EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES AND PROTRACTED CRISES

For Decision

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 This document presents the Board of Directors with information on the proposed Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises (EiEPC) platform and it's alignment with the Global Partnership for Education's ("GPE" or "Global Partnership") strategic goals and operational model. It also examines some of the issues to be considered if GPE were to host the platform, and explores some of the opportunities, challenges, and risks that are posed by the creation of such a new platform.

1.2 The Coordinating Committee on a call on February 18, agreed to the need for an analysis of the EiEPC platform to support the GPE Board in its efforts to understand and deliberate upon the implications of a new platform for the Partnership. This paper responds to this request. However the Secretariat would stress that significant additional work on both the design of the platform, and the further implications for GPE as a potential host are required before the Board could make any substantive decisions on hosting.

1.3 The Board is asked to consider the issues raised in this paper and approve GPE's continued engagement in the development of the EiEPC platform. The Board is asked to note that such engagement will facilitate GPE having the best prepared proposal for final Board decision on the matter of GPE hosting. The Board is asked to identify any pertinent issues not covered in this document that the Secretariat should seek to clarify through continued engagement in the design of the platform.

2. DECISION LANGUAGE

BOD/2016/03-XX – <u>Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises:</u> The Board of Directors notes the progress made to date on the Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises (EiEPC) platform and the potential synergies with GPE's work.

- It therefore requests the Secretariat to continue to engage with the Technical Strategy Group (TSG) responsible for the design of the EiEPC platform and to respond to the TSG's request for an initial hosting self-assessment.

- The Board requests that when the TSG establishes the terms of the process for a formal hosting review, the GPE Secretariat prepare an in-depth business case for the Board's consideration. The business case should outline GPE's value added as a host, and include a detailed analysis of the implications for GPE's governance and institutional arrangements, core work, and the resources of the GPE Secretariat.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 At the Oslo Summit on Education for Development held in July 2015, senior representatives of international agencies, governments, and non-governmental organizations made a commitment to address the disruption of education and learning in countries experiencing emergencies and protracted crises through the creation of a new common platform. At the summit, ten important principles were agreed, under the ***Oslo Consolidated Principles for Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises.***

3.2 The Oslo Summit also saw the creation of a Technical Strategy Group, co-chaired by the UK and Canada[1], to oversee the technical work and consultation processes needed to create a draft EiEPC platform proposal, and to report to the political champions now convened by UN Special Envoy for Global Education, Gordon Brown, UNICEF Executive Director, Tony Lake, and GPE Board Chair, Julia Gillard. GPE and a number of its partners are represented on the TSG. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) has been contracted to research the relevant issues and to produce options for the TSG's and partner's consideration. Over the past five months, ODI has produced a number of draft proposals for the TSG's consideration (February 15, 2016 Version - attachment 1). Wide consultations of the proposal have been conducted by the International Network on Education in Emergencies. The governments of Norway, the UK and the US have financed the technical research and consultations.

3.3 The political champions and the TSG have agreed to launch the new platform at the World Humanitarian Summit, in May 2016. They have also agreed that the initial host for the platform will be UNICEF, for a period of up to a year. During that time, an Advisory Committee and

[1] The full Technical Strategy Group advising on this work consists of 19 governments, organisations and networks, with the Governments of Canada and the UK serving as co-chairs, Save the Children serving as secretariat, and the following members: the Governments of Lebanon, Norway, South Sudan and the United States, the Office of the United Nations Special Envoy for Education, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Dubai Cares, the European Commission, the Global Business Coalition for Education, the Global Compact on Learning Donor Network, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and the World Bank.

Secretariat for the platform will be established. A hosting review and selection of a permanent hosting arrangement will be undertaken within 6 months after the platform is launched.

3.4 On February 15, the TSG requested that GPE prepare a hosting self-assessment to better evaluate and assess its capacity to act as a long-term host of a new platform and financing facility for EiEPC.

4. SUMMARY OF THE EiEPC PLATFORM PROPOSAL

4.1 As agreed by the membership of the TSG, and described in the ODI draft proposal, the goal of the new EiEPC platform is to ensure that all children and youth affected by crisis and conflict, especially the most marginalized, receive their right to education and learning. Four main bottlenecks and barriers to meeting this need are identified:

- too little overall financing for education in crisis, especially for underfunded emergencies;
- limited funding and lack of effective, coordinated capacity for rapid response;
- poor planning and needs analysis and poor evidence and data
- a gap between humanitarian response and development response, both in terms of coordination, planning and financing – leading to a lack of predictable multi-year funding.

