1.0 Strategic

Implementation of GPE strategic plan

- Implementation Plan
- Partner Commitments
- Monitoring mechanisms
- Mandate of GPE Secretariat/Board

Support to the education sector in developing countries

- Support to Education Sector Plans
- Engagement strategy
- GPE role in Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crisis (EEiPC)
- Operational modalities

2.0 Programmatic

Program implementation and oversight

- Quality assurance process
- SE/ME oversight
- Program Implementation Timeline
- Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at country level
- New Funding Model - support to countries
- Implementation modalities

Data and results

- Quality data
- Program Implementation Modality
- Grant Management

3.0 Financial & Fiduciary

Available resources

- Donor pledges
- DCPs pledges
- Alternative funding
- Liquidity

Fiduciary

- Fraud and misuse

4.0 Governance & Management

Decision making process

- GPE decision making process
- Grant decision making process
- Risk Management
- Board governance responsibilities

Functioning and mandate of Secretariat

- Media exposure
- World Bank - Secretariat hosting arrangement
- Secretariat capacity

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

	Impact			
Probablity	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
Very Likely	Medium	High	Critical	Critical
Likely	Low	Medium	High	Critical
Possible	Low	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

1.0 Strategic

Risk that threaten the achievement of Global Partnership's strategic objectives.

1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan

1.1.1	The risk that the Board and Management have not developed a realistic and achievable implementation plan to support the achievement of Strategic Plan goals and objectives.	
1.1.2	The risk that GPE Partners fail to deliver on commitments made in achieving GPEs Strategic Plan Objectives.	
1.1.3	The risk that the Partnership is unable to monitor and demonstrate progress on Strategic Plan Objectives.	
1.1.4	The risk that Board members do not share a common agreement on the mandate of the Board and the Secretariat.	

1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries

1.2.1	The risk that the partnership does not address the sustainability of education systems in Education Sector Plans.	
1.2.2	The risk that GPE is unable to positively influence education budgets at country level.	
1.2.3	The risk that the partnership is unable to define its mandate in Education and Emergencies and Protracted Crisis in both GPE and non GPE member countries.	
1.2.4	The risk that GPE processes do note take sufficient account of the level of national capacity and the operating environment, particularly in conflict-affected states.	

2.0 Programmatic

Risk related to the implementation of the Global Partnership's programs at country level.

2.1 Program implementation and oversight

2.1.1	The risk that GPEs quality assurance processes do not always detect poorly designed programs at country level (both in terms of substance and oversight) and ensure they are remedied.	
2.1.2	The risk that SE/MEs are not always providing effective oversight.	
2.1.3	The risk that grant objectives are not achieved within the expected implementation period.	
2.1.4	The risk that roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the GPE Secretariat, LEGs, CAs, SEs and MEs in country are not clearly defined, understood and consistently applied.	
2.1.5	The risk of disruption in GPE activities due to problems in the implementation of the new funding model.	

2.1.6 The risk that a country can not identify a SE/ME.	

2.2 Data and results

2.2.1 The risk that the Partnership is unable to capture reliable data to monitor and demonstrate performance of GPE grants, activities and ESP.	
2.2.2 The risk to GPE that by not using government systems, GPE will not realize sufficient progress in the sector.	
2.2.3 The risk to GPE that poor performing grants are not all detected and remedied in a timely manner.	

3.0 Financial & Fiduciary

Risk concerned with the management and control of Global Partnership resources; and risk that funds are not used for the intended purposes, do not achieve value for money, and/or are not properly accounted for. The realization of fiduciary risk can be due to a variety of factors, including lack of capacity, competency or knowledge; bureaucratic inefficiency; and/or corruption.

3.1 Available resources

3.1.1 The risk that donors fail to deliver on their current funding pledges.	
3.1.2 The risk that some DCPs fail to deliver on their current pledges.	
3.1.3 The risk that GPE fails to attract alternative sources of funding or additional funding.	
3.1.4 The risk that the GPE Fund has insufficient funds and liquidity to meet its current and planned funding obligations.	

3.2 Fiduciary

3.2.1 The risk that significant GPE funds are diverted from their intended purpose through fraud or other forms of misuse.	

4.0 Governance & Management

Risk related to weak governance structures, lack of clarity in roles between the Board and the Secretariat, risk due to inadequate or failed internal processes, people and systems.

4.1 Decision making process

4.1.1 The risk that GPE decision making is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.	

4.1.2 The risk that GPE decision making with regard to grants is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.	
4.1.3 The risk that Board and Management do not systematically take risk into consideration while taking decisions.	
4.1.4 The risk that some Board members do not understand their governance responsibilities.	

4.2 Functioning and mandate of Secretariat

4.2.1 The risk that GPE does not have sufficient capabilities to deal with a serious media crisis.	
4.2.2 The risk that the Secretariat may become less effective and efficient due to operational challenges of the hosting arrangement and the current restructuring within the World Bank.	
4.2.3 The risk that the Secretariats technical capacity, organizational structure, financial, and human resources are not sufficient to deliver on the responsibilities assigned to it by the Board.	

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.1.1 Implementation Plan

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan
Risk Definition	The risk that the Board and Management have not developed a realistic and achievable implementation plan to support the achievement of Strategic Plan goals and objectives.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Loss of focus on core objectives which may lead to failure to deliver on strategic goals.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The impact of not having a new strategic plan and implementation plan would cause severe damage to the Global Partnerships ability to perform. The Secretariat recommends to change the impact from moderate to major.
Probability	Unlikely | The risk is seen as unlikely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The Board will take a decision regarding the new strategic plan and its implementation plan in December 2015.The Secretariat recommends to change the probability from likely to unlikely. The overall risk score would remain medium
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	Karen Mundy |

Mitigation Measures

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
For the current Strategic Plan : continue initiated work to refocus and prioritize the activities that have the most added value and are achievable within the remaining timeframe	Karen Mundy	Technical Reference Group/SPC/Board	Completed
For the next Strategic Plan: develop a new Strategic Planning Process, agree on implementable goals and develop an implementation plan focused on GPE's added value with objective measures for tracking progress.	Karen Mundy	Board Chair/CC/Alice Albright	In progress

Comments

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• Consultation Process (online survey, webinars, etc...) is in a very advance stage, with significant inputs from all Partners
• Independent Evaluation provided further inputs on the structuring of the strategic plan
• SPC will provide their observations to the various Strategic Plan components and it will be discussed further in the Board Retreat mid-October

Update as of 03/2015
• Strategic Planning Process prepared, including consultations strategy and under implementation

General Comments

SPC, October 2015
SPC Chair noted the risk speaks both to the existing plan, as well as the new one. The Committee did not recommend any changes to the risk or the update provided by the Secretariat.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.1.2 Partner Commitments

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE Partners fail to deliver on commitments made in achieving GPEs Strategic Plan Objectives.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	 Stable
Risk Consequence	Limited success in implementation of strategic plan and increased risk of loss of funding.
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The Independent Evaluation is mentioning the current difficulty of tracking GPE's added value, which can be linked to the difficulty of monitoring GPE's partner delivery on commitments to the current strategic plan. The Secretariat still evaluates the impact as moderate.
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The probability remains likely because in the current plan it's very difficult to monitor the implementation due to the lack of results framework. The overall risk score remains medium
Risk Owner(s)	SPC | Board
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Remove deliverables that have no credible and tangible partner assigned to support delivery.	Karen Mundy	Victoria Egbetayo	Completed
Monitor whether GPE Partners follow on their commitments. Have periodic meetings to discuss means of accelerating progress on deliverables under the Implementation Plan of the Strategic Plan.	Karen Mundy	SPP	In progress

Comments

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• As of December, GPE will have a new Results Framework which will supersede and enable the Partnership to monitor.

