grants, except for those delegated to the Secretariat;
2. notes that when the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee carries out its full governance review at the end of the committees' initial two-year term, the terms of reference of all committees will be reviewed and revised as needed.

2014 Portfolio Review (BOD/2014/12 Doc 09)

8.24 The CGPC Chair invited the Interim CST Lead to present the Portfolio Review.

8.25 The Interim CST Lead noted that the review is intended to provide the Board with an annual status report on the grant portfolio, with conclusions informing recommendations on funding priorities, strategies, and implementation arrangements. She provided an overview of the Portfolio Review process and what had been new in this year's Portfolio Review. Key points included that active grants totaled US$2.9 billion; there is significant support to fragile and conflict-affected states; 80% of program implementation grants are implemented using a project modality; implementation challenges are often marked by institutional capacity and design issues; and there has been a drop in administrative cost from 11% to 8.6%. In terms of total disbursements in 2014, she noted it was the first time that Program Implementation Grant disbursements had exceeded US$500 million. With respect to reporting, she noted that there are still challenges with regard to demonstrating the Global Partnership's impact in country. In addition, a standardized reporting format has not yet been established, innovations and lessons learned are not captured well, and there remains a need to clarify roles and responsibilities with regard to reporting on impact.

8.26 The CGPC Chair introduced the recommendations from the Secretariat and the CGPC based on the findings of the Portfolio Review which included a greater attention to marginalized children; choice of modality; use of country systems; tighter linkages between GRA work and country work, and additional recommendations from the CGPC related to tracking domestic financing pledges made at the 2014 Replenishment Conference, developing a single matrix in future Portfolio Reviews to provide an update on FAC/CGPC recommendations, and the need for standardized reporting on basic indicators.

8.27 The Chair noted that it is reassuring that there is a common diagnosis across discussions during the Board retreat and the executive session, reinforcing which issues will need to be addressed in the strategic planning process.

8.28 The Interim CST Lead reported that the investigation into the alleged misuse of funds in Madagascar was in the final stages. The Board had been informed of the allegations earlier in the

year and the grant had since been closed. A full and final analysis would be provided by UNICEF in the first quarter of 2015.

Discussion:

8.29 Board members generally supported the direction of the Portfolio Review and the recommendations put forward by the Secretariat and the CGPC. Several Board members requested to note in the decision language that the 2014 Portfolio Review be a key input into the strategic planning process, especially in work stream 1, as per BOD/2014/12-02.

8.30 Choice of modality was strongly supported as a key issue that was well captured in the Portfolio Review. Most of the GPE grants are still implemented in a project modality although the focus is on having an impact at the sector level. There was strong support among Board members for use of country systems and the need to understand why more progress has not yet been made on this recurring issue. The Interim CST Lead responded that it should be discussed at country level by the Local Education Group ("LEG"). Based on those discussions, an implementation partner should be engaged. She acknowledged the lack of diversity in supervising entities and insufficient clarity about the role of the Supervising Entity ("SE").

8.31 Areas for improving the Portfolio Review included linking it to the work on the results framework, particularly regarding the focus on marginalized children. It was also suggested that the Portfolio Review should report more on outcomes instead of solely focusing on outputs. Another Board member suggested a clearer separation between the purpose and contents of the Portfolio Review and the Results for Learning Report with the former focusing on financial reporting, and the latter on indicators and results.

8.32 With respect to tracking domestic financing pledges in the country pages, a Board member suggested the lens be enlarged and include an analysis of other external aid, including an analysis of whether there is a trend in GPE funds crowding in, or pushing other external funding out. The Secretariat responded that it would work on improving that information in the report going forward.

8.33 Several Board members noted the need for a Board discussion on the roll-out of the new funding model and in particular from the perspective of developing country partners. The Secretariat responded that the funding model had been discussed with the developing country partner constituencies during their recent meetings and the Secretariat would develop a Q&A document based on the questions received and post it online.

