REPORT FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE: INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATION ON CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND

For Decision and Information

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1. The purpose of this paper is to summarize the deliberations of the Strategy and Policy Committee ("SPC") during its face-to-face meeting held in Washington, D.C. on October 9-10, 2014.

1.2 This paper contains the following:

For Decision

- Civil Society Education Fund (Annex 1: page 8)

For Information

- Initial Reflections from the Chief Technical Officer (section 2)
- Strategic Planning Process and Key Issues (section 3)
- Results for Learning Report 2014: Key Results (section 4)
- Roll-Out GPE Funding Model (section 5)
- Update on SPC Work Plan (section 6)
- Revisions to Strategic Plan Implementation Plan (Annex 2: page 15)

2. INITIAL REFLECTIONS FROM THE CHIEF TECHNICAL OFFICER (CTO)

2.1 Karen Mundy, CTO, provided initial reflections on the Global Partnership. She noted the ongoing question regarding how the global level can best be leveraged to support the country level in such areas as advocacy, knowledge, and resource mobilization. The Global Partnership should focus on adding catalytic value where it has a unique, competitive advantage.

2.2 She noted the enormous convening power of the Global Partnership at the country level in working with governments to solve problems, and utilizing expertise in the donor community. By leveraging these resources through the principles of partnership, programs and policy solutions can be accelerated.

2.3 Comments from committee members included that the Global Partnership should consider its original Education for All–Fast Track Initiative mandate, and deliver on goals at country level. It was noted that much work had in fact been accomplished at country level, but it is challenging to demonstrate.

2.4 Committee members noted a number of key challenges, including the need to develop a shared understanding with respect to the GPE business model, or theory of change, as well as the respective roles of the Secretariat and the Global Partnership in such areas as the new funding model, advocacy, and technical expertise.

3. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS AND KEY ISSUES

3.1 The CTO summarized the strategic planning process. The current phase is process-focused and includes a Board survey on what the external opportunities, threats and strengths are and where the Global Partnership has or should have added value. It also includes soliciting feedback from developing country partners (DCPs) during their constituency meetings. The results of the survey and the DCP constituency meetings will be discussed at the Board retreat in December.

3.2 The second phase includes commissioning a few stock-taking papers, and the third phase starting in late May will include high-level consultations with ministers and heads of state. A concept note will also be produced for the May Board meeting. The Board will finally approve the new strategic plan at the end of 2015.

3.3 The Secretariat expressed hesitation to align the new strategic plan to the replenishment funding cycle as both require 12-18 months of planning and the Secretariat has limited capacity. This will have to be discussed at the Board retreat.

3.4 Committee members commented that the strategic planning exercise offers an opportunity to clarify the core work of the Global Partnership, how it should accomplish this work, and the value added that this work can bring. The Secretariat might consider putting out a call for nominations of issues to be included in the strategic plan. Several committee members stressed the importance of ensuring broad consultation among the various stakeholders early in the process, especially the Local Education Groups (LEGs) and the constituencies. The consultations should be balanced by both consulting both new and old partners.

3.5 The suggestion was made that the Secretariat systematically identify those issues that are in the concept phase or need further work or resolution to ensure they remain on the radar and can be built into the strategic planning process.

4. RESULTS FOR LEARNING REPORT 2014: KEY RESULTS

4.1 Jean-Marc Bernard, Monitoring and Evaluation Team Lead, reported on the key results of the 2014 Results for Learning Report. Universal primary education has not been achieved, but there has been progress in access to education, gender equity and learning conditions in terms of class size, teacher training and government funding for education. Most progress has occurred in fragile and conflicted-affected states ("FCAS"). However, progress made is threatened, especially in fragile states, by the declining funding for education globally.

4.2 Despite the global decline in funding, the Global Partnership has increased its financial and technical support to basic education and FCAS. Eighty-two percent of GPE program implementation grants include a project modality. It was noted that GPE funding results are generally difficult to analyze as OECD does not track GPE funding separately. This problem is being rectified.

4.3 Mr. Bernard clarified that the report includes aggregate changes. The actual situation in each country is different, but the trends are general. It was noted that ideally, the analysis should cover data over a period longer than the two-three years covered in the report.

4.4 Committee members noted a lack of data on learning in the report and suggested including an explanation in the report. It was also suggested to link the need for data on learning to a strategy moving forward and that assessing learning should be a strong requirement for GPE-funded countries.

5. ROLL-OUT OF THE FUNDING MODEL FOR THE 2015-2018 PERIOD

5.1 Margarita Focas Licht, Acting Country Support Team Lead, provided an update on the roll-out of the funding model. A task force consisting of country leads for countries with indicative allocations in 2015 are monitoring the process underway in these countries as they prepare to submit an application. The first countries to apply will not have had enough time to fulfill all the requirements which the CGPC will need to address. Country Support Team (CST) staff will provide briefings on the funding model during the DCP constituency meetings in early December.