Update as of 03/2015
• For the current Strategic Plan: Implementation Plan has been reviewed and revised and endorsed at the Board. Presentation and discussion of the revised plan at the DCP meeting in December.

General Comments

SPC, October 2015
SPC Chair noted that if applied to the current strategic plan, there is less and less risk with just a few months to go and the SPC has monitored it extensively, but when applied to the new strategic plan it is an issue and a challenge. SPC recommends that if this risk is part of the new risk registry applicable to the new strategic plan, the Board would be best situated to own the risk and be accountable for it.

SPC, April 2015
SPC determined that the risk was accurately classified as 'medium risk.' It also noted that the risk had been significantly mitigated in that the revised implementation plan for the current strategic plan had eliminated deliverables from partners and instead focused on what the Secretariat could feasibly deliver on its own.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.1.3 Monitoring mechanisms

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan
Risk Definition	The risk that the Partnership is unable to monitor and demonstrate progress on Strategic Plan Objectives.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	Failure to achieve and demonstrate results and impact. Loss of credibility and inability to articulate GPE's value-added.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The impact to the Global Partnership of not being able to demonstrate GPE's added-value remain stable. The impact trend will change after the adoption of the new Strategic Plan and the Results Framework.
Probability	Unlikely | The risk is seen as unlikely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The new strategic plan will include a theory of change, a results framework with indicators, targets and timelines to allow for improved monitoring and demonstration of progress during implementation. If the Board regularly monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan, the risk is less certain to occur in the next 3 years. The Secretariat recommends to change the probability trend from very likely to unlikely. This change would impact the overall risk score from critical to medium.
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Define the theory of change, design upfront a results framework as part of the Strategic Plan with indicators, targets and timelines to track progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.	Karen Mundy	Strategy, Policy and Performance Team, SPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Significant progress on the aboved mentionned actions in preparatoin to the Board Retreat in October
• SPC to assess the progress of the work, provide observations and support on the Concept Note, including the theory of change, results framework

Implement and maintain regular reporting on the progress of all partners against the results framework	Karen Mundy	Strategy, Policy and Performance Team	Not Started

General Comments

SPC, October 2015
SPC agreed that the overall risk is decreasing. it was noted that given the near end of the current strategic plan and the substantive work completed on creating a framework for monitoring progress in the new plan, no changes to the dashboard were needed.

Existing assurance arrangments
• Secretariat – Strategy, Policy and Performance Team takes account of risk while currently leading development of new plan
• CC/SPC – Overseeing development of new plan
• Board – Actively engaged in development of new plan

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.1.4 Mandate of GPE Secretariat/Board

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan
Risk Definition	The risk that Board members do not share a common agreement on the mandate of the Board and the Secretariat.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	Inability of GPE to meet its strategic goals.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged.
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Given extensive work on the strategic plan, consultations/outreach and feedback, the Secretariat recommends to change the probability from likely to possible. The overall risk will change from critical to high.
Risk Owner(s)	Board | Alice Patterson Albright
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Prioritize GPE and Secretariat activities through the development and maintenance of a Board and Committees annual workplan. Comments	Padraig Power	Alice Albright	Under development
Update as of 10/2015 • Secretariat will continue to develop and monitor Board and Committees annual workplan.			
GPE partners to respect the Board-endorsed work plan of the Secretariat and seek Board endorsement for major Secretariat activity outside of the agreed work plan. Comments	Charles William Nicolas Tapp	Padraig Power	In progress

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• Board approved a six month extension of funding (for pre-Board DCP Constituency meeting) through December 2015.
• A progress/evaluation report will be submitted to the Board in December 2015 on the results/value added of the constituency meetings. A proposal for a multiyear support for DCP constituency meeting will be put forth to the Board for consideration in the Board of Directors meeting in December 2015.

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• Board - Retreat to consider key strategic issues and direction of GPE
• Board - Intensive Engagement of Board members in development of new Strategic Plan
• Secretariat - Support to Board members, Committee members, and Constituencies to ensure greater understanding and engagement in GPE activities. This includes DCP constituency meetings and Board orientation.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.2.1 Support to Education Sector Plans

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries
Risk Definition	The risk that the partnership does not address the sustainability of education systems in Education Sector Plans.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	May lead to unsustainability of improvements made in education through GPE grants after their completion.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Unchanged
Risk Owner(s)	CGPC |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation	Status
Monitor and report on the implementation of the new Funding Model, focusing on the compliance of preparation of the grant application with the Funding Model requirements.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The FY 2015 Portfolio Review includes an assessment of the 3 ESPIG applications done under the New Funding Model. It focuses on compliance with NFM requirements.
• Ongoing monitoring of implementation progress will continue FY 2016.

Update as of 03/2015
• Implementation of new funding model on track for first round 2015
• Grant guidelines updated and piloted, including requirements matrix to assess status of ESP, data and financial commitments
• Monitoring and reporting on compliance discussed at CGPC
• Monitoring systems under development in CST Monitoring Unit.

DCP constituency meetings should serve as a platform for collective discussion and decision making on issues of concern, while also sharing experience.	Michelle Mesen	DCPs	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• On October 2015 DCP constituency meeting will be held for the 12 DCP Focal Points represented on the Board of directors. In addition to discussing the Board decisions in order to arrive at a consensus, the meeting will include a technical session on the Strategic Plan
• A December 2015 DCP constituency meeting will be held for the 60+ DCP Focal Points in Uganda. This meeting will be the first time that all six DCP constituencies gather as a whole, rather than divided by Africa and Rest of World regions. In addition to discussing the Board decisions in order to arrive at a consensus, and participating in a school visit, a technical discussion will also be organized on a theme to be decided.
• A progress/evaluation report will be presented to the Board in December 2015, highlighting the added value and impact of the DCP constituency meetings on DCP engagement and contributions to the partnership overall, to justify continued financing of these meetings beyond 2015.

Update as of 03/2015
• December DCP meetings included technical session on new funding model
• May DCP meetings to include technical session on credible ESP.

Develop technical assistance services and processes to develop credible ESPs	Raphaelle Martinez		Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Revised Guidelines for Plan Preparation and Appraisal (IIEP/GPE) of credible ESPs have been published and disseminated to GPE partners countries in FY 2015 – Q4. Methodology for conducting Education Sector Analysis (UNICEF, UNESCO, WB, GPE) have been translated in Spanish.
• Guidelines for transitional plan preparation plan guidelines are currently being developed. They would provide guidance on how to develop credible TEPs and what are the key criteria that speak for the credibility of transitional plans .
• Minimum standards are defined for ESP credibility on the basis of the Plan Preparation Guidelines. A methodology is defined to assess the credibility criteria and best advise the countries on their readiness to meet the criteria and to identify areas where additional technical support would be needed.
• GPE Secretariat is piloting a cross-country knowledge and experience sharing/ south-south approach for 3 countries conducting their ESA and developing their ESPs along the same timelines. The first workshop aimed at supporting the countries in developing comprehensive road maps for efficient planning processes before the actual development of ESP. The initiative is being documented to be eventually replicated among other pools of countries.
• As a continuation of facilitating capacity building on south-south exchange basis, GPE Secretariat is participating financially and technically in the design of Capacity Development workshops together with UNICEF and Pole de Dakar for building the capacities of GPE country partners and development agencies in using Education Sector Analysis findings in the stage of policy and strategy formulation.

Update as of 03/2015
• Guidelines for Education Plan Preparation and Appraisal updated in line with new funding model in collaboration with UNESCO IIEP.