8.34 The Board approved the following amended decision:

BOD/2014/12-07 — 2014 Portfolio Review: The Board of Directors determines that the 2014 Portfolio Review and the recommendations of the Secretariat and the CGPC as set out in BOD/2014/12 DOC 09 be a key input into the strategic planning process, especially in work stream 1, as per BOD/2014/12-02.

9 REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, RISK, AND FINANCE COMMITTEE – PART TWO (BOD/2014/12 DOC 04)

9.1 The Chair invited Padraig Power, the Senior Financial Officer, to present an overview of the GERF's recommendations to the Board related to the financial forecast, maximum country allocations for Round 2 of 2015 and Round 1 of 2016, and approval of organizations for eligibility to serve as GPE supervising and managing entities for smaller grants.

9.2 The Senior Financial Officer recalled decisions made by the Board in February and June 2014 with respect to allocation formula, funding priorities, and maximum country allocations. With respect to the projection of available resources for the 2015-2018 funding period announced during the June 27-28, 2014 Board meeting, he reported that clarifications of the conditions of a pledge, and the expected timing of contributions, combined with a significant strengthening of the US dollar have resulted in the need to reduce for forecasting purposes the value of resources that could be considered as available for allocation at this stage.

9.3 Positive developments in the Global Partnership's financial position since June 2014 included new and additional pledges from Canada, the Republic of Korea, Denmark and Sweden and a first financial contribution from a private foundation, the Children's Investment Fund. In addition, two countries with indicative allocations in 2014 have deferred their application into 2015, thereby eliminating the need for additional indicative allocations for these countries in the 2015-2018 period. These positive impacts were not enough to outweigh the factors resulting in reductions in the forecast of available resources.

9.4 As a result of the overall decrease in available resources, the GERF had to apply all the prioritization criteria determined by the Board during its June 2, 2014 audio call: reducing to zero the provision for unanticipated contingencies and innovative financing to leverage other external funding; not making a new allocation to those countries expected to apply in Round 2 of 2014, considering that implementation is unlikely to be complete until 2018, and allocations to LMICs reduced proportionally to 50%.

9.5 With respect to disbursement totals, the Senior Financial Officer noted the cumulative funding amount to date for program implementation grants totaled US$4.1 billion with this year being the first year that more than US$500 million is being disbursed. Similar or higher disbursement totals are expected to occur in the next two years.

Approval of Maximum Country Allocations

Discussion:

9.6 The Board Chair noted that the requested decision on maximum country allocations ("MCAs") was based on an allocation formula and funding priorities made by the Board earlier this year. She invited comments from Board members.

9.7 A Board member asked why the GERF was not recommending MCAs beyond Round 1 of 2016 in order to give countries more funding predictability. The Senior Financial Officer explained that the GERF had determined that announcing MCAs for funding rounds beyond Round 1 of 2016 would not be prudent at this time because of the reality that the projection of available resources may need to be adjusted downward further due to the impact of conditionality of certain pledges and the potential for further adverse exchange rate movements. Rolling allocations were therefore deemed necessary to strike a balance between possibly over promising and giving enough notice to countries for planning purposes.

Decision:

9.8 There being no further comments, the Board Chair determined the following decision approved:

BOD/2014/12-08 — <u>Approval of Maximum Country Allocations</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the following Maximum Country Allocations for Round 2 of 2015 and Round 1 of 2016:

List of Eligible Countries *All Figures in USD Millions*	Fixed (70%)	Variable (30%)	Maximum Country Allocation	Earliest Application Round
Myanmar	54.4	23.3	77.7	R2 2015
Lesotho	1.6	0.7	2.3	R2 2015
Papua New Guinea	5.0	2.1	7.1	R2 2015
Afghanistan	70.0	30.0	100	R1 2016
Burundi	18.1	7.7	25.8	R1 2016
Comoros Islands	1.5	0.7	2.2	R1 2016
Congo, Democratic Republic	70.0	30.0	100.0	R1 2016
Guinea Bissau	3.4	1.4	4.8	R1 2016
Somalia	23.2	9.9	33.1	R1 2016
South Sudan	21.2	9.1	30.3	R1 2016
Tanzania[2]	59.4	25.5	84.9	R1 2016
Zimbabwe	20.6	8.8	29.4	R1 2016
Cote D'Ivoire	18.3	7.8	26.1	R1 2016
Nicaragua	3.2	1.3	4.5	R1 2016
TOTAL	**369.9**	**158.3**	**528.2**	

List of Eligible Small Island and Landlocked Developing States[3] *(All Figures in USD Millions)*	Maximum Country Allocation
Country	**Amount**
Timor Leste	3.9
Total	**3.9**

2. the allocation for these countries will remain valid for the 2015–2018 period unless otherwise adjusted by the Board, and will be subject to the requirements of the new funding model for the 2015–2018 period.

3. requests the GERF to conduct a review of the forecast of available resources at its next face-to-face meeting in 2015 and to make recommendations for decision by the Board on the level of available resources for approval of the Maximum Country Allocations for Round 2 of 2016 and Round 1 of 2017 and potential positive adjustments to the Maximum Country Allocations for Round 2 of 2015 and Round 1 of 2016, and the resources available for the general provision initially allocated for contingencies such as leverage funding and humanitarian/emergencies.

Financial Considerations

9.9 The GERF Chair introduced the GERF recommendation on financial considerations based on the current projection of resources available. He noted that the GERF had been very disappointed by the downward adjustment of available resources and the negative consequences for countries, flagging it as a major concern. The Chair invited comments from Board members.

[2] As a Federal State, the allocation may be divided between Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar as determined at the country level. It is expected that only the Zanzibar application would be submitted by Round 1 of 2016.
[3] Sao Tome & Principe is eligible but not for Round 2 of 2015 or Round 1 of 2016 as it has an existing grant expected to be active after the dates of these rounds. The remaining eligible countries have been notified of their maximum country allocation and can apply as of Round 1 of 2015.

Discussion:

9.10 Board members expressed concern about the negative impact of currency conversions on the financial forecast. It was suggested to possibly postpone conversion of contributions to a time when the conversion rate would not result in a loss of resources. It was also suggested that the US dollar might not be the most favorable currency and to consider allocating in Euros for example. The Senior Financial Officer clarified that the reason for the immediate conversion into US dollars is that World Bank trust fund allocations are in US dollars and the Trustee policy is to convert funds immediately as it does not wish to speculate on currency fluctuations. The CEO added that GPE liabilities are in US dollars as well, further necessitating conversion to that currency.

9.11 A high degree of concern was expressed by Board members representing developing country partner constituencies and civil society constituencies about the conditions attached to one donor's pledge and their significant negative impact on available resources and resulting funding predictability for GPE countries. It was noted by some of the concerned members that such conditionality was not apparent to them at the Brussels Board meeting. The constituencies urged donors to honor their commitments and called for donors who had not yet made a pledge to do so.

9.12 A question was raised as to whether there might be flexibility in the forecast considering that not all resources might be required in the replenishment timeframe for the variable portion of the allocations. The Senior Financial Officer responded that the timing of the variable tranche payments has been factored into the forecast and contributed to the justification to allow up to 20 percent of the value of grant allocations to be financed from future contributions to be made under the next replenishment period (covering the post 2018 period) to coincide with when the funds are expected to be required, as decided by the Board during its June 2, 2014 audio call.

9.13 The Board member representing the donor whose pledge was conditioned stated that the reasons for the conditions included accountability to its tax payers and their assessment that the Global Partnership is currently a high-risk organization with critical risks. She explained that the conditions of their pledge are closely related to accountability issues and were designed to mitigate the Global Partnership's risks, but noted that these issues are being addressed through the strategic planning process, the results framework, and an enhanced quality assurance review process for the Global Partnership.