4.2 The proposed design tackles these barriers by creating three main windows of activity and financing:

I. **A Global Public Goods Window,** that supports global public goods, like improved planning and needs analysis, better global level capacity, innovative delivery of services, and better evidence and knowledge. This window might also support improvements in the capacity of the UN Education in Emergencies cluster and the International Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE).

II. **A Rapid Response Window**, that among other things might provide initial "startup funding" to get appropriate planning and coordination in place and ensure where (where relevant) that refugee hosting governments have capacity to plan and absorb early arrivals. This rapid response window might also provide matching funds to other humanitarian fund raising efforts – for example OCHA or CERF.

III. **A Multiyear Financing Window,** that would fund education in crises and emergencies over a three to five year period, around **a coordinated education plan**. This window

would need to be capable of financing both governments and direct service providers (multilateral, INGO and NGO) and moving funding between these two types of providers in dynamic ways to provide continuity of services. It should also be capable of creating what are called "pop up" windows for specific emergencies.

4.3 As outlined in the draft proposal, the platform is not intended to **duplicate** the work of others but rather to crowd in better coordination and efficient response across the humanitarian and development architectures. It must not add additional costs or layers of bureaucracy; and it must not duplicate or displace current efforts or add to fragmentation. The design calls for a lean secretariat with low costs.

4.4 It is expected that funding for the platform will be raised from traditional and non-traditional sovereign donors as well as the private sector, individuals and foundations. Innovative financing will play a central role in the financing function of the platform. The platform is tasked to raise **additional** finance (not substitutive).

4.5 **Governance** is proposed to be through a multi-stakeholder board or management committee representing major actors involved in EIEPC, including GPE. The governance structure must be able to make rapid decisions on financing during times of crisis.

5. ALIGNMENT OF THE PLATFORM GOALS AND FUNCTIONS WITH THE GPE STRATEGIC PLAN AND OPERATIONAL MODEL

5.1 The proposed EiEPC initiative has considerable overlap with GPE's mandate, strategic goals and mechanisms, as outline in the attached overview of GPE work in fragile and conflict affected settings (Attachment 2).

5.2 As outlined in the attached issue brief, GPE has committed to continued focus on education in fragile and conflict-affected settings in GPE's new Strategic Plan (2016 – 2020). A growing share of GPE resources and technical assistance targets fragile and conflict affected settings. Approximately 50% of GPE's disbursements in recent years have been made to fragile and/or conflict affected countries. Furthermore, more than 60% of the world's refugee children and youth live within GPE partner countries.

5. 3 The Partnership has evolved its approach in this area, and now has three mechanisms to support education in emergencies and crisis (described in more detail in the issues brief):

- **Accelerated Financing** – which allows up to 20% of an existing allocation to be used for emergencies, and which can be disbursed rapidly when crisis strikes.

- **Transitional Sector Planning** (and minimum criteria for preparedness in all Sector Planning) – which supports needs assessment and coordinated response between development and humanitarian actors

- **Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict Affected Settings** – which provides a framework for redeployment of funds in an existing GPE grant and enables their use in direct service delivery when governments are not capable of responding.

5.4 One significant issue for the GPE will be the requirement to work in new geographies, for example, in dealing with regional crisis of the kind that unfolded following the conflict in Syria. Detailed analysis of GPE capacity to respond in such situations will be needed. GPE does not at present have a modality for delivering funding for the education of refugee children or incentivizing better national attention to this issue within GPE partner countries. However, as a starting point we note that using the most recent statistics available, Syria has met GPE eligibility requirements since as early as 2014: it has less than 85% primary completion rates and GNI per capita has fallen below US$2,500.[2]

5.5 A second significant issue for GPE will be the requirement to support the education of refugee children. At the moment, while GPE grants may be used to fund education for displaced populations, they are primarily used for national development, and do not provide strong incentives for refugee hosting governments to address refugee issues.

5.6 There are many other features of the proposed platform that would require the creation of new GPE capacity and mechanisms if GPE was to serve as host. These are briefly described in Table 1 below.

[2] These statistics are based on 2014 data released in 2016.