LEGs members engage more with governments on development and implementation of education sector plans and report any difficulty to the Secretariat.	Douglas Chester Lehman	LEGs	In progress

Comments

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• GPE Secretariat Country Leads are working with countries planning to apply in 2016 on the initial drafts of the GPE Funding Model Fixed Part Matrix which encourages LEG partners to engage on ESP-related topics.
• LEG partners engage in discussions with government on the selection of Funding Model Variable Part indicators and targets, assessing risk and appropriateness, including issues of financial sustainability, quality of data, timing of interventions, etc.
• GPE Secretariat increasingly present in Joint Sector Reviews; use of GPE Sector Monitoring Initiative matrix highlights importance of government-produced sector plan implementation reports and participatory nature of process.

Update as of 03/2015
• LEG members in Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda engaged with governments on ESP in context of NFM preparations.
• Discussions begun with second group of countries in Q1 2015.

Develop quality assurance processes and services to support ESP development and appraisal	Hugues Moussy	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• A Quality Assurance Review process for ESPs is under development. It will be presented to CGPC in October.
• Guidelines for transitional plan appraisal are currently being developed.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.2.2 Engagement strategy

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE is unable to positively influence education budgets at country level.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Failure to make progress toward achieving GPE's strategic goals.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Unchanged Risk
Risk Owner(s)	DCPs |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Identify priority countries, develop an engagement strategy and encourage LEGs members to engage and support DCP.	Raphaelle Martinez	Edouard Lamot/LEGs/SE/ME	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • The Secretariat is working on detailing the technical specifications of the Funding Model requirement on domestic financing that will be the common ground for assessing and monitoring countries' commitments in the area. This will constitute the basis for elaborating methodological guidelines for domestic resource mobilization to be developed later in FY 2016. Update as of 03/2015 • Domestic Financing discussed as part of New Funding Model requirements in Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda.			
Monitor the implementation of the requirement on domestic financing in the new funding model and regularly brief the Board on progress against commitments.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	LEGs/DCPs/Jeff Ramin	In progress
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
•For the first three applications approved in May 2015, it became evident that a clearer methodology to assess domestic commitments was needed. This is being finalized and will be used by the Secretariat to systematically guide and monitor domestic finance discussions at country level across the portfolio.

Update as of 03/2015
• Secretariat development of Monitoring Function underway as part of Organizational Change process.

Support civil society coalitions to build their capacities and engage in the LEGs.	CSOs	Natalie Poulson, PERT	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• A cross-team Quality Assurance Review (QAR) panel reviewed the revised proposal in September and made a recommendation for approval. The revised proposal will go to the CGPC on September 28, 2015. Committee members will have one month to review and provide written questions/comments before a decision is taken at the October committee meeting. The QAR panel has advised that it will continue to work with GCE to refine portions of the results framework before implementation.

Update as of 03/2015
• New CSEF grant reviewed by the CGPC and then sent to Board for approval in May

General Comments

Attachments

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.2.3 GPE role in Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crisis (EEiPC)

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries
Risk Definition	The risk that the partnership is unable to define its mandate in Education and Emergencies and Protracted Crisis in both GPE and non GPE member countries.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	GPE may be expected to play central role in certain crises where children's education is affected but without mandate, staffing or funding, would not be able to fulfill this role.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Due to the high figures of children being affected by EiEPC it will have negative impact for GPE not being able to carry out its work and fulfill its mandate to provide education to all children.
Probability	Unlikely | The risk is seen as unlikely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The Board will decide to what extend EiEPC should be reflected in the Strategic Plan. The Secretariat recommends to change the probability from possible to unlikely. The overall risk score would remain medium.
Risk Owner(s)	SPC |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Define GPE's role, policy and operational modalities in education in emergencies and protracted crisis, in both GPE and non GPE countries.	Jesper Andersen	Margarita Focas Licht	Under development

Comments

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• Despite the relatively slow progress on defining the operational model for a Platform and Fund for EEiPC, it's expected to be clearer towards end 2015 beginning of 2016. This would provide for GPE a better opportunity to define the Partnership's role within the Global context related to EiEPC
• Active Participation within the Champion's Advocacy Group and the Technical Strategy Group
• Active communication on different platforms, including INEE.
• GPE is currently reviewing/updating all operational guidelines regarding GPE support to Conflict Affected and Fragile States.

Update as of 03/2015
• Meetings with key partners on an ongoing basis
• Operational Model for EEiCEducation Fund is beeing developped. Focus will be on broader definition of humanitarian crisis

General Comments

SPC, October 2015
SPC Chair noted that the SPC had recognized this risk as a higher-level risk at its previous meeting, and assessed the risk as medium and stable. He noted that an external process led by an external group - the Technical Strategy Group – is now responsible for delivering on the issue, and the SPC could thus not be held accountable. In the event that external process does not deliver, the question will come back to the SPC. Suggestion to transfer the risk to the Board.

SPC, April 2015
The SPC determined that the risk were accuratly classified as medium. The Committee noted that the risk was being mitigated sufficiently in that the Board was addressing the issue and a proposal from a dedicated external working group to address the issue was underway, including a possible role for the Global Partnership. With the Board responsible for defining the mandate, the Secretariat at that meeting pointed out that Risk 1.2.3. might best have ownership of it transferred to the Board.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	1.2.4 Operational modalities

Risk Category / Sub-Category	1.0 Strategic / 1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE processes do note take sufficient account of the level of national capacity and the operating environment, particularly in conflict-affected states.
Overall Risk Score	Critical
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	Failure to increase the number of children who have access to education in fragile and conflict affected states.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Decreasing as GPE further strengthens its Operational Platform
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Apply and review as needed existing policies such as the Operational Framework, Accelerated Funding and Transition Education Sector Plans.	Margarita Focas Licht	Jesper Andersen, Fazle Rabani, Sven Baeten	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• 2015 Portfolio Review includes a section on how the GPE mechanisms have been applied in countries in crisis over the past year, highlighting strengths and weaknesses. Further work is planned in 2015/16 to assess these mechanisms.
• Guidelines for transitional plan preparation plan guidelines are currently being developed. They would provide guidance on how to develop credible TEPs and what are the key criteria that speak for the credibility of transitional plans.

Update as of 03/2015
• Development of guidelines for transitional ESPs launched with UNESCO IIEP
• Portfolio Review 2015 to include sections to analyze implementation of Accelerated Funding and Operational Framework
• Capacity assessment at the local level will be an important feature for a possible Humanitarian Funding Mechanism and will influence current guidelines and operational framework related to accelerated funding.

Examine whether adjustments to GPE's operating model, particularly widening the range of delivery partners, would help to ensure GPE assistance is suitable for the country context.	Padraig Power	Margarita Focas Licht	Completed

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
•Reference Group recommendations are substantial and include developing an Operational Risk Framework for GERF review in 2016 to allow a more differentiated approach to quality assurance and monitoring in these contexts
• Both Save the Children and Concern are now accredited SE/MEs and Save the Children are in discussion to manage grants in GPE countries.