Decision:

9.14 There being no further comments, the Chair declared the following decision adopted, including the two requested amendments:

BOD/2014/12-09 — <u>Financial Considerations</u>: The Board of Directors notes the importance of the following issues highlighted by the GERF:

1. that projected available resources have reduced substantially since the June 2014 replenishment conference;
2. the current financial position requires the application of all of the prioritization measures previously discussed by the Board of Directors at its June 2, 2014 meeting, and requires a reduction in allocations to the lower-middle income countries below the 60% level previously discussed by the Board to 50%;
3. that the prioritization measures may be adjusted if additional resources become available due to new pledges; and
4. that given the financial position, the Board considers options for improving prospects for reaching the replenishment target.

Eligibility to Act as Supervising and/or Managing Entity

9.15 Before the discussion on the proposed decisions regarding eligibility of organizations recommended for eligibility as supervising and/or managing entity, CSO 1, Save the Children, declared a conflict of interest for decision BOD/2014/12-10. The following Board constituencies offered conflict of interest declarations for BOD/2014/12-11: CSO 1, CSO 2, CSO 3, UNESCO, and the World Bank.

9.16 The Chair noted any approval of the second decision regarding the Global Campaign for Education serving as supervising/managing entity for the Civil Society Education Fund will be effective only if the SPC recommendation regarding GCE becoming the supervising/managing entity for the new CSEF program is approved by the Board later in the meeting.

9.17 As there were no comments from Board members, the Chair announced the following decisions approved:

BOD/2014/12-10 — Eligibility to Act as a Global Partnership for Education Supervising and/or Managing Entity: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the following organizations as eligible Supervising and/or Managing entities ("SE/ME") for the Global Partnership for Education ("GPE") grants up to the value of US$5 million:
    a. Save the Children US
    b. Save the Children UK
    c. Concern Worldwide

2. notes that in line with the Board's approval of the Eligibility Expansion Plan (BOD/2013/11-09) – the above listed organizations are also eligible to act as Supervising and/or Managing Entity if nominated by a Local Education Group for grants in excess of US$5 million, subject to satisfactory completion of a further detailed grant level assessment to be completed as part of the Secretariat's Quality Assurance Review process prior to review of the proposal package by the Country Grants and Performance Committee. The grant level assessment will take into account the organization's capacity at local level to supervise and/or manage a larger grant, taking into account the proposed implementation arrangements of the proposal and the country context.

BOD/2014/12-11 — Eligibility to Act as a GPE Supervising and/or Managing Entity ("SE/ME") in the context of the Civil Society Education Fund ("CSEF"): The Board of Directors:

1. approves the Global Campaign for Education ("GCE") as eligible to act as Supervising/Managing Entity for funding under the Civil Society Education Fund, as proposed by the Strategy and Policy Committee; and
2. requests that if the GCE is selected to be SE/ME for a new CSEF program, that any commitment of funds by the Trustee to GCE be subject to confirmation by the Secretariat to the GERF that satisfactory progress on implementing the recommendations outlined in Annex 3 of GERF/2014/10 Doc 04 plus any critical issues that may be identified from a further detailed grant level assessment have been made.

10. REPORT FROM THE TRUSTEE

10.1 World Bank Senior Financial Officer François Lefebvre presented the proposed Trustee budget for the period January 1 to June 30, 2015. The Senior Financial Officer clarified that the

budget is slightly higher compared to the current year budget due to a higher projection on average balance of the portfolio. He elaborated on the Trustee services included in the budget.

Discussion:

10.2 Responding to a question, the COO clarified that the Trustee Budget was included in the financial forecast along with other liabilities.

Decision:

10.3 There being no further comments, the Chair considered the following decision approved:

BOD/2014/12-12 — Trustee Budget: The Board of Directors approves of the estimated administrative expenses of US$276,000 for trustee services for the period of January 1 to June 30, 2015.