5.2 Ms. Licht noted that the funding model is in need of more detail on a number of points including how to assess whether an ESP is 'credible'; how the 'availability of data' should be defined and justified; and several aspects related to the variable part of the grant. The CGPC and the CST will address these issues in the coming months.

5.3 Committee members noted the challenges of measuring and monitoring results, and the risks of the results-based funding model. While it will push countries to improve their education sector plans, there is the risk of an adverse impact: governments may feel pressured to emphasize what donors want, which may harm the national education curriculum. The variable tranche requirements of equity, efficiency, and learning are a core challenge. Advancing each simultaneously will be difficult and progress in some areas may lead to trade-offs in others that may do a country more harm than good. Secretariat staff responded that it is aware of the challenges in this regard but noted there are no set benchmarks. The idea is to adapt to each country context.

5.4 It was recommended that the Secretariat draw on economist theories on principal agents and verification which are applicable to any problem and could assist in dealing with such difficulties as assessing targets and incentives. The Secretariat might also draw on the experience of other organizations that may have gone through similar transitions. Ms. Licht confirmed that the Secretariat had consulted with other organizations that have implemented results-based programs, including the World Bank and DFID.

5.5 The Chair invited the Secretariat to consider how the SPC might be involved in the new funding model. It was noted that any role would need to be high-level and strategic. The CGPC has the main role in overseeing the new funding model.

6. UPDATE ON STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE WORKPLAN

6.1 The committee reviewed progress made on the SPC work plan and related issues. Two work plan items in particular were noted as needing a way forward: innovative financing and the role of the Global Partnership in humanitarian and complex emergency issues. The Chair noted some difficulty with these topics because they are so broad. The SPC may help structure these issues and give it a strategic approach to get traction, rather than provide content.

6.2 With regard to innovation funding, the Chair noted that that topic should be addressed through the strategic plan. The SPC will be involved on the approach, but not the content. The Global Partnership may consider creating a new funding framework as the successor to the GRA which includes funding for innovation.

Human rights

6.3 Committee members recognized the need for a comprehensive approach to human rights issues.

6.4 Secretariat staff questioned how effective any policy would be. The Global Partnership's principles of mutual accountability are not always carried out at country level where it is hard to reach consensus considering the diverse interests of the various stakeholder groups. The Secretariat can flag issues in the Quality Assurance Review but not require the country to reach consensus and resolve it. A committee member suggested external conventions and mechanisms that address human rights violations might be referenced in the grant preparation phase. If there is a United Nations directive, for example, it should be flagged in the application.

6.5 While other initiatives may be better placed to address human rights issues, the Chair noted that there is a role for the Global Partnership in addressing human rights issues in grant making that conflict with donor policies. For example, a GPE donor partner might cease funding of a country in which human rights are violated where the Global Partnership continues funding, creating a conflict for the donor. Other comments included concern about political issues affecting donors' perspectives on funding. It was noted that the Global Partnership is not a political actor and country representatives to the Global Partnership are not representatives for political rights.

Attacks on Education

6.6 The Chair recalled the Board resolution from February 26, 2014 in response to an attack on a school in Nigeria (BOD/2014/02-09). While recognizing that the issue is being addressed in-country, it was deemed important for the Global Partnership to take some action as attacks on

education are a critical threat to the work of the Global Partnership. Thought needs to be given to which tools and mechanisms would best address the issue. Suggestions included promoting best practices, defining a role on the policy side, and supporting an existing partner initiative or policy work conducted by partners. The issue may also be woven into the strategic planning process.

Disability

6.7 The SPC noted the need for partners to know what the Global Partnership is doing in disability and how it will be addressed specifically in the new funding model. Secretariat staff commented that disability is embedded in strategic objective 3 on learning. Within the corresponding technical reference group ("TRG"), an informal sub reference group on disability has also been created. Other suggestions included a statement by the Board Chair on the day of disabilities, and a follow-up on the momentum created by the call for action on disability in the Replenishment Conference.

GPE Partner Influence

6.8 A discussion ensued on the issue of partners approaching the SPC and the Secretariat to advance topics that are important to them. Committee members generally agreed that there needs to be a mechanism for stakeholders to articulate issues so that they may feed into the strategic planning process, and at the same time allows for issues to be raised once the strategy is set.

6.9 Several committee members also expressed concern about donors raising thematic issues and viewing the Global Partnership as a vehicle to move these issues. The GPE goal is to strengthen the policy process at the county level in the development of education sector plans. Forcing too many lenses into a technical process, while ensuring country ownership, creates problems in terms of quality and capacity of the Global Partnership to make effective progress at country level. In addition, imposing external political agendas on countries or flagging donor-led issues leads to confusion at country level. Moreover, countries often feel pressured to respond to them, which may prove harmful to the country.