Update as of 03/2015
• Integrated into Strategic Planning process on Workstream 1
• Ongoing assessment of new SE/ME

Implementation of Reference Group recommendations on strengthening the Operational Platform	Margarita Focas Licht	Padraig Power	In progress

Comments

Subject to Board endorsment of the Reference Group recommendations - significant work is scheduled to be completed by June 2016

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• LEG/DCP – Choice of Managing Entity or Supervising Entity arrangements
• SE/MEs –take account of the risks during design of the program.
• Secretariat – Applies existing policies such as the Operational Framework, Accelerated Funding and Transitional Education Sector Plans, and focuses on this risk during Quality Assurance Review.
• CGPC - Considers as part of proposal review
• Board - ensures Secretariat is adequately resourced, oversees any changes to the operational model as part of strategic planning process, expanded eligibility to increase number and type of SEs/MEs that can operate in fragile and conflict affected states.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.1 Quality assurance process

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk that GPEs quality assurance processes do not always detect poorly designed programs at country level (both in terms of substance and oversight) and ensure they are remedied.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Poorly designed grants at country level that are difficult to implement and do not achieve desired results.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged.
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The probability trend will decrease when the new (for ESPs) and strengthened (for programs) quality assurance processes will have been fully implemented.
Risk Owner(s)	CGPC |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Redesign and strengthen the quality assurance process, including clarifying roles and responsibilities of actors involved (DPC, LEGs, SE/LE, Secretariat, CGPC) including stronger focus on fiduciary arrangements.	Hugues Moussy	Sven Baeten/All Partners	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The quality assurance process for programs (QAR 1 and 2) has been revised to comply with the new funding model. The requirements for the fixed part are assessed in QAR 1, and the indicators for the variable part in QAR 2, alongside with the program document. This new process is detailed in the Education Sector Plan Implementation Grant guidelines. Roles and responsibilities for partners involved have been clarified.
• The process to strengthen the quality assurance process for programs (QAR 1, 2 and 3) is ongoing and will be finalized in December 2015. It will include (i) refined minimum standards for the quality of programs, (ii) strengthened peer-review mechanisms within Secretariat to make better use of internal expertise, (iii) a clear delimitation between support to country work (by CST) and quality assurance process to avoid conflicts of interest, (iv) development of an assessment framework for CGPC so as to better align the committee's final recommendation with the Secretariat's quality assurance process. The creation of an GPE-appointed Technical Review Group to independently appraise the quality of programs is also envisaged.

Update as of 03/2015
• Integrated in Quality Assurance Review development
• SPP Team being strengthened with recruitment of Staff specifically dedicated to quality assurance.

Monitor and evaluate on a periodic basis whether quality assurance process is identifying weaknesses in education sector plans and grant applications.	Hugues Moussy	Raphaelle Martinez/Padraig Power/CGPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The revision of the methodology to assess the quality of ESPs has been finalized. It will help feed the corporate indicator on the quality of ESPs and draw lessons on both support given to countries to develop credible ESPs, and the value of ESP quality assurance process.
• Such a methodology is to be developed for programs.

Update as of 03/2015
• Preliminary review of Quality Assurance Review conducted in 2014 and feeding into the process to develop Secretariat Qualify Assurance function
• Recruitment of Quality Assurance lead underway
• Quality Assurance Framework is being established.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.2 SE/ME oversight

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk that SE/MEs are not always providing effective oversight.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Inability to accurately achieve outcomes and evaluate progress and impact of GPE sponsored programs.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Decreasing
Risk Owner(s)	SE/ME |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Review all program supervision reports if not performed through joined sector reviews.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Valentina Toma; SE/ME	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• A process has been adopted for review of SE/ME progress reports on grant implementation to provide feedback and propose follow-up actions, and rollout has started.
• A mechanism is being rolled out for quarterly joint Secretariat/agency management review of grant portfolio by regions for the World Bank, at the global level for UNICEF and on a biannual basis for SEs managing 1-2 grants.

Update as of 03/2015
• Will be addressed in development of Monitoring Function through Organizational Change process
• The Country Leads, Monitoring Unit and Finance Officer review supervision and progress reports and provide comments and follow-up with the SE/ME.

Develop proposal for the GERF and Board to consider applying minimum standards to all new SE/ME(s) (including GPE partners) and consider if/how to apply minimum standards to existing SE/MEs.	Padraig Power		In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Board Reference Group has recommended adoption of Minimum Standards currently in place for INGOs to all SE/MEs
• If Board approves in October, GPE Secretariat will work with the SE/MEs to complete the review against the standards and report to GERF at its first meeting in 2016
• Secretariat has commenced information gathering to facilitate this review

Review all program audit received.	Valentina V. Toma	/ME/Thierno Diop	In progress

Comments

• Finance Team and the Country Leads review the audits and request follow up actions from SE/MEs, when necessary. Finance Team presents its comments in writing in a form of an internal Memo.
• As of 09/22/15, the Secretariat has received from SE/MEs 18 audit reports and has reviewed 11 of them, or 60%.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.3 Program Implementation Timeline

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk that grant objectives are not achieved within the expected implementation period.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Delays in program implementation leading to slow results and impact on the ground. Possible negative impact to GPE's ability to attract future funds.
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged.
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Unchanged.
Risk Owner(s)	DCPs |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Analyze root causes for delays in program implementation.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	SE/ME/CGPC	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • The disbursement and implementation status of all grants active during FY15 was analyzed and follow-up actions proposed for the FY 15 Portfolio Review. A standard methodology for assessing implementation is being developed. • A process has been adopted for review of SE/ME progress reports on grant implementation to provide feedback and propose follow-up actions, and rollout has started. • A mechanism is being rolled out for quarterly joint Secretariat/agency management review of grant portfolio by regions for the World Bank, at the global level for UNICEF and on a biannual basis for SEs managing 1-2 grants. Update as of 03/2015 • More attention to program "readiness" using a checklist by Country Leads and Monitoring Unit following grant approval is proposed to reduce implementation delays.			
During the proposal development stage, precisely define objectives and targets and a realistic timeline for implementation.	Sven Baeten	LEGs	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• New ESPIG policy has strict rules on grants start date.

Update as of 03/2015
• Clearer guidance provided in revised ESPIG Guidelines.

Monitor at risk grants and engage earlier with corrective action including potential cancellation or mandatory reprogramming of grants.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Country Leads/Valentina Toma/CGPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The CST has established an ongoing process for regular monitoring of at risk and other priority grants to focus on implementation progress and to identify from SE/ME progress reports issues requiring follow-up actions.
• A mechanism is being rolled out for quarterly joint Secretariat/agency management review of grant portfolio by regions for the World Bank, at the global level for UNICEF; and on a biannual basis for SEs managing 1-2 grants.

Update as of 03/2015
• Monitoring Unit being established to monitor the status of all grants and flags at risk grants to CLs for follow-up with SE/ME
• Corrective actions are discussed with the SE/ME and government.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.4 Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at country level

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk that roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the GPE Secretariat, LEGs, CAs, SEs and MEs in country are not clearly defined, understood and consistently applied.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	Poor quality of grant proposals, slow implementation, lack of adequate results and impact.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Decreasing as GPE is clarifying roles and responsibilities.
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Review current situation, identify gaps, define the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities and discuss with GERF and CGPC. CGPC makes proposal to Board on any revisions/changes to roles, responsibilities of actors at country level.	Margarita Focas Licht	Sven Baeten/Padraig Power/GERF/CGPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Board Reference Group work has made significant progress in this area.
• Subject to recommendations being adopted - further work will take place from October to June 2016.

Update as of 03/2015
• As Part of the development of the next Strategic Plan, SPP is conducting a thorough analysis of the current operational Model which will be integrated in workstream 1.

Board approves CGPC recommendations and Secretariat amends all relevant documents clarifying roles including the Charter, Country Level Process Guide, and FPAs.	Padraig Power	Margarita Focas Licht/Aya Kibesaki/Trustee/SE/ME	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Awaiting initial Board decision on Reference Group recommendations in October

Update as of 03/2015
• Roles and responsibilities addressed in Strategic Planning Process
• Revisions of governance documents will await the approval of the new Strategic Plan.