11 PROJECT EVERYONE

11.1 The Chair resumed discussion of the proposed endorsement of Project Everyone introduced in the Chair's opening remarks that day. She invited comments from Board members.

Discussion:

11.2 A UNICEF representative noted that the agency was still in a conversation with Richard Curtis and waiting to hear back on such questions as to what implications an endorsement would have for the agency and the Global Partnership. Other Board members also expressed discomfort with the proposed endorsement. Comments included that more information was needed, whether an endorsement for the projection for the project would set a precedent, and what the value-added would be of a GPE endorsement if the United Nations is already supporting the effort.

11.3 The Chair determined there was no consensus and announced the proposed endorsement would be put on hold until such a time when it is clearer the Board would support it.

11.4 The Board Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch and invited Board and Alternate Board members to attend a lunchtime event hosted by the World Bank and the Global Partnership on Early Childhood Development.

12 REPORT OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE PART TWO (BOD/2014/12 DOC 07)

Civil Society Education Fund

12.1 The Chair called for declarations of conflict of interest with respect to the recommendation. All civil society constituencies declared conflicts of interest for either being a direct CSEF grant recipient (CSO 3: representing the Senegalese and Sierra Leone civil society coalitions) managing one of the regional CSEF funds (CSO 1 (Action Aid) and CSO 2 (Education International). UNESCO also declared a conflict of interest as supervising entity of the current CSEF. SPC Chair Joseph O'Reilly, Board member for CSO 1 confirmed that he had no direct conflict.

12.2 The Chair invited SPC Chair, Joseph O'Reilly, and Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist, Sarah Beardmore, to introduce the recommendation. The SPC Chair summarized the requested decision and recalled the core and fundamental principle that the Global Partnership is a multi-stakeholder partnership with civil society engaging at all levels. The purpose of the CSEF program is to support civil society at the national level to participate in policy processes. He concluded that

the Board in November of 2013 had approved a civil society engagement strategy, one element of which included that the Secretariat would outline the process for continuation of the current CSEF.

12.3 The SPC Chair invited the Senior Policy and Strategy Specialist to present the recommended decision and acknowledged her leadership in shepherding the CSEF program. She provided an update on the proposal process, an overview of the proposed aims and objectives of the CSEF, and the thorough due diligence process for GCE to become managing entity for the new CSEF program, the latter of which necessitated a proposed costed extension of the current program to the end of 2015. She noted that this recommendation is important at this time in order to avoid the risk of a break in funding as the current CSEF program concludes in March 2015.

Discussion:

12.4 Several Board members noted that the Board was generally supportive of the Civil Society Education Fund as a vehicle to support civil society and the recommended decision.

12.5 Board members requested clarity on issues of sustainability of CSEF- funded activities and long-term predictability of funding. The Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist explained that the initial timeframe for the new program had been four years. However given the process around SE/ME due diligence, it was determined that a costed extension of the current program was prudent to avoid a gap in funding, therefore resulting in the new program having a life span of three years.

12.6 Responding to a question regarding whether the teaching profession is included in national education coalitions, the Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist noted that in principle, teachers unions need to be included in all coalitions and in many countries, the teachers unions host the coalitions. However, the interest, expertise and role of the teaching profession in policy dialogue are distinct as actual deliverers of education which may warrant separate funding. At present, the teaching profession is supported through the GRA program.

12.7 On the role of youth in the CSEF, the Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist confirmed that the CSEF program is an effective platform for youth engagement and GCE has been encouraged to consider how to include and support youth groups in a more systematic way. She noted that a high number of youth and student organizations are already coalition members.