Table 1: GPE Capacity and Expertise Relevant to the Three EiEPC Platform Windows

Platform Mandate and Design Features	GPE's Current Capacity and Mechanisms	Challenges, Risks and Areas that would need development
A Global Public Goods Window, providing global public goods, improved technical assistance and better needs assessment and planning to bridge emergencies and development.	• GPE has some experience in providing grants to support partner development of global public goods (GRA). • GPE has good experience in coordination of planning and needs assessment across the development/humanitarian divide. • GPE has promoted preparedness and resilience through its support to Sector Analysis and Sector Planning.	• GPE would need to develop a new mechanism for channeling financing to key global public goods providers in the EiEPC field – including the Education Cluster and INEE. • It would need improved in house technical capacity in early emergency response, including additional expertise in working with Humanitarian Agencies.
A Rapid Response Window, targeting improvements in financing and coordination for emergency response – not restricted to LICS and LMICS	• GPE presently works in 61 member countries - many of these have underfunded emergencies, which is a focus of the platform. • It has experience in supporting coordination of planned response and needs assessment through Transitional Education Sector Plans. • It has proven experience in providing emergency financing through its Accelerated Funding mechanism. • It has developed a solid partnership with UNICEF, which is the grant agent for GPE in many fragile/conflict settings and is capable of ensuring redeployment of funds to meet emergency needs. • It has the ability to rapidly disburse funds to INGOs.	• GPE would need to develop new mechanisms to support partners in early needs assessment and costing. • It would need to design a response mechanism that channels funding through new partners, including Humanitarian Organizations capable of ensuring direct service provision. • It would need to design a mechanism to fund governments receiving refugees, including governments that are not GPE partner countries. • An incentive or matching approach will be needed to offset the risk of displacement of existing education humanitarian effort.
A Multi-year Funding Window	• GPE already provides multi-year funding to 28 FCAS, and has the flexibility to redeploy this funding to emergency purposes. • It already has an approach that links funding to longer term development planning and the creation of sustainable systems.	The design of country-specific "pop-up windows" to raise and disburse funds rapidly and effectively would need to be thought through carefully. The proposed design does not provide a clear indication of how this would be operationalized

6. HOSTING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The ODI proposal and the letter from the political champions (Annex 1) propose key criteria for hosting the new platform. These criteria emphasize creation of an inclusive, multi-stakeholder board and a lean secretariat, with the capacity to raise new financing (including innovative financing, and financing from the private sector). It also emphasizes that the new platform must have the capacity to deliver financing rapidly and effectively to a variety of partners across a range of emergency circumstances (including INGOs).

6. 2 Below is a rapid and preliminary analysis of these criteria against current GPE capacities. It is important to note that this is only a starting point and any decision on GPE as a host would need to be supported by an in-depth business case as outlined above. A key question is the extent to which the new platform can be integrated into existing GPE governance and program delivery structures and processes, while still retaining the speed and flexibility to work in emergency contexts.

Hosting Requirements	GPE Current Capacity	Areas that would need development
Governance - Multi-stakeholder Board - Inclusion of *humanitarian agencies* - Rapid decision making capacity	• GPE is governed by a multi-stakeholder Board, with representation from FCAS. The Secretariat has long experience providing support to such a diverse body. • GPE is in conversation with UNCHR about joining its Board. Other humanitarian actors could also be included. • Where the Board has provided delegated decision-making GPE has shown the ability to have rapid decision-making.	• The relationship between the platform's governance and GPE's existing governance structures needs careful consideration. • Delegated decision-making to committee or other body would be a must in order to operate rapidly.
Fundraising and Advocacy - Lead political mobilization and work with group of Political Champions - Raise funding from a variety of sources – traditional, private sector and individuals. - Develop innovative financing mechanisms	• The Board Chair and members, and Secretariat have significant experience in mobilizing support. • GPE's most recent replenishment secured pledges from private foundations for contributions to the GPE Fund. • Board working group established to develop options for leveraging innovative financing. • The CEO and Chief Finance and Operations Officer have experience in this area while an additional Senior Finance Officer is currently being recruited. • The GPE Fund is a Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF). An additional FIF can be set up to receive segregated funding for the Platform. • The innovative financing and governance arrangements of FIFs enable funds to be raised from multiple sources, including from sovereign and private sources. FIF structures are customizable.	• Platform partners would need to be fully engaged in mobilizing support. • A single well-resourced replenishment campaign for GPE and the platform would be essential to ensure additionality. • Additional short-term investment costs could be needed to rapidly develop and operationalize any ideas that would be approved around innovative funding • To significantly scale up funding from the private sector and individuals may require additional dedicated resources. • Design of any FIF to accommodate innovative financing would take time and requires approval from the World Bank.
Management of Funds - Low overhead - Can disburse rapidly - Can disburse to different intermediaries	• GPE Secretariat operating expenses average 4% of annual disbursements which is significantly less than comparator organizations. Administration of the GPE Fund itself averages approximately 0.1% of the average fund balance. • Once decisions are made on funding, money can be moved rapidly to multilaterals, bilaterals, and International NGOs.	• A detailed costing exercise would be required to estimate the costs of hosting the platform. The degree of integration with the core activities of the GPE Secretariat would have an impact on costs.

– including INGOs and local organizations		• The fund flow and oversight arrangements need further analysis.
Development, Technical Oversight and Quality Assurance of Grants - Expertise to support platform. - to linking humanitarian response to longer term preparedness, recovery and development planning. - Provide funding windows to support global public goods, innovation, research and evidence.	• GPE has experience in designing the requirements for, and operationalizing new funding models and windows. • GPE has a Board approved policy framework to guide its work in emergencies and crises. • GPE uses its Transitional Education Sector Plans, LEGs, and different grants to anchor stakeholders in a planning process that recognizes the ground level needs of country partners, providing an entry point for both policy dialogue and financial support to external agencies, and catalyzing urgently needed resources to the sector. • GPE is preparing a knowledge and good practice exchange strategy that will articulate a vision for leveraging knowledge, innovation, skills, and best practice from across its partnership to bring the best of its collective membership to where it is most needed.	• The design of the platform itself still needs significant work. • The degree of integration and managing the potential duplication in current GPE eligible countries would need careful consideration. • The Secretariat would need to strengthen its technical expertise in Humanitarian / emergency response contexts. • Processes for quality assurance, and decision making would need to be designed or updated to accommodate the platform needs.
Secretariat/Core Services - Brings cost and value consciousness. - Brings transparency and accountability and manages by results. - Provide requisite HR, fiduciary, workspace, and other support services	• GPE operating expenses are relatively low compared to comparator organizations. • GPE has a transparency policy and is accountable to the Board. Substantial information on decisions and grants are published on the website. GPE also reports its data to the International Aid Transparency Initiative. • GPE has the ability to hire staff and consultants on a range of contracts and to accept secondees from other organizations. GPE has the ability to recruit staff from all over the world. • GPE Secretariat operating expenses are subject to a comprehensive internal control system. The Secretariat has access to accounting, HR, travel, security, medical, IT, procurement, legal services, and facilities management. Its expenses are subject to internal and external audit through the World Bank, and staff have access to an internal justice system	• The level of integration with core Secretariat activities would need to be developed as this would have implications for the Secretariat's management, oversight arrangements, and costs of the platform.

7. SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES, RISKS, AND CHALLENGES

7.1 There are a number of opportunities, risks, and challenges associated with the proposed platform. Some of the key issues are set out below:

7.2 Opportunities

- Hosting a new platform that closely aligns to GPE's mission, goals and objectives could allow GPE to better achieve impact in meeting the needs of children in the fragile and conflict-affected settings that form 50% of its membership. In particular the platform could amplify GPE capacity to provide effective support to fragile and conflict affected countries experiencing protracted crisis; and to support the needs of refugee children, more than 60% of whom live within GPE partner countries.
- The opportunity to build upon GPE's existing framework for supporting fragile and conflict affected settings, which enhances stability by providing predictable support for planning and systems.
- Increased global attention and more efficient, less fragmented financing for education if the platform and GPE activities are well aligned and complementary.

7.3 Challenges

- Adapting GPE's governance structures, operational model, and management capacities at a time when GPE is heavily focused on implementing a new Strategic Plan and fully rolling out improvements to its operational model. GPE would need a six-twelve month period from the time a decision was made for GPE to host to prepare itself. Short term investment in surge capacity to cope with the preparation costs and to ensure a smooth transition from the interim host would be essential.
- If GPE were to host, it would likely be in 2017 when GPE is preparing for its next replenishment. A challenge will be to ensure sufficient time and clarity on the platforms operational details are available to allow for an effective single fundraising campaign to be developed. It is therefore essential that a decision on hosting is taken within a matter of months.
- The eligibility for the platform and for core GPE funding may not fully align (e.g. while Syria may become eligible for GPE funding based on current criteria, Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon would not be) and the Board would need to consider its willing to host a platform that operates to meet the need of refugee children in these areas.

7.4 **Risks**

a) Risk if GPE hosts

- The risks of hosting a platform that may not be fit for purpose and for which significant financial resources may not materialize, damaging GPE's reputation.
- The risk that GPE's existing operations are negatively impacted during the startup phase of hosting the platform due to the need to dedicate significant Secretariat, Committee, and Board attention to this area.

b) Risk if GPE is not the host

- Potential displacement of funding for GPE work in fragile and conflict affected settings and other low income developing country partners.
- Further fragmentation of international aid for education.
- The platform may take significant time to be fully operational and the costs of establishing the platform outside of GPE may be significant depending on who the host is.

8. NEXT STEPS

8.1 The Secretariat will continue to actively engage and support the design work of the TSG in preparation for the launch of the platform at the World Humanitarian Summit in May.

8.2 Assuming the Board is willing to explore GPE as a potential host of the platform, the Secretariat will work with the interim host (currently expected to be UNICEF) and participate in the interim governance structures of the platform in anticipation of a formal hosting review process.

8.3 The Secretariat will continue to update the Board on key milestones as the platform design develops and greater clarity on the process for hosting emerges.

9. PLEASE CONTACT Karen Mundy at kmundy@globalpartnership.org or Padraig Power at ppower@globalpartnership.org for further information

10. ANNEXES AND ATTACHMENTS

10.1 This paper contains the following annexes:

Annex 1: Letter from the EiEPC Political Champions

10.2 The following attachments to this paper are available:

Attachment 1: ODI - Education Crisis Platform Draft Proposal 15th February Version

Attachment 2: GPE's Work in Fragile and Conflicted Affected States Briefing Note

Annex 1: Letter from the EiEPC Political Champions

Dear Anna, Julie and members of the TSG,

I am responding to you on behalf of the Champions Group.

First, Gordon, Tony and I would like to convey our thanks to each of you and to ODI for the hard work done to date. We all share a passion for ensuring every child, including those whose lives are blighted by crisis and conflict, gets a good quality education.

Whilst in London for the recent meeting of the Education Commission and in the days since, the Champions Group has drafted and agreed a statement that best captures our view of what is required to make a real difference for the children we all seek to serve.

That statement of intent is as follows:

'It is proposed to launch the new platform for education in emergencies at the World Humanitarian Summit in May.

The new platform can be most effective in transforming the potential for delivering education in emergencies only by bringing in new resources and not through the reallocation of existing funds. We want it to catalyze and coordinate new and additional business, foundation and philanthropic contributions and in time to reach out to draw upon voluntary contributions from the general public.

Any new arrangements must meet the following conditions:

a) Have capability of delivering additional finance from existing aid donors and draw in new donors

b) Be equipped to attract new donors from countries that historically have not contributed directly to multilateral humanitarian aid

c) Be equipped to bring in private finance from the business and commercial sector

d) Be equipped to bring in finance from foundations

e) Be equipped to draw on the philanthropy of public spirited individuals

f) Be equipped to develop and manage innovative financing

g) Have the ability to more effectively and efficiently support education and distribute educational resources in humanitarian crises than the current architecture allows

h) Have the ability to work in and beyond humanitarian settings and to bridge the current divide between work on education in humanitarian settings and in a development context.

The initial focus of the platform will be the delivery of education in specified existing crises and then it will broaden its focus to include anticipating new crises and emergencies.

To best meet the conditions we have set for success, we will now conduct intensive outreach to elicit potential new donors.

The platform will initially be hosted in UNICEF. The intention – and the preference – is to create a permanent hosting arrangement. After the first year, a review will be conducted by the advisory group below to examine progress and the transition to longer-term hosting arrangements, with particular reference to GPE and the necessary amendment of its mandate and its ability to host a platform to meet the conditions in paragraph (3).

A platform advisory group will be set up, comprising of Julia Gillard, Anthony Lake, Gordon Brown, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the heads of traditional donor agencies, the head of an emerging donor agency, a foundation leader , an NGO leader , and a business leader.'

The statement itself deals with your first question to us regarding hosting.

On priorities, the statement contains our view that it would be dooming the new platform to failure if it was expected to be have immediate impact in all current emergency and crisis settings. Consequently, there does need to be clarity around which of the current emergencies the platform will be active in and priority guidelines for the future.

On process, it is the intention of the Champions Group to communicate with the broader group that met in Oslo. We envisage this being a progress report back and seeking of feedback by letter. The precise timing of this correspondence is yet to be established but it should certainly be sent no later than early March and it should provide as much detail as possible regarding the structure and functioning of the new platform.

Once again, we thank you for your efforts. We offer our guidance in a spirit of collaboration. We appreciate that there is still much work to be done to steer this to a successful outcome at the May Humanitarian Summit. In that regard, we look forward to continuing to work with you, receiving the final report and collaborating on ongoing advocacy efforts with your institutions.

Kind regards,

Julia Gillard