Monitor and evaluate if revisions clarify roles and responsibilities and have a positive effect on grant implementation, results and impact.	Padraig Power	Mathieu Smith	Not Started

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Part of the Board Reference Group recommendations is an increased emphasis on monitoring through a new GPE M&E Strategy. An interim approach will be ready by December with a more comprehensive approach agreed in June 2016

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• Secretariat – Country Level Process Guide outlines key roles and responsibilities at country level while Charter and other Governance documents cover the rest of partnership.
• SE/ME and Trustee – legal relationship outlined in the Financial Procedures Agreement
• SE and DCP – legal relationship outlined in Grant Agreements
• Committee – Committee TORs for all committees
• Board – Board operating procedures in place
• GERF – conducts annual review of governance arrangements

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.5 New Funding Model - support to countries

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk of disruption in GPE activities due to problems in the implementation of the new funding model.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Weak or rushed grants applications without proper planning.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Unchanged
Risk Owner(s)	Alice Patterson Albright |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation	Status
Develop guidelines and standardize and clarify GPE core processes (ESP quality assurance, QAR, monitoring) for country engagement, reduce ad hoc/non core communication and ensure procedures are implemented at country level.	Margarita Focas Licht	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• CLPG updated by July 2015 to reflect the new funding model. Operational Platform work will further clarify processes, roles and responsibilities including those of the Secretariat.
• CST at full capacity in terms of country leads and operations officers, enabling closer work with countries through fewer countries per person; organizational change process has offloaded tasks from country leads to focus on countries. Time management system with codes enable monitoring of time spent on core processes.

Update as of 03/2015
• Integrated in workstream 1 for the new Strategic Plan
• Development of a more defined Mitigation framework.

Redesign and strengthen the quality assurance process, including clarifying roles and responsibilities of actors involved (DPC, LEGs, SE/LE, Secretariat, CGPC) including stronger focus on fiduciary arrangements.	Hugues Moussy	All Partners, Sven Baeten	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The process to redesign and strengthen the quality assurance process for GPE programs (QAR 1, 2 and 3) will begin at the end of September.

Update as of 03/2015
• Integrated in Quality Assurance Function discussion. Integrated into WS 1 for the new Strategic Plan.
• Recruiting Senior Quality Assurance Officer and Senior Finance Officer.

Clarify how strictly the NFM requirements will be applied in all country contexts.	Sven Baeten	Hugues Moussy/CGPC	TBD

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Paper on application of variable part for grants under 5 million USD approved by the CGPC.
• Discussion paper on application of New Funding Model in Fragile and Conflict Affected States drafted for internal review.

Evaluate the outcome of the first round of country application around the new funding model and adjust guidelines based on lessons learned.	Margarita Focas Licht	Sven Baeten, CGPC	Not Started

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Outcome assessed in 2015 Portfolio Review for discussion with CGPC to determine next steps.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.1.6 Implementation modalities

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.1 Program implementation and oversight
Risk Definition	The risk that a country can not identify a SE/ME.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Prevent the use of the grant as identified in the forecast.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Implementation of the Eligibility Expansion Plan.	Padraig Power	LEGs	Completed
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
• The Plan is now complete. Concern Worldwide and Save the Children are accredited GPE SE/MEs.
• Both Switzerland and the Asian Development Bank are aslo in discussions to become eligible to act as an SE/ME.

Update as of 03/2015
• Negotiation of Financial Procedures Agreements with eligible INGOs underway

Consider options to GPE's current business model to broaden the range of implementation modalities to best suit the country context and submit them for consideration to the GERF.	Padraig Power	Margarita Focas Licht/Trustee/GERF	Under development
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
• The work on the circumstances in which GPE could operate without an SE/ME is scheduled for completion by June 2016.

Risk Dashboard

General Comments

Attachments

The Global Partnership for Education is the only multilateral partnership devoted to getting all children in to school for a quality education in the world's poorest countries.

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.2.1 Quality data
Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.2 Data and results
Risk Definition	The risk that the Partnership is unable to capture reliable data to monitor and demonstrate performance of GPE grants, activities and ESP.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	May hinder taking corrective action during program implementation articulating results and impact and demonstrating GPE value added.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Impact is downgrading because new systems and safeguards are being established.
Probability	Unlikely | The risk is seen as unlikely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	It's a high priority for the Partnership as a whole.
Risk Owner(s)	DCPs | SE/ME
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Ensure that data requirements in the New Funding Model are applied in all new program implementation grants.	Sven Baeten	CGPC/Margarita Focas Licht/Hugues Moussy	Under development
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Matrices on requirements of New Funding Model, including on data presented to CGPC. • Lessons learned on first grants approvals included in portfolio review to be presented to CGPC end of October.			
Develop M&E mechanisms, including minimum reporting requirements capturing key sector and grant level indicators, baselines, and targets and ensure regular reporting of the results.	Karen Mundy	Padraig Power	In progress
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
• Internal capacities have been strengthened at the Secretariat
• Cross-team efforts to secure, strengthen, monitor, define indicators and framework.
• Quality assurance of Education Sector Plans have been strengthen.
The Board Reference Group has made recommendations to strengthen M&E including the development of a menu of input level measurements to better capture the use of GPE grant resources.

Update as of 03/2015
• A pilot for annual progress reporting with Zanzibar and completion reporting with Rwanda have been started
• Discussions are ongoing with partners on common indicators.

Improve Secretariat services and processes to support required ESP Implementation Plans and allocate subsequent capacity to report on consolidated sector implementation.	Margarita Focas Licht	Raphaelle Martinez	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Fully staffed CST enables closer support to countries. Of 84 support missions to 52 member countries in FY15, 48 addressed sector planning including implementation plans. Countries preparing for a grant application that would otherwise not have included implementation plans are now doing so.
Methodology to monitor JSR quality has been developed and a baseline is being established.

Update as of 03/2015
• Discussion on Secretariat support to ESP process on DCP meeting agenda in May
• Monitoring tool for Secretariat support to country level processes under development.

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• SE/ME – include results frameworks to capture grant level targets with each proposal. Reports are provided to the Secretariat in accordance with SE/MEs own reporting procedures
• Secretariat – Grants are monitored and reported to the CGPC and Board through the Annual Portfolio Review. Sector performance provided in Results for Learning Report
• DCP/LEG – Joint Sector Reviews capture performance at sector level in each country and government's sector plan implementation report

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.2.2 Program Implementation Modality

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.2 Data and results
Risk Definition	The risk to GPE that by not using government systems, GPE will not realize sufficient progress in the sector.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	GPE will not be able to have the sector wide impact that it wishes to have without shifting its grant making and implementation modalities.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Improve Secretariat services and processes to support ESP preparation and appraisal, with early consultations on aid effectiveness and transparent dialogue on choice of modality and SE/ME.	Edouard Lamot	Raphaelle Martinez/SE/ME/LEGs	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Current work to develop Quality Assurance in ESP development which will include focus on aid effectiveness and modalities. • Secretariat is working on lessons learned of choices of modalities and SE/ME to improve GPE guidelines and support services to country partners. • The FY15 Portfolio Review includes an overview of use of government systems by grant, and this information is now including in the grant application format to ensure discussions on implementation modalities are held and reported on. • A proposed process for selection of SE/ME is integrated in the Operational Platform proposal to the Board.			
Define monitoring criteria and annually report on the use of modalities (modality screening tool, portfolio review, …). Improve ability of Secretariat to monitor and report on the use of modalities (modality screening tool, portfolio review, …).	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Sven Baeten/SE/ME/LEGs/CGPC	Under development
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
• A updated desk review of program modalities was conducted for the FY 15 Portfolio Review building on the method developed and assessment provided in the FY 14 Portfolio Review.
• A proposed process for SE/ME selection is integrated in the Operational Platform proposal to the Board and includes consideration of aligned modalities.

Update as of 03/2015
• Countries are now required to provide data on modalities in the ESPIG application form
• Information on modalities should also be provided in progress reports.

Explore options for GPE's business model to enable a wider range of delivery modalities to suit the country context, including the option of direct funding where national systems are deemed to be robust.	Padraig Power	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The work to explore the circumstances in which GPE may operate without an SE/ME is currently scheduled to be completed by June 2016.