12.8 Several Board members requested clarity on the recommended indicative amount of US$30 million. The Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist confirmed that the indicative amount served as a ceiling only and GCE could propose activities up to that ceiling if justified and accompanied with a complete and clear results framework. The recommended indicative amount would mean a scale-up of 25% compared to the current program, which the Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist deemed reasonable as it would allow the recommended increase in country level monitoring work and support for southern board constituencies, which are not currently included in the CSEF program.

12.9 Several Board members noted the importance of a results framework for the program, especially given that advocacy is challenging to monitor. Comments included that a results framework should focus on impact rather than activities and should link to the overall GPE results framework. A Board member also noted that the evaluation of the current program should inform the design of the new program. The Strategy and Policy Specialist agreed that a clear results framework linked to the GPE results framework and reviewed by the SPC would be important. She noted that the CGPC will review the deliverables prior to Board consideration. She reported that the independent evaluation of the current program would be complete by September, which would allow for changes to the new program prior to its implementation in January 2016.

12.10 A Board member requested clarification on whether GCE would serve as managing or supervising entity, and on the organizational status of GCE as a civil society movement with coalitions, and the potential conflicts of interest in the structure. The Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist explained that the organization is a legally-registered organization in South Africa with a Board of Directors. Any conflict of interest was addressed in the current CSEF by the recusal of any board member whose organization receives funding from CSEF. The Global Oversight Committee, which consists of a subset of the GCE Board without conflict of interest, provides oversight of the program. She noted that GCE supports the activities of a federation of independent coalitions which are not legally related except through their receipt of funds from GCE. The SPC Chair added that GCE would serve as managing entity (not supervising entity), and that the final proposal would clarify that. The proposal would also need to present the organization's governance arrangements and a clear conflict of interest policy and process.

12.11 The Board Chair concluded that there was consensus on the recommended decision. At the May 2015 Board meeting, the Board would carefully consider the final proposal and pay particular attention to the value-add of the proposal.

12.12 The SPC acknowledged the role of UNESCO as a very effective supervising entity for the program and in particular Board member David Atchoarena's contributions as UNESCO's representative and SPC member in enabling the CSEF to function in its current form.

12.13 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2014/12-13 — <u>Civil Society Education Fund</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. requests Global Campaign for Education to develop a new Civil Society Education Fund proposal with a maximum indicative allocation of US$30 million for the 2016-2018 period;
2. requests that the proposal be subject to a Quality Assurance Review (QAR) encompassing a detailed grant-level assessment to be arranged by the GPE Secretariat which shall outline any proposed conditions to funding in addition to those recommended by the GERF, and propose supervision arrangements based on the findings of the QAR process. The proposal and findings of the Secretariat's QAR shall be submitted for review by the Country Grants and Performance Committee for their recommendation to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting in May 2015; and
3. authorizes an extension of the existing Civil Society Education Fund program to December 31, 2015 with UNESCO as Supervising Entity, and delegates authority to the Country Grants and Performance Committee to review and approve a request for a costed extension of up to US$5 million plus applicable agency fees and a supervision allocation.

13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Board Composition

13.1 The Chair announced that four Board members were leaving the Board at the end of this year. Minister Thiam, Board member of the Africa 2 constituency, Charles Aheta-Tsegah, Board member of the Africa 3 constituency, Yvonne Stassen, Board member of the Donor 1 constituency, and Natasha de Marcken, Alternate Board member of the Donor 6 constituency. The Chair expressed gratitude to all four members for their incredible service to the Board.

Notice of Next Board Meetings

13.2 The Chair announced the next face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors on May 22-23, 2015 in Incheon, Korea. The Secretariat will circulate detailed information in due course.