6.10 Secretariat staff noted that any requests to the Secretariat for special attention to an issue has implications for both the role of the Secretariat and resources, and may overlap with work of other entities. Especially given the establishment of the TRGs, it is not clear what the role of the Secretariat would be working on thematic issues.

7. PLEASE CONTACT Karen Mundy at: kmundy@globalpartnership.org for further information.

8. ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Civil Society Education Fund Proposal

Annex 2 – Implementation Plan Revisions and Lessons Learned

Annex 3 – Attendance list of the SPC face-to-face meeting October 9-10, 2014

ANNEX 1:

CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND PROPOSAL

For Decision

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to update the Board on the process for developing a grant proposal for the Civil Society Education Fund ("CSEF"). It recommends that the Board invite the Global Campaign for Education ("GCE") to submit a proposal for the Civil Society Education Fund in early 2015 with a maximum allocation of US$30 million for the period 2016-2018. The paper also outlines the process for review of the proposal, including a Quality Assurance Review ("QAR") and implementation of proposed supervision arrangements based on the findings of the QAR.

1.2 The timeline for this process requires the Country Grants and Performance Committee to review the CSEF proposal for recommendation to the Board at its face-to-face meeting in May 2015. In order to avoid the risk of a break in funding when the current grant period ends on March 31, 2015, this paper also asks the Board to consider a costed extension of the current CSEF program to allow the QAR process to take place. This paper supports the GPE priority to enhance the participation of its civil society constituencies in global and national education policy processes.

2. RECOMMENDED DECISION

2.1 The Secretariat requests that the Board of Directors approve the following decision:

BOD/2014/12-XX—Civil Society Education Fund: 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.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Global Partnership has supported civil society engagement in education policy oversight through the Civil Society Education Fund since 2008. The current CSEF program supports activities of national, regional and global civil society from April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2015. In November 2013, the Board requested the Secretariat to develop a Civil Society Support Proposal 2015-2018, in consultation with the Global Campaign for Education, Education International and other stakeholders, for consideration by the Board at its meeting in June 2014. However, due to the capacity constraints posed by the Global Partnership's Replenishment Campaign and the additional requirements related to the Global Campaign for Education's application to become eligible to act as Supervising Entity/Managing Entity, the Secretariat has been working with its civil society partners to prepare a CSEF application for review at the next face-to-face Board meeting in May 2015.

Civil Society Review and Review of CSEF

3.2 In order to ensure that lessons learned from the previous two CSEF grant programs are adequately factored into the design of the next CSEF application, the Secretariat and Strategy and Policy Committee have undertaken efforts in 2014 to review and provide feedback to the Global Campaign for Education. First, the Secretariat has developed a *2014 Civil Society Review* which looks at the extent to which civil society has been enabled to meaningfully engage in education policy dialogue at the Board level, and at the national level through Local Education Groups ("LEGs"). This review, based on program documentation, as well as interviews and survey responses, is available as a background paper on the GPE Committee eTeam site.

3.3 Secondly, initial findings and recommendations from the *2014 Civil Society Review* were shared with the Strategy and Policy Committee in August for their feedback and endorsement. The Strategy and Policy Committee endorses the following principles to guide the development of a funding proposal to support the engagement of civil society in education policy. Specifically, the SPC agreed that:

- The Global Partnership should continue to invest in the CSEF, through an allocation of funding for a period of four years.

- This allocation should be increased above current levels to allow for increased investment in global and regional functions (particularly to support the CSO constituencies on the Board of Directors).

- The proposal should allow for a longer planning period, consideration of an initial assessment of the results of the current phase and consideration of more flexible eligibility requirements.

- In addition, the SPC endorsed that the Secretariat work with the Global Campaign for Education to develop strategies to improve the next phase of the CSEF.

- Finally, the SPC also notes that the Global Partnership should consider earmarking additional funding in the future to support the engagement of the teaching profession in policy dialogue, and assess what areas would require support for civil society outside of the CSEF and GRA programs, in alignment with the next strategic planning process.

Proposed Revised Objectives for CSEF

3.4 Based on this guidance from the Strategy and Policy Committee and broader feedback from the *2014 Civil Society Review*, the Global Campaign for Education developed proposed aims and objectives for the CSEF 2015 to 2018 program which were shared with the Strategy and Policy Committee on October 9, 2014 for feedback. In light of this feedback, the Global Campaign for Education has further revised these aims and objectives.

3.5 While still subject to final approval, the proposed overall aim for the CSEF program for 2016 to 2018 is that "*National civil society coalitions in the education sector contribute to the achievement of national and global education goals, including the post-2015 agenda, by holding governments and other duty-bearers to account for education delivery and outcomes, through effective, informed and widespread citizen participation in policy-making, planning and monitoring*." Building on the current phase, the program aims to achieve this through supporting broad-based and representative coalitions of civil society organizations by providing grants, capacity building, technical support, and by facilitating linkages to regional and global debates and policy forums.