Update as of 03/2015
• Addressed in Strategic Planning process.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	2.2.3 Grant Management

Risk Category / Sub-Category	2.0 Programmatic / 2.2 Data and results
Risk Definition	The risk to GPE that poor performing grants are not all detected and remedied in a timely manner.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Inability to achieve the objectives of the Funding Model and negative impact on countries.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	We are making efforts to better detect the poor performing grants and to work with partners to restructure these grants. However the risk remains that these actions may not significantly improve overall grant performance.
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The risk is still likely to occur within the next 3 years because the expense of nature and complexity of the grant portfolio and the fact that a large portion of these grants is executed under very difficult circumstances.
Risk Owner(s)	CGPC |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Analyze existing information and data to determine causes for performance issues/risks and define appropriate responses.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Valentina Toma	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The Monitoring Unit has begun working with CST Country Leads and the Ops Finance Team to review recent SE/ME progress reports on grant implementation to provide feedback and propose follow-up actions. This work will continue throughout the year.
• Quarterly management review meetings with agencies managing multiple grants and biannual meetings with those managing 2 or less being established.

Update as of 03/2015
• Updated information on risks and mitigation measures should be provided in regular progress reports.

Develop minimum standards for capturing key sector and grant information, baselines, and targets - monitor performance against these targets - identify corrective action as appropriate and agree on their implementation.	Thomas Jeffrey Ramin	Karen Mundy/M&E	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Preparation of GPE Strategic Plan Results Framework will help establish minimum standards for sector plan and grant program performance, on which basis CST and SPP will monitor performance and propose corrective actions as needed.
• Operational Platform proposal includes minimum standards for LEGs, ESPs and Programs.

Update as of 03/2015
• Discussions initiated with SE/ME partners on common grant program indicators to facilitate aggregation and analysis of program results.

Agree on roles and responsibilities with respect to performance and actions that may be taken in cases of non-performance.	Sven Baeten	CGPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• ESPIG Policy replacing Timeframes policy approved by the Board in May 2015 includes reporting requirements and sanctions in cases of non-performance.
• Operational Platform proposal includes conflict resolution mechanism.

Update as of 03/2015
• Preliminary Discussion on performance in CGPC retreat (Feb. 2015)
• Timeframes policy to be submitted to the Board (May 2015) to also tighten up deadlines for signing and implementing grants.

More frequent monitoring of program implementation and frequent country visits.	Margarita Focas Licht	Country Leads/Valentina Toma	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The capacity of the CST to focus on country support has increased through the organizational change process: 84 country visits to 52 member countries were carried out in FY15 compared to 59 missions to 44 countries in FY14.

Update as of 03/2015
• Tracking of country missions ongoing; Frequency of country visits steadily increasing.

Revise Timeframes Policy to tighten up deadlines for signing and implementing grants.	Sven Baeten		Completed

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Policy approved with tightened deadlines for signing and implementation of grants.

Update as of 03/2015
• To be submitted to the Board (May 2015)

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	3.1.1 Donor pledges

Risk Category / Sub-Category	3.0 Financial & Fiduciary / 3.1 Available resources
Risk Definition	The risk that donors fail to deliver on their current funding pledges.
Overall Risk Score	Critical
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Uncertainty about GPE's ability to honor current and future commitments.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Very Likely | The risk is seen as certain to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable at Possible
Risk Owner(s)	Donors |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Monitor conversion of donor pledges to contributions and the related impact on GPE's financial position through the financial forecast and publicize pledge delivery status on website.	Padraig Power	Karen Schroh, GERF	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Pledge Monitoring performed monthly within the Secretariat and incorporated within the Financial Forecast. • Some of the traditional donors will not be giving expected top ups to their pledge due to the refugee migration crisis. For ex. Denmark has cut its pledge by 1/3. Update as of 03/2015 • Update on status of pledges included in Financial Forecast and to be included in end 2014 financial reports due late March 2015			
Promote timely signature of Contribution Agreement to maximize pledge conversion (including multi-year contribution agreements).	Padraig Power	Karen Schroh	In progress
Comments			

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• Contribution Agreements have been signed with 16 out of 20 Donors that have made pledges.
• Significant delays have been encountered on the contribution agreement with the European Union due to complex contract negotiations between the European Commission and World Bank that have not yet been resolved.

Update as of 03/2015
• Trustee and Secretariat in discussion with multiple donors regarding completion of contribution agreements. 8 out of 18 have signed their contribution agreements by mid-March

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	3.1.2 DCPs pledges

Risk Category / Sub-Category	3.0 Financial & Fiduciary / 3.1 Available resources
Risk Definition	The risk that some DCPs fail to deliver on their current pledges.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Failure to make progress toward achieving GPE's strategic goals.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable- The Secretariat is working on a way to capture domestic funding commitments.
Risk Owner(s)	DCPs |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Track pledges and work with countries to strengthen dialogue with the Ministries of Finance.	Secretariat	PERT, CST/SPP/DCPs/LEGs	Not Started
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Ongoing Secretariat effort to define a methodology to track country pledges based on regular dialogue with countries. Secretariat will develop a Methodological Guidelines for Domestic Resource Mobilization. • Ongoing Development of a Corporate indicator on domestic financing (just the methodology): The indicator is the number of Developing Country Partners (DCPs) that have: (i) increased their public expenditure on education since joining GPE; or (ii) maintained education sector spending at 20% of the budget or above (cumulative) – due in the next couple of weeks.			
Improve strategies for efficiencies through new Funding Model to strengthen case for domestic financing of education.	Secretariat	LEGs	Not Started
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Paper on domestic finance requirements on the Funding Model to be presented to CGPC.			

General Comments

The Secretariat considers that this risk should be extended to Developing countries domestic financing for all GPE country partners and not to be limited to countries which have pledged in June 2014.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	3.1.3 Alternative funding
Risk Category / Sub-Category	3.0 Financial & Fiduciary / 3.1 Available resources
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE fails to attract alternative sources of funding or additional funding.
Overall Risk Score	Critical
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Insufficient funding to meet growing demands.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Likely | The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Increasing due to European refugee crisis diverting ODA resources.
Risk Owner(s)	Board |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Provide a stronger case for investing in GPE focused on measuring and reporting results and value-added.	Charles William Nicolas Tapp	Jeff Ramin/SPP	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Theory of Change and Results Framework being considered by the Board in October and December 2015 Board meeting. • The Board Reference Group have made recommendations on the development of a comprehensive M&E framework for GPE including the development of input level measurements to be able to report on the use of GPE grant resources against a menu of core inputs (e.g Teachers trained, textbooks distributed, schools built, Children Supported etc). Update as of 03/2015 • CST is developing a monitoring tool and system focused on six aspects of country level work • Cluster and logbook system in place to monitor country level work.			
Develop options paper considering forms of ear-marking or funding of special initiatives.	Padraig Power	Karen Schroh	Under development
Comments			

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• Strategic Financing scheduled for discussion at October Board retreat with Strategic Financing Paper due to Board in December.

Update as of 03/2015
• New Financing Mechanism Paper for discussion with GERF, CGPC and SPC.

Develop an overall strategy for fund mobilization (mitigate risk of mobilizing alternative funding whilst not alienating traditional donors).	Karen Michaela Schroh	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Options for new funding modalities have been included in the strategic planning process, if those are accepted, this could be an alternative source of funding.
• Continuous engagement with non-traditional donors as a mid to long term strategy and possibly not for this replenishment period.
• Active advocacy strategy for mobilizing new funds.

Private sector engagement strategy.	Lydia Wambui Murimi	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Corporate Alliance Guidelines have been developed and will be reviewed by the GERF in November.
• Once approved by the Board, the guidelines will facilitate the development of the Private Sector Strategy.

Update as of 03/2015
• Strategy framework developed and approved by the constituency.

Prepare an options paper on leverage financing (buy-downs and non-grant assistance) for discussion with the GERF.	Padraig Power	Under development

Comments

• Discussions are continuing with the Islamic Development Bank on possible collaboration including through debt-buy downs.
• Strategic Financing discussions and paper at October retreat and December meeting will address the issue of leverage financing.

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• Secretariat - Continue to engage with current and potential new donors to reach replenishment targets

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	3.1.4 Liquidity

Risk Category / Sub-Category	3.0 Financial & Fiduciary / 3.1 Available resources
Risk Definition	The risk that the GPE Fund has insufficient funds and liquidity to meet its current and planned funding obligations.
Overall Risk Score	Critical
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Insufficient funding to meet demands. Loss of credibility with partners and possible disruption to country planning and implementation of sector plans
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Very Likely | The risk is seen as certain to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable
Risk Owner(s)	GERF |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
GERF reviews the Financial Forecast to ensure prudent levels of allocations and recommend mitigation action to the Board if liquidity risks arise.	Padraig Power	GERF	In progress
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Financial Forecast for consideration at November 2015 meeting with recommendations on prioritization of resources Update as of 03/2015 • Financial Forecast submitted to GERF for April 2015 meeting with recommendations on prioritization of resources			
Donors provide flexibility on the timing of their contributions within a given year to meet cash flow needs of GPE Fund.	Padraig Power	GPE Fund Donors	In progress
Comments			

Update as of 10/2015
• Likely to be needed from 2016 especially if European Commission and World Bank cannot conclude contract negotiations in the near future to facilitate the pledge from the European Union.

Update as of 03/2015
• Currently not required to date in 2015 but likely to be needed from 2016 onwards.

GPE Secretariat explores with donors ways to mitigate the devaluation of local currencies.	Padraig Power	GPE Fund Donors	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Limited scope for substantial change with donors, however GPE actively discussing with World Bank possibilities for hedging including the development of a new World Bank policy in 2016.

Update as of 03/2015
• Ongoing dialogue between Secretariat and GPE Fund Donors.

General Comments

GERF May, 2015
GERF agreed to increase the overall score from medium to critical. The key reason for this change is the impact of the significant appreciation of the US dollar since the replenishment conference and its effect on reducing the projected value of non-US dollar based donor pledges to the GPE Fund.

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	3.2.1 Fraud and misuse

Risk Category / Sub-Category	3.0 Financial & Fiduciary / 3.2 Fiduciary
Risk Definition	The risk that significant GPE funds are diverted from their intended purpose through fraud or other forms of misuse.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Funds are not used for the intended purpose (or not properly accounted for). Possible loss of trust, credibility and funding.
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	PLEASE UPDATE
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	PLEASE UPDATE
Risk Owner(s)	DCPs | SE/ME
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Review the Misuse of funds policy, define criteria and agree on minimum standards for SE/MEs to monitor, notify and report in this area.	Padraig Power	Christine Guetin	Under development
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Board Reference Group has recommended adoption of minimum standards for SE/MEs. These minimum standards include ability to deal with fraud and misuse, including investigations, and protection of whistleblowers.			
Ensure new grant proposals have robust oversight arrangements on fraud prevention and detection.	Valentina V. Toma	Padraig Power	In progress
Comments			

Risk Dashboard

Update as of 10/2015
• The two financial management specialists have been recruited.
• All new grant applications reviewed by the Secretariat ensure that the implementing agencies have a strong quality assurance and fiduciary control systems in place, including on anti-corruption and fraud prevention.

Update as of 03/2015
• Recruitment of two financial management specialists at interview stage
• Work to commence in second half of 2015

Prepare exception reports for admin budget to highlight internal control risks; organize training for staff all relevant World Bank policies and procedures.	Padraig Power	Taru Bhargava	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• All Staff trained on World Bank procurement policies
• GPE Staff Travel Policy to be reviewed and updated by end of 2015

Ensure that applicable rules and principles related to preventing, detecting and correcting irregularities, misuse of funds and fraud are rigorously applied by SE/Mes to protect GPE resources.	Margarita Focas Licht	Padraig Power	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• All grant approval letters include a link and reference to GPE's Misuse of Funds policy
• GPE Secretariat has strengthened its capacity in this area through recruitment of two financial management specialists to support this aspect of the work in quality assurance reviews and monitoring of GPE grants.

Put on GPE website a reference to SE/ME fraud reporting tools so that outside parties know where to report allegations of fraud or misuse.	Alexandra Humme	Completed

Comments

Update as of 03/2015
http://www.globalpartnership.org/board-committees

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangments
• DCP - Implementing partners use their own systems and procedures to prevent and detect misuse of funds.
• LEG - All GPE partners are required to be alert to the potential for misuse and report suspected cases
• SE/ME - Applies their own policies and procedures in relation to misuse of funds while managing GPE Funds and complies with legal requirements in the Financial Procedures Agreement requiring that funds be repaid if misused and conditions in grant agreements include clauses for repayment if funds are misused by third parties
• Secretariat - Oversees application of “Misuse of Funds Policy” and liaises with relevant partners on suspected cases of misuse and considers the risk during Quality Assurance Reviews of funding proposals. Ensures completion of capacity assessments for SE/MEs other than Multilateral and Bilateral Agencies. Links to fraud reporting hotlines on GPE website.
• GERF - Ensures that this risk and relevant mitigation measures are appropriate through semi-annual reviews and updates on the risk management matrix. Reviews the findings of capacity level assessments for potential new SE/MEs and makes recommendations to the Board
• Board - Is informed of suspected or actual misuse cases and may take corrective action such as cancelling an allocation where necessary. Responsible for ensuring

risk management is appropriate. Has adopted minimum standards for new SE/MEs to be considered eligible to receive GPE Funds and is responsible for approving these entities after recommendation from the GERF.
• Other - Respective Internal and External oversight and audit functions of the World Bank are applied to the Secretariat operations and where the World Bank acts as SE (approximately 70% of grants). The internal and external oversight and audit functions of other SEs/MEs apply when they are recipients

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.1.1 GPE decision making process

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.1 Decision making process
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE decision making is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	May negatively impact speed and efficiency of execution and achieving expected outcomes at country level.
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable
Risk Owner(s)	GERF |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Review governance decision making process (areas that need Board approval or delegation of authority to Committee or Secretariat) and make recommendations to the Board on how to address any major impediments.	Christine Marie Beatrice Guetin	Sven Baeten, CGPC	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Board approved in May 2015 to delegate authority to the Country Grants and Performance Committee to approve material changes to grants, as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, and to approve accelerated funding for emergency and early recovery activities (in accordance with the Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations);
• Governance decision making process will be reviewed as part of the overall governance review.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.1.2 Grant decision making process

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.1 Decision making process
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE decision making with regard to grants is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Not aligning with countries planning cycle. Submission of rushed applications.
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Unchanged
Probability	Very Likely | The risk is seen as certain to occur within the next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Unchanged
Risk Owner(s)	CGPC |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Develop a proposal for delegating authority for non-controversial grants approval to CGPC to facilitate a more flexible approach to grant application dates.	Padraig Power	CGPC/Sven Baeten/Christine Guetin	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Board approved in May 2015 to delegate authority to the Country Grants and Performance Committee to approve material changes to grants, as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, and to approve accelerated funding for emergency and early recovery activities (in accordance with the Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations);
• The GERF, in consultation with the CGPC, will review the implementation of this delegation of authority and report to the Board at its next governance review.

Update as of 03/2015
• Proposal to streamline grants decision-making process for material changes and accelerated funding, to be discussed at GERF and CGPC April meetings.

Explore with SE/MEs business processes and incentives that can be adjusted in order to expedite commencement of newly approved grants.	Margarita Focas Licht	Operations/SE/ME	Not Started

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• It is expected that the strengthened Operational Platform will determine how this can be done, in particular through strengthened reflection on implementation modalities upstream in the selection of SE/MEs.

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.1.3 Risk Management

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.1 Decision making process
Risk Definition	The risk that Board and Management do not systematically take risk into consideration while taking decisions.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	 Stable
Risk Consequence	Inability to avoid or mitigate risks leaving GPE exposed to loss of credibility and financial liabilities
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The impact of not having Board and Management not systematically take risk into consideration could have potential damage on GPE's ability to deliver.
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	As the Board and Management have reinforced risk management over the past 6 months, the Secretariat recommends that the probability that the risk occurs decreases from likely to possible.
Risk Owner(s)	Board | Alice Patterson Albright
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Systematically monitor risk and progress on implementing risk mitigation measures and report to the Committees and Board.	Christine Marie Beatrice Guetin	Padraig Power,GERF	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Secretariat is monitoring information related to each risk and updating the status of mitigation actions through the Risk Dashboard. This information is reviewed and analized by the Leadership Team in terms of overall risk trends and effectivness of actual mitigation actions.
• Secretariat present semi-annual reports to Technical Committees and to the Board for recommendation. The second report will be reviewed by the GERF in November, with inputs from CGPC and SPC and will be then discussed by the Board in December.

Update as of 03/2015
• Drafting of the first risk implementation update
• Launch of the Risk Dashboard
• Development of the Assurance Map

Take risk appetite and risk governance processes into consideration while taking decisions at Board and Management Level. When applicable include a discussion of risk in board papers.	Padraig Power	GERF/CGPC/SPC/Secretariat	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The work of the Board Reference Group on Workstream 1 specifically references the Risk appetite as defined in the Risk Policy.
• The practice of risk analysis in Board/Committee papers continues.
• Each Committee reviews risks assigned to it at each meeting.
A risk discussion is scheduled for the next meeting of the Board in December 2015.

Update as of 03/2015
• Ongoing Development of a culture of risk among GPE
• Board and all Committee are involved in the risk analysis
• A risk analysis is included in all Board/Committee papers

Include risk considerations in relevant guidelines, templates and briefings.	Padraig Power	Christine Guetin, Board Services Team	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• A "culture of risk" has been continuously developed within the Secretariat
• The Leadership Team pay an increasing attention to the quality of the risk analysis in all Board/Committee documents.
The Board Reference Group have recommended the development of an Operational Risk Framework to be embedded within the GPE's Risk Policy to guide how GPE adopts a differentiated risk based approach to quality assurance and monitoring of its country programs. If approved, this would be delivered by June 2016

Update as of 03/2015
• A risk analysis is included in all Board/Committee papers

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.1.4 Board governance responsibilities

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.1 Decision making process
Risk Definition	The risk that some Board members do not understand their governance responsibilities.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Weak implementation, inefficiency, inability to achieve GPE's Goals.
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The impact of having some Board members not having the capacity to handle their governance responsibilities remains major for the organization.
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	However, the probability that the risk occurs is stable until mandate and governance review issues are settled.
Risk Owner(s)	GERF |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Provide induction, training and support to new Board and committee members	Christine Marie Beatrice Guetin	Board Services Team	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• All new Board and Committee members received an induction package with all core governance documents
• Board Support Team provides support and offer individual training/support to Board and Committee members.
• The quality of the service currently provided by the Secretariat will be evaluated through the overall governance review and additional actions will be designed as needed.

Update as of 03/2015
• The first face to face Board Orientation took place end of February 2015

General Comments

Attachments

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.2.1 Media exposure

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.2 Functioning and mandate of Secretariat
Risk Definition	The risk that GPE does not have sufficient capabilities to deal with a serious media crisis.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	 Stable
Risk Consequence	Serious harm to GPE's reputational risk
Impact	Major | The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	The Secretariat is in a better position to handle such an event.
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The probability the Secretariat will deal with one is high, but mitigation is pretty good right now.
Risk Owner(s)	Alice Patterson Albright |
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation	Status
Develop and maintain internal protocols and communication measures to be applied in case of an incident occurring.	Charles William Nicolas Tapp	Under development

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Draft protocol to handle a media crisis under preparation
• Review by communications strategy implementation task team
• Goal for the Leadership Team to approve in early October

General Comments	
Attachments	

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.2.2 World Bank - Secretariat hosting arrangement

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.2 Functioning and mandate of Secretariat
Risk Definition	The risk that the Secretariat may become less effective and efficient due to operational challenges of the hosting arrangement and the current restructuring within the World Bank.
Overall Risk Score	Medium
Overall Risk Trend	Stable
Risk Consequence	Use of World Bank policies and procedures may lead to some inefficiency in administrative decision making processes and less visibility of GPE where programs are being implemented.
Impact	Moderate | The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	Stable
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	Stable
Risk Owner(s)	Alice Patterson Albright | World Bank
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Work closely with the VP of Development Finance to ensure there is understanding of GPE Board decisions and find ways to streamline decision-making when VP's approval is needed.	Padraig Power	Alice Albright/Padraig Power, The World Bank	In progress

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• The relationship with the current VP is very collaborative and solutions have been found to any issues arising with relative ease.

General Comments	
Attachments	

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
quality education for all children

Risk Dashboard

Risk Name	4.2.3 Secretariat capacity

Risk Category / Sub-Category	4.0 Governance & Management / 4.2 Functioning and mandate of Secretariat
Risk Definition	The risk that the Secretariats technical capacity, organizational structure, financial, and human resources are not sufficient to deliver on the responsibilities assigned to it by the Board.
Overall Risk Score	High
Overall Risk Trend	Decreasing
Risk Consequence	Staff burnout, turnover and decreased motivation
Impact	Severe | The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.
Impact Trend	PLEASE UPDATE
Probability	Possible | The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years.
Probability Trend	The probability is stable given the12 new positions that were allotted by the Board but this needs to be monitored closely based on workload arising from the Strategic Plan.
Risk Owner(s)	Board | Alice Patterson Albright
Risk Mitigation Manager(s)	
Mitigation Measures	

Action	Responsible Parties for Mitigation		Status
Develop an implementable Secretariat work plan with associated timeline and resources.	Andrew R. Beaulieu	Secretariat leadership team	Under development
Comments			
Update as of 10/2015 • Work plan is fully functional, including monthly updates from over 30 different secretariat staff covering each of the more than 100 activities • GPE Leadership Team each month reviews a summary report highlighting outcomes and trends from the work plan updates Update as of 03/2015 • Teams are starting to define their work functionally and a full workplan should be completed by start of the new fiscal year, July 2015			
Assess the capacity of the Secretariat to deliver on tasks assigned by the Board and address capacity issues.	Padraig Power	Alison Evans, Alice Albright	Completed

Comments

Update as of 03/2015
• Alison Evans organizational review finalised and submitted to the Board with specific recommendations

Board to approve additional capacity in areas identified in the organizational review or agree on tasks to be dropped by the Secretariat.	Board		Completed

Comments

Update as of 10/2015
• Organizational Review completed
• Secretariat conducted a progress survey in March/April which included some questions about prioritization and work-life balance.
• Secretariat capacity issues is currently addressed by all the hiring done.

Update as of 03/2015
• Board approved 14 new positions recommended by Alison Evans report to support more country facing work, monitoring, Quality Assurance, financial oversight and technical anchors. Recruitment in progress

Monitor Implementation of the Organizational Review	Andrew R. Beaulieu	Alice Albright, Padraig Power	In progress

Comments

• A number of key indicators and targets have been developed and are monitored quarterly by the Leadership Team

General Comments

Existing assurance arrangements
• Secretariat – 2014 organizational review completed and under implementation, annual budget and work plan developed to address the responsibilities assigned by the Board
• Board – Considers the findings of organizational reviews of the Secretariat and approves resources deemed necessary to fulfill responsibilities

Attachments