13.3 There being no other business, the Chair closed the meeting at 2:50pm.

ANNEX 1- Participants List

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
Adricula, Sylvia	Event Assistant	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Aheto-Tsegah, Charles	Ag. Director-General	Ghana Education Service	Ghana	Board Member Constituent of Africa 3
Ajoku, Lincoln	Education Advisor	Concern Worldwide	United States	Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Albright, Alice	Chief Executive Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Anakotta, John	Assistant Director	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Archer, David	Head of Programmes	ActionAid	United Kingdom	Board Member Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Atchoarena, David	Director	UNESCO	France	Alternate Board Member Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Baeten, Sven	Senior Country Operations Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Baker, Tony	Education for All Campaign Manager	RESULTS Educational Fund	United States	Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Beardmore, Sarah	Advocacy Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Bernard, Jean-Marc	M&E Team Lead	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Biney, Francis	coodonnateur	Task Force SEF	Côte d'Ivoire	Constituent of Africa 2
Bouapao, Lytou	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Bouchane, Kolleen	Director, Policy and Advocacy	A World at School/Global Business Coalition for Education	United States	Observers
Bourne, Josephine	Associate Director	UNICEF	United States	Alternate Board Member Constituent of UNICEF

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
				(Multilateral Agency 2)
Bous, Katie	Policy Advisor - Education and Health	Oxfam International	United States	Observers
Brinkhaus, Michaela	Officer for Primary Education	Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5
Brouwer, Ids	UN Youth Representative to UNESCO	Dutch National Youth Council	Netherlands	Observers
Callahan, Brian	Advocacy & Outreach Manager	Global Campaign for Education, US	United States	Observers
Camara, HE Kandia	Minister of Education	Minister of Education	Côte d'Ivoire	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Africa 2
Cherevatova, Natalia	Operations Officer	The World Bank	United States	Observers
Christensen, Olav Rex	Sr. Public Finance Specialist	The World Bank	United States	Alternate Board Member Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Cristofoli, Vigdis	Head, education section	The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Colenso, Peter	Executive Director, Education	The Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member Constit Private Sector/Private Foundations
Costin, Claudia	Senior Director	The World Bank	United States	Board Member Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Coulibaly, HE Samadou	Minister of Education	Ministry of National Education and Literacy	Burkina Faso	Constituent of Africa 2
Dansie, Grant	Education Advisor	Norad	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
De Marcken, Natasha	Director, Office of Education	USAID	United States	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 6
Di Vozzo, Donatella	Education Economist	BTC-Belgian Development Agency	Belgium	Observers

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Educational Planning and Reform	Ministry of National Education	Senegal	Constituent of Africa 2
Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Alternate Board Member Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
EGBETAYO, Victoria	Partnership Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Empey, Patrick	Human Development - Policy Team Leader	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade / Irish Aid	Ireland	Constituent of Donor 4
Evans, Alison	Consultant	Independent	United Kingdom	GPE Secretariat
Feinberg, Nathalia	Ambassador, Head of Department, Development Policy and Global Cooperation	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 4
Focas Licht, Margarita	Senior Education Specialist	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Gantenbein, Nicole	Program officer education	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SADC)	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Gardiner, Amanda	Director of Partnerships	Pearson	United States	Board Member Constit Private Sector/Private Foundations
Gillard, Julia	Board Chair	GPE Board Chair	Australia	Chair
Goudiaby, Gisele	Event Coordinator	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Graff, Bent	Special Advisor	MFA	Denmark	Constituent of Donor 4
Gragert, Ed	Executive Director	Global Campaign for Education-US	United States	Observers
Grossman, Allison	Senior Legislative Associate	RESULTS Educational Fund	United States	Observers
Guétin, Christine	Board Operations Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
Gupta, Geeta Rao	Deputy Executive Director	UNICEF	United States	Board Member Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Habibyar, Moud. Shakir	Special Assistant to the Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Hanjam, Rui	Principal Advisor	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Henfry, Sally-Anne	Special Assistant to the Board Chair	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Hoelzer, Ronja	Project Manager, German BACKUP Initiative Education in Africa	GIZ	Germany	Observers
Ismonov, Fathiddin	Deputy Minister of Education and Science of RT	Ministry of Education	Tajikistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Iwase, Keita	Diplomat	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Kaboré, Ibrahima	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Education	Burkina Faso	Constituent of Africa 2
Lefebvre, Francois	Senior Financial Officer	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
Leumer, Wolfgang	Programme Manager CSEF	GCE	South Africa	Observers
Lombardi, Joan	Senior Advisor	Bernard van Leer Foundation	United States	Observers
Lorenzo, Veronique	Head of Unit	European Comission	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	National Coordinator	COSYDEP	Senegal	Board Member Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Miachi, Ojonwa	Policy/Advocacy Advisor	Connected Development	Nigeria	Observers