3.6 The specific objectives and policy focus in each country will be determined nationally, according to the country context and taking into account (for example) existing national education sector plans and emerging national challenges. These objectives may include civil society engagement in formal policy processes at national, regional and local level (including e.g., LEGs);

effective representation of diverse education beneficiaries and stakeholders in education sector debates and decision-making; citizen-led data-gathering and research on programs, financing and outcomes and use of this data to hold authorities to account; democratizing education debates and improving transparency through facilitating widespread public access to data and enhancing public participation in debates; and facilitating national civil society engagement in regional and global debates, including at the Global Partnership. In the program as a whole, five proposed objectives (already refined in light of SPC feedback, but still subject to final approval) that cut across the national work:

Objective 1 -- National education coalitions are consistently and effectively participating in and engaging with formal education sector programme, policy and budget development processes at national, local and school level, including through Local Education Groups and other consultative stakeholder forums.

Objective 2 -- National education coalitions with increasing thematic, institutional and advocacy capacity work through democratic and transparent structures to effectively represent diverse education beneficiaries and stakeholders (including marginalized children, youth and adults, students and learners, teachers, parents, people with disabilities, women and girls, and people from rural areas), and are actively and responsively supporting their participation in education sector debates and decision-making.

Objective 3 -- National education coalitions are engaging in citizen-led data-gathering and research, and monitoring, tracking, and analyzing policies, financing, implementation and outcomes at national, sub-national and school level, and using this data to hold education authorities and donors to account.

Objective 4 -- National education coalitions increase transparency in the education sector and democratize education debates by facilitating widespread public access to data and information, enhancing public participation in education debates, and drawing attention to public opinion.

Objective 5 -- Through the facilitation, support and engagement of regional and global CSEF partners, national and grassroots civil society engage with and bring their perspectives into regional and global education policy processes, forums and partnerships, including the Global Partnership.

Members of the Strategy and Policy Committee continue to provide valuable feedback on the content, approaches and activities of the CSEF program which will be addressed in the final proposal to be developed by the Global Campaign for Education in early 2015.

GCE Application to Become a Managing Entity

3.5 In conjunction with this process to refine and develop the Civil Society Education Fund program, the Global Campaign for Education has also applied for accreditation as a GPE Supervising Entity/Managing Entity ("SE/ME") (see BOD/2014/12 DOC 04). The Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee ("GERF") have recommended to the Board that the Global Campaign for Education be considered as eligible to take on the role of SE/ME for the CSEF program given the findings of the assessment. Based on the GERF's recommendations in relation to the eligibility of GCE to act as a SE/ME, and in light of the Global Partnership's current experience of the CSEF and work to date on developing the concept for the new CSEF program, the SPC proposes GCE perform the role of SE/ME for a new CSEF program for the 2016-2018 period.

3.6 In accordance with the GERF's recommendation to the Board and pending Board approval, the Global Campaign for Education will undergo a grant-level assessment and put in place prerequisite conditions for the management of the CSEF grant (outlined in Annex 3 of GERF/2014/10 Doc 04). The Secretariat will also put in place a cross-secretariat multi-disciplinary team for overseeing the Secretariat's relationship with GCE during the implementation of any approved CSEF program. The timeline for the completion of these requirements is likely to exceed the current period of implementation of CSEF which ends on March 31, 2015.

Proposed Temporary Extension of Existing Program with UNESCO as Supervising Entity

3.7 To mitigate the risk of a gap in funding due to the length of time required to commence implementation of a new CSEF program, it is proposed that GCE (in consultation with the current Supervising Entity, UNESCO) prepare a proposal due in January 2015 to extend the existing program to the end of 2015. This paper is therefore asking the Board to approve an in principle agreement to provide a costed extension through the end of 2015, at current levels (i.e., US$5 million from April to December 2015). The Board is also asked to delegate to the Country Grants and Performance Committee the review of such a proposal for a costed extension in early 2015 by teleconference. The proposal should build off the current program, already approved by the Board, maintaining the objectives and structure and updating activities and targets to reflect what GCE would do under an extended period. This should include baselines for each activity based on latest results and proposed reasonable incremental target increases based on the funds. GCE should support the proposal with a detailed budget and UNESCO should also outline what is needed for supervision and agency fees.

3.8 Taking into account that the costed extension would thus ensure that the current program covers activities from April to December 2015, the final proposal for the next phase of funding for the CSEF should address activities to be undertaken between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2018. This proposal should be prepared in early 2015, and undergo a Quality Assurance Review by the Secretariat. It should then be submitted to the Country Grants and Performance Committee for its consideration and recommendation to the Board. The Board should then review this proposal in May 2015 for final approval.

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

4.1 This paper presents decisions to the Board that will allow the Global Partnership to continue to strengthen the role of civil society in the partnership, including in the development, oversight and monitoring of education policy and finance. This is particularly relevant as a core strategy to increase transparency and accountability during the 2015-2018 replenishment period, which will include but not be limited to partner commitments made in the replenishment conference last June, GPE grant allocations during the 2015-2018 replenishment period and the adoption and planning of post-2015 education strategies.

4.2 The proposed recommendations allow sufficient time to develop a comprehensive proposal, and ensure that it will be subject to a rigorous Secretariat-led quality assurance process, and review by the Country Grants and Performance Committee prior to being considered for approval by the Board. The inclusion of a costed extension will ensure the risk of disruption to existing activities is mitigated.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR SECRETARIAT RESOURCES

5.1 The Secretariat will include costs for the detailed grant assessment and quality assurance review as part of its January 1, 2015 – June 30, 2015 budget request. This is likely to be in the region of US$50,000 – US$75,000 to facilitate the independent assessment and any Secretariat travel costs required as part of the quality assurance review.

5.2 The costs for the ongoing supervision and oversight of any approved CSEF proposal with GCE as Supervising/Managing Entity will be determined based on the findings of the quality assurance review process and will be factored into the 2015/2016 Secretariat budget. Any such costs are likely to be related to outsourcing in-country verification missions to a suitably qualified firm and are expected to be lower than those currently required as agency fees and supervision allocations under the current CSEF arrangements.

6. NEXT STEPS

6.1 Following the Board decisions, the following steps will be taken:

1) GCE and UNESCO will prepare an application for a costed extension of the current program up to US$5 million plus supervision and agency fees for April 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015

2) The Country Grants and Performance Committee will review and approve the costed extension

3) GCE will prepare a full application proposal for the CSEF for the period of January 1, 2016 to December 31 2018

4) The Strategy and Policy Committee will continue to provide oversight of the policy and strategic issues associated with the CSEF and provide feedback on the content, approaches and activities of the CSEF program, including in response to a draft proposal for 2016 - 2018

5) The Secretariat will undertake a Quality Assurance Review of the 2016 – 2018 proposal

6) A contracted firm will undertake a detailed grant level assessment as part of the QAR process

7) The CGPC will review the full proposal for CSEF 2016 to 2018

8) The Board will review the CGPC assessment of and consider their recommendation for CSEF 2016 – 2018 at its meeting in May 2015

9) Prior to transfer of funds for implementation, GCE will have demonstrated satisfactory progress on implementing all recommendations made by the GERF in relation to the outcomes of their Institutional Capacity assessment, in addition to any other requirements determined by the Board arising out of the QAR and CGPC review process.

7. PLEASE CONTACT Sarah Beardmore at sbeardmore@globalpartnership.org for further information.

ANNEX 2:

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REVISIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

For Information

1. PURPOSE

1.1 This report updates the Board of Directors on proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan for the GPE Strategic Plan (2012-2015), based on a review by the Strategy and Policy Committee. The new version of the Implementation Plan suggests a way forward on the GPE five Strategic Objectives, drawing on consultations and key Lessons Learned from the review process (see Attachment 1). The plan includes reference to Global and Regional Activities program ("GRA") and the newly-constituted Technical Reference Groups. A key observation and lesson learned is the need to fully integrate the Implementation Plan into the Strategic Plan.

1.2 This document is prepared for information and discussion. No decision is requested.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 On April 30, 2014, the Strategy and Policy Committee ("SPC") agreed to review the current GPE Implementation Plan, and capture important lessons learned. This was followed by a face-to-face meeting on May 22, 2014, between the SPC Chair, chairs of the GPE Communities of Practice ("CoPs") for each of the five strategic objectives and Secretariat technical leads to reflect on the Implementation Plan, its progress and challenge. The consultations provided a commonality of approach for moving forward to deliver more realistically on the current Implementation Plan by December 2015, including discussions to transform the COPs to GPE Technical Reference Groups ("TRGs"). The Chair of the SPC briefed the Board on this at its meeting in Brussels in late June. The SPC met again on September 9, 2014, to consider lessons learned from the review consultation process. At its face-to-face meeting on October 9-10, the SPC, with participation from partner representatives of the TRGs, discussed proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan and activities to be implemented in 2015.

2.2 As part of these discussions the SPC and partners involved in CoPs, including critically the Chairs of each of the then CoPs, agreed to the transformation of Communities of Practice into Technical Reference Groups, which will play an advisory role and collaborate in the activities prioritized for each thematic objective.

2.3 In addition to advising on and supporting the Implementation Plan, it is envisaged that the TRGs will play an important consultative role during the development of the new GPE Strategic Plan throughout 2015.

2.4 Based on lessons learned from the Strategic Implementation Plan process to date, GPE Partners and the SPC have agreed the approach below for the next year, with the aim of laying the foundations to increase the impact and effectiveness of the Partnership. As highlighted in Attachment 1, lessons from the review of the current Implementation Plan bring into sharp focus the transaction costs and capacity needed within the Secretariat to not only execute or support the list of actions contained in the original Plan but find ways of linking global activities to country-level impacts.

3. THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR 2015

3.1 The revised Implementation Plan is focused on the GPE five strategic objectives: fragile and conflict-affected states, girls' education, learning outcomes, teachers' effectiveness and financing as means of achieving high-level goals. In subsequent sections an update on progress made to date, as well as key deliverables for 2015 are provided for each objective.

3.2. Strategic Objective 1: Fragile and conflict-affected states ("FCAS") able to develop and implement their education plans

Update: Good progress has been made in GPE work with FCAS[1], including: rapid expansion of FCAS Partners (28); increased volume of grants to FCAS; GPE support for transitional planning (including guidance on conflict-sensitive planning); and the creation and successful development of the accelerated funding option for countries in emergency and early recovery situations. Progress is also underway in respect of the expansion of eligible Managing and Supervising Entities, which is in part designed to increase the range of entities that can operate in FCAS. The Global Partnership has been active in the International Network for Education in Emergencies ("INEE"). The Global Partnership recognizes the challenges posed by the low levels of international funding to education in FCAS and in emergency/humanitarian contexts in particular.

Key actions/deliverables for 2015: The Global Partnership will continue to strengthen support for national ESPs and their implementation in FCAS. It will also prepare a formal assessment of areas where the Global Partnership can add value and potentially play a role in

[1] For detailed data on GPE work with FCAS, please refer to the Results for Learning Report on the GPE website.

enhancing global coordination and finance, in humanitarian and emergency contexts. It will prepare a proposal for decision by the Board in 2015.

3.3 Strategic Objective 2: All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment

Update: Good progress has been made in developing and piloting an ESP Gender Analysis Tool; GRA work on school-related gender violence is ongoing; the Global Partnership is participating in the launch of Global Partners Working Group on School-Related Gender-Based Violence, and; the Civil Society Education Fund ("CSEF") is supporting global and regional advocacy on girls' education and gender equality. The Global Partnership needs to build on existing efforts to better mainstream gender in all country-level processes the Global Partnership supports.

Key actions/deliverables for 2015: The Global Partnership will continue to monitor gender equity outcomes in GPE countries. It will complete GPE gender tools and ESP guidelines with support from the TRG. It will also support ongoing GRA work on school-related gender violence. A brief stocktaking report on the status of gender in GPE-supported education sector plans will be completed.

3.4 Strategic Objective 3: Dramatic increase in the number of children learning and demonstrating mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills by Grade 3

Update: The Global Partnership has a variety of activities that support better learning outcomes. It supports education sector plans within which there is an increasing focus on initiatives to enhance learning. The Global Partnership funds 12 GRA programs that engage its partners in the areas of learning, teaching and health/disability, and out-of-school children. It sits on the advisory board of the Learning Metrics Task Force ("LMTF") and participates in the early childhood, the learning champions, and IPAL working groups of the LMTF. Through CSEF the Global Partnership supports national and regional advocacy on literacy, disability and inclusive education as well as other quality education issues. However, the Global Partnership has had trouble finding the right way to engage with a TRG in learning, in part because this has developed into four epistemic/issue arenas: early grade literacy and numeracy; equity and inclusion; role of health in promotion of learning, and; early childhood education.

Key actions/deliverables for 2015: In 2015 the Global Partnership will consult with partners on each of the four sub-thematic areas and technical reference group members to better define where the Global Partnership can add unique value either through better linkage at country level or through global or regional initiatives. It will continue to engage in the IPAL and early childhood

education initiatives under the LMTF. The Global Partnership will also work with partner countries to include learning outcomes as indicators for the variable portion of grants delivered under the new funding model.

3.5 Strategic Objective 4: Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education

Update: The Global Partnership has offered support to this objective through four of its GRA activities. It has also supported greater teacher engagement in policy dialogue through the CSEF activities, and civil society involvement in Local Education Groups ("LEGs"). Teacher policies are prominently addressed in GPE-supported national education sector plans. However, the Global Partnership needs to develop a consistent way of addressing teaching effectiveness and teacher policies in its country-level activities and the country-level processes the Global Partnership supports.

Key actions/deliverables for 2015: In 2015 the Global Partnership will work with its partners to assess the best modalities for future GPE support in this area. It will consider, with partners, the unique or catalytic role the Global Partnership might play in disseminating findings and tools on teacher/teaching effectiveness and reinforce teacher provisions and teacher engagement within the sector plans and sector policy processes at country level. It will continue to participate in the UNESCO/Education International/Teacher Task Force and support the development of teaching effectiveness tools and indicators.

3.6 Strategic Objective 5: Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic funding and support to education in GPE-endorsed countries

Update: In 2014 the Global Partnership designed a new funding model that is intended to bring a stronger focus on using finance to improve equity, efficiency and learning outcomes. It supports a GRA activity with key partners focused on building national education accounts – which will support improved financial decision making and greater transparency. At the June 2014 Replenishment Conference, the Global Partnership mobilized donor pledges of US$2.1 billion for 2015-17 as well as $400 million in innovative financing. Developing Country Partners also pledged significant increases in domestic financing for education which the Global Partnership estimates could be worth as much as $26 billion, if fully realized.

Key actions/deliverables for 2015: In 2015 the Global Partnership will continue to refine the new funding model to leverage greater focus on equity, efficiency and learning in sector resource

allocation. It will support the evolution of national education accounts through the GRA activities. It will continue to mobilize global resources. Finally, as part of its strategic plan consultations it will explore areas where the Global Partnership can play a catalytic role in education finance, including through greater transparency of information about education sector spending and better alignment of external financing to partner countries' systems.

4. NEXT STEPS

4.1 The Secretariat will engage with each of the Technical Reference Groups early in 2015, and will involve them in consultations related to the formation of the GPE new Strategic Plan. The Global Partnership will also invite them to play a role in relevant activities in relation to the Implementation Plan.

4.2 Technical Reference Groups and their contact information will be posted on the website.

5. PLEASE CONTACT Karen Mundy at kmundy@globalpartnership.org and Victoria Egbetayo at vegbetayo@gloalpartnership.org for further information.

6. ATTACHMENTS OR INFORMATION

Attachment 1 – Key Lessons Learned From Strategic Plan Implementation
Attachment 2 - List of Technical Reference Groups as of November 8, 2014

ATTACHMENT 1: KEY LESSONS LEARNED FROM STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The top line lessons commonly agreed upon in the consultations:

- **Integrate the Implementation Plan into the Strategic Plan**
  - Ensure the Partnership has a common understanding of what is an Implementation Plan.
  - The Implementation Plan should avoid being a list of activities that do not speak to catalytic value of the GPE or that the Secretariat has limited capacity to carry out.
- **Early, inclusive and consistent engagement of all partners – particularly Developing Country Partners ("DCPs")**
  - Level the playing field in terms of voice within the planning and implementation process as part of overall efforts towards systems strengthening.
- **Develop a shared understanding of how the Global Partnership works**
  - Clarify roles and responsibilities across all the elements of the Global Partnership (Secretariat including country support, advocacy, partnerships, financing and monitoring and evaluation, Board and Committee structures, Local Education Groups ("LEGs"), Constituency Meetings, Supervising Entities and Managing Entities).
  - Clarify roles and responsibilities of the different partners and entities of the Global Partnership at global level and country level.
  - Clearly set out structure and coordination mechanisms to promote efficiency.
  - Focus on the way the partnership adds value through expertise and knowledge in order to achieve the strategic objectives, especially in partner countries.
  - How the Secretariat links up its advocacy and policy work at the country level.
  - Arrive at a shared understanding of the core GPE business model and its modalities, approaches and levers, into which the strategic objectives, and the work related to achieving them, can be integrated.
- **Strengthen the evidence base and business case for GPE thematic priorities and interventions**
  - What kind of evidence does the Global Partnership need to inform the next strategy? What type of evidence does the Global Partnership itself want to generate?
  - Refine how the Global Partnership can add value at the country level and provide strong evidence and a business case for including thematic objectives and related activities in the new Strategic Plan.
  - Show the links and interrelationship between strategic priorities, evidence and activities.
- **Estimate resource and capacity requirements of partners and the Secretariat to deliver**
  - Do we need to think differently about how we finance the work of the Global Partnership and levelling of the playing field on the financing side in recognition of a changing global economic landscape?
- **Develop clear operational structures for the delivery of the Strategic Plan/Implementation Plan**
  - What is the most optimal and effective approach to the delivery mechanisms and Secretariat engagement in a manner that is not duplicative?
- **Develop clear monitoring framework to track results and demonstrate the Global Partnership's value.**
  - What is the Global Partnership trying to achieve and what results and evidence does it want to see that are measurable, impactful and attributable?
  - What should the Global Partnership's theory of change be (global and country level)?

ATTACHMENT 2: TECHNICAL REFERENCE GROUPS

TRGs have two principal functions: **advice** – in large measure at the request of the Global Partnership, inviting advice in response to issues or ongoing activities; they also act as an opportunity to facilitate **collaboration** – TRG members can be involved in the development or review of a new tool, proposal for funding etc. The aim is to create a mechanism by which individuals and organizations can provide their advice and collaborate with the Secretariat on key strategic objectives. In order to be inclusive, TRG information is published on the GPE website, with contact information for those interested in joining them.

Strategic Objective	TRG	Chair(s)	Secretariat focal point
SO1: Fragile and Conflict-Affected States	Yes	Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly | Save the Children Email: j.oreilly@savethechildren.org GPE website: http://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/conflict-affected-and-fragile-states	**Jesper Anderson,** Sr. Policy Advisor jandersen@globalpartnership.org W + 1 202 458 7308
SO2: Girls' Education	Yes	Nora Fyles | UNGEI Secretariat Email: nfyles@unicef.org T: +1-212-326-7375 Fanny Gazagne | Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France Email: fanny.gazagne@diplomatie.gouv.fr T: +33 (0)1.43.17.72.64 GPE website: https://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/girls-education UNGEI website: http://www.ungei.org/	**Aya Kibesaki,** Sr. Country Operations Officer akibesaki@globalpartnership.org W + 1 202 458 5541 • M + 1 202 444 1234
SO3: Learning Outcomes	Several sub-groups, no Chair	The Secretariat is facilitating identification of four subchairs. GPE website: http://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/learning-outcomes	**Aigly Zafeirakou,** Sr. Education Specialist azafeirakou@globalpartnership.org W+ 1 202 473 3416
SO4: Teachers Effectiveness	Yes	***Edem Adubra***, Head of the Secretariat, International Teacher Task Force on Teachers for EFA, UNESCO, T: +33(0)1 45 68 15 58, Fax: +33(0)1 45 68 56 26, E-mail: e.adubra@unesco.org GPE website: http://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/teachers Teachers Task Force: www.teachersforefa.unesco.org	**Hugues Moussy,** Sr. Country Operations Officer hmoussy@globalpartnership.org W+ 1 202 473 4391 • F + 1 202 522 3923
SO5: Financing (and Systems Strengthening)	No	Creation of an ad hoc group for the strategic plan.	**Edouard Lamont,** Sr. Country Operations Officer elamot@globalpartnership.org W+ 1 202 473 1322

The above list and A Terms of Reference for ("TOR") for the Technical Reference Groups is available on the GPE website: http://www.globalpartnership.org/strategy

ANNEX 3 –Participant list of the SPC face-to-face meeting October 9-10, 2014

Committee Members	Title and Organization	Representing
Joseph Nhan O'Reilly - Chair	Senior Education Adviser, Save the Children	n/a
David Atchoarena	Director, Teacher Development & Higher Education, UNESCO	Multilateral Agencies
Olav Christensen	Senior Public Finance Specialist, World Bank, *Alternate for* Claudia Costin (portion)	Multilateral Agencies
Claudia Costin	Senior Director of Education, World Bank	Donor Partners
Stellan Arvidsson Hyving	Lead Policy Specialist, Education, Swedish International Development Agency, Sweden	Donor Partners
Ruth Levine	Director, Global Development and Population Program, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	Private Sector/ Foundations
Natasha de Marcken	Director, Office of Education, Bureau of Economic Growth, Education and Environment, USAid, *Alternate for* Maggie Koziol, Senior Policy Advisor, USAid	Multilateral Agencies
Bishwa Prakash Pandit	Secretary, Ministry of Education, Nepal	Developing Country Partners
Dennis Sinyolo	Senior Coordinator, Education and Employment, Education International	CSOs
Francisco Gutiérrez Soto	Head of Education Division, Spanish Agency for International Development and Cooperation, Spain	Donor Partners
Secretariat Staff		
Alice Albright	CEO (portion)	
Karen Mundy	Chief Technical Officer and SPC Focal Point	
Johanna Van Dyke	Board Operations Officer and SPC Governance Support	
Jesper Andersen	Senior Policy Advisor	
Jean-Marc Bernard	Monitoring and Evaluation Team Lead (portion)	
Charles Tapp	Manager, Partnerships and External Relations Team (portion)	
Victoria Egbetayo	Partnership Specialist (portion)	
Sarah Beardmore	Advocacy Officer (by phone) (portion)	
Margarita Focas Licht	Acting Country Support Team Lead (portion)	
Aglaia Zafeirakou	Senior Education Officer (portion)	
Aya Kibesaki	Country Lead (portion)	
Hugues Moussy	Country Lead (portion)	
Edouard Lamot	Country Lead (portion)	
Guests during Session on Strategic Plan Implementation Plan		
Edem Adubra, Teachers Task Force (by phone)		
Mark Waltham, UNICEF (by phone)		
Sreerupa Mitra, UNICEF (by phone)		
Sherine Lutfeali, Save the Children (by phone)		
Paul Collins, USAid (by phone)		
Nora Fyles, UNGEI (by phone)		
Observers		
Patrick Collins, Team Leader, Basic Education, USAid (by phone)		
Committee Members Absent with Apologies		
S.E. Maker Mwangu Famba	Minister of Education, DRC	Developing Country Partners
Solomon Shiferaw	Director, EMIS, Planning and Resource Mobilization Directorate, Ethiopia	Developing Country Partners