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
Mornet-Cariou, Odile	Advisor	GIZ	Germany	Observers
Mowe, Kjersti	Networks and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	South Africa	Observers
Mundy, Karen	Chief Technical Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Murphy, Yvette	Director of Advocacy and Outreach	Association for Childhood Education International	United States	Observers
Naidoo, Jordan	Senior Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Constit Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Nerayo, Lewam	Finance Assistant	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
Nestel, Yona	Senior Education Advisor	Plan International	Canada	Observers
Nhan-O'Reilly, Joseph	Senior Adviser	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Nicod, Chantal	Head of West Africa and Education Division	Swiss agency for development and cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 1
Nkaada, Daniel	Commissioner Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Uganda	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Africa 1
Oliver, Jessica	Policy Analyst	Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada	Canada	Constituent of Donor 3
Omer, HE Fuad	State Minister	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Constituent of Africa 3
Paradis, Anne-Françoise	Education Advisor	Belgium Ministry Foreign Affairs - DG Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid	Belgium	Observers
Pascual, Jay	Senior Counsel	World Bank	United States	Trustee
Passey, Rebecca	Program Officer	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
Power, Padraig	Sr. Financial Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Rafique, Atif	Education Specialist	UNICEF	United States	Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Riisoen, Kari	Project Manager	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Rohner, Allison	Executive Director	IDP Foundation, Inc.	United States	Observers
Rosenberg, Karin	Fellow	Bank Information Center	United States	Observers
Sakho, Marieme	Syndicat	Sypros	Senegal	Board Member Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
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
Sarch, Terri	Deputy Head| Global Funds Department	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Acting Board Member Constituent of Donor 3
Schroeder, Noel	Manager, Education Policy	Women Thrive Worldwide	United States	Observers
Seim, Olav	Policy Director Education	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	Board Member Constituent of Donor 4
Shouldice, Julie	Director	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development	Canada	Alternate Board Member Constituent of Donor 3
Siebes, Ronald	Head Education and Research Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Constituent of Donor 1
Stassen, Yvonne	Deputy Director Social Development Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Board Member Constituent of Donor 1
Svihlik, Jan	Education Advisor	GIZ - German International Cooperation	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title/Titre Professionel	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency Board
aka, Shinichiro	Senior Advisor	Japan International Cooperataion Agency	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Tapp, Charles	Manager	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Thiam, HE Serigne	Minister of Education	Ministry 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
Toure, Kaffouba	Director	Ministry of Education	Côte d'Ivoire	Constituent of Africa 2
Turnipseed, Stephan	President Emeritus & Executive Director - Strategic Partnerships	LEGO Education	United States	Observers
Van Dyke, Johanna	Board Operations Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Wane, Michaelle	Senior Board Operations Asst.	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Whitehead, Diane	Executive Director	Association for Childhood Education International	United States	Observers
Wilson, Ashley	Communications Manager	Global Campaign for Education-US Chapter	United States	Observers
Wolpe, Bruce	Chief of Staff	Hon Julia Gillard	Australia	GPE Secretariat
Wood, Grace	Deputy Programme Manager I Global Funds Department	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Yoshida, Kazuhiro	Professor	Hiroshima University	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Yuk, Sookhee	Program Assistant	Global campaign for education US chapter	United States	Observers
Zubaidulloev, Mukhibullo	First Deputy Director	International Presidential School	Tajikistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia