GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS 7-8 JUNE 2012, BERLIN, GERMANY

INTRODUCTION

Following a one-day retreat in which the Strategic Plan and review of the Secretariat's hosting arrangement was discussed, the Board of Directors held a meeting in Berlin on 7-8 June 2012 in Berlin, Germany.

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

This report presents a summary of the issues that were discussed and decisions that were approved.

1. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT

1.1 Bob Prouty, the Head of the Secretariatgave a presentation on the progress of the Global Partnership in a number of areas, particularly in primary access and completion, gender parity in schools and learning outcomes. The presentation showed consistent progress in the aggregate across GPE developing country partners, but significant challenges for fragile and conflict-affected states. This trend was seen particularly for: (i) primary completion rates, which increased to 68% in GPE developing country partners, but with much less growth in fragile and conflict-affected states; (ii) the number of out-of-school children, which declined over the past six years by almost 50% in non-fragile states, but stagnated in fragile; (iii) the gender parity rate in primary completion, which increased from 0.85 to 0.99, but showed much lower progress in fragile states; (iv) the number of countries in which girls showed an enrolment disadvantage, which declined from 25 to 14 (of 33), but where fragile states are over-represented. The report also noted that initial results from reading programs supported by GPE partners are promising.

1.2 Disbursements from the GPE Fund improved over the past year and reached nearly US$400 million in 2011. This represented a 62% increase over 2010. Disbursements for 2012 were expected to be similar to 2011. The cash balance was expected to decline from US$880 million to US$556 million once ongoing requests, proposals for grants, and financing of the Secretariat moved forward.

[1] http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Berlin%202012/Board%20documents/DOC%2001%20Revised%20Agenda_29%20May.pdf

1.3 The Head advised that the countries expected to apply for program implementation funding in June 2012 included Nicaragua, Vietnam, Ghana and Sudan (for a total of US$253 million). Possible countries coming forward before the end of 2012 included Benin, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kyrgyz Republic, Mauritania, the Republic of Congo, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, Yemen, and Zambia. Education plan development grants of US$250,000 were recently approved for each of Zimbabwe, Uzbekistan and Madagascar.

1.4 Next steps include: (i) expanding support to fragile states (six additional fragile states were expected to join the Partnership over the next year); (ii) supporting the expansion of tracking out-of-school children to five additional countries; and (iii) extending reading interventions to at least 20 additional countries.

Discussion

1.5 Board members noted the results achieved, while recognizing the need to increase efforts in fragile states. Board members wanted to know in what areas the Secretariat was working with GPE partners to address the issues identified in the presentation, and on which existing initiatives the Secretariat was building in key areas.

1.6 Board members requested that a written report from the Head/Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of the Secretariat be sent to the Board of Directors prior to future Board meetings. The report should include information regarding results achieved by the Global Partnership in key areas, as well as information on disbursement, cash balance, and portfolio management and performance.

1.7 Board members suggested including presentations or reports from constituencies at future Board meetings to identify best practices, successes and lessons learned in key areas, such as learning outcomes. The Chair noted that the session on the German Back-up Initiative was aimed at providing this kind of information and similar sessions will be planned for future meetings.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-2015

2.1 Jenny Da Rin, Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group, presented the draft Strategic Plan Framework, based on feedback received on the written Draft Strategic Plan (BOD/2012/06 DOC 03) during the Retreat held on 6 June 2012.

Discussion

2.2 Several Board members stated that the revised Strategic Plan Framework should be approved during the meeting, while others indicated a preference to wait until both the Framework and the Strategic Plan were finalized in order to approve them together, by audio-conference.

2.3 The Chair put forth a proposed decision that included new language in the Strategic Plan Framework in addition to a request that the Secretariat develop a policy on teachers by the next face-to-face Board meeting of 2012.

2.4 The following decisions were approved:

> **BOD/2012/06-01 — <u>Strategic Plan</u>:** The Board of Directors approves the following with regards to the Strategic Plan:
>
> 1. **Vision:** A good quality education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies.
>
> 2. **Mission:** To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable.
>
> 3. **Strategic Goals:**
>
> (i) **Access for All**: All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped space to receive an education, with a skilled teacher.
>
> (ii) **Learning for All**: All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades.
>
> (iii) **Reaching Every Child**: Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states.
>
> (iv) **Building for the Future**: National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver, support and assess quality education for all.
>
> 4. **How the Partnership will Work**: The Global Partnership for Education will leverage the skills, leadership and resources of its partners by:
>
> - Increasing the visibility of education as a key strategy for the health, wealth and stability of nations;
> - Supporting countries to develop and implement good education plans which are sustainable and country-led;
> - Strengthening the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of government systems;
> - Continuously improving through innovation and by promoting best practice;
> - Developing and promoting harmonized education goals and metrics; and
> - Improving development effectiveness.

5. **Objectives 2012-2015**:

Objective 1: Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans.

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

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

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

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

BOD/2012/06-02 — <u>Finalization of the Strategic Plan</u>: The Board of Directors requests:

1. The Strategic Plan Working Group to revise and finalize the draft Strategic Plan, based on input received at the Retreat and meeting of the Board of Directors in June 2012, and present it no later than mid-July 2012 for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled in late July 2012.

2. The Secretariat to submit to the Board of Directors for its approval, following approval of the Strategic Plan, an implementation plan, budget considerations, risk management plan, and communications strategy for the Strategic Plan.

3. Noting that Objective 4 of the Strategic Plan is to improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education, the Secretariat to deliver a paper regarding a strategy for its implementation by the next face-face meeting of the Board of Directors.

3. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

3.1 Bob Prouty, Head of the Secretariat,presented the report (BOD/2012/06 DOC 04) which noted that, since the Pledging Conference, pledges to the Global Partnership increased to over US$1.7 billion, with additional pledges expected over the coming months. The report noted that three donors represent over half of the contributions to the Global Partnership and that the economic crisis has adversely affected some donors' ability to contribute finances. Most OECD-DAC donors decreased official development assistance (ODA) in 2011, although education-specific funding held its own with only a 1% decline. However, education figures were hurt by a significant decline in ODA targeting budget support, which decreased by 50% in the past year.

3.2 To monitor pledges made at the Pledging Conference, the Secretariat proposed a range of data sources, including data from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), Joint Sector Reviews, partner surveys and others. Civil society organizations (CSOs) would be requested to

assist in providing oversight of the monitoring process. The proposed new monitoring andevaluation unit within the Secretariat would have primary responsibility for the work.

3.3 Next steps include: (i) the development of a comprehensive pledge monitoring system; (ii) continued fundraising; (iii) securing contribution agreements from pledges already made; (iv) exploring innovative financing options which might include the development of an education bond; (v) establishing and strengthening partnerships with new and emerging donors; and (vi) providing evidence of value for money.

Discussion

3.4 Board members supported efforts to bring new and emerging donors into the Partnership, as well as increasing engagement with the private sector. The Private Sector constituency Board member suggested that the private sector could help map out programs supported by its constituency members to show available services, funds, know-how, policy guidance and other information that could help the Global Partnership in its resource mobilization efforts.

3.5 Board members agreed on the value of providing clear reporting on efforts in resource mobilization, including: (i) a plan that includes a strategy and targets for the coming year; (ii) tracking of bilateral commitments to basic education with clear benchmarks; (iii) information on domestic efforts in increasing education budgets; and (iv) a broader sense of in-kind contributions, such as technical assistance and staff.

3.6 Some Board members felt that the Global Partnership should advocate for increased domestic investment in education, possibly through taxation and revenue reforms. Board members suggested that the Global Partnership should find a way to help countries use their own resources more effectively.

3.7 Several Board members suggested that the Global Partnership should play a role in ensuring that GPE funds are additional and did not "crowd out" other donor resources (e.g., the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) financing). The Chair suggested that future resource mobilization reports should reference how much IDA funding has been drawn down each year.

4. REPORTING ON RESULTS

4.1 Laurent Cortese of the Secretariat presented on the first Results Report of the Global Partnership (BOD/2012/06 DOC 05), which was a product of the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. The objectives of the M&E Strategy include: (i) the monitoring of education plan implementation at the country level; (ii) GPE Fund implementation; (iii) Strategic Plan implementation and GPE commitments at local and global levels; and (iv) an assessment of the impact of the Global Partnership. The tools utilized in support of the M&E Strategy include:(i) the Results Framework, which includes the Global Partnership's goals, outcomes and outputs;

(ii) the Mutual Accountability Matrix; and (iii) an impact evaluation system to assess the value added of the Global Partnership. The M&E Strategy is based on information coming from (i) Joint Sector Review Reports; (ii) the UIS database; and (iii) in-country surveys. The main deliverables linked to the M&E Strategy will include: (i) an annual results report; (ii) results forms for each GPE developing country partner on the website; (iii) impact evaluation studies; and (iv) a final evaluation synthesis available in 2015.

4.2 Some of the main findings of the Results Report include: (i) poverty is the greatest predictor of whether children will be out of school; (ii) quality measurement has improved (although quality itself has not shown measurable improvement); (iii) challenges for improving quality include improving teachers' employment conditions and managing the development of post-primary enrollment (lower secondary completion rates are growing and class sizes are increasing at the secondary level); and (iv) there is a lack of accountability and transparency, especially for monitoring progress against education plan targets and indicators during Joint Sector Reviews at the country level.

4.3 César Guadalupe Senior Program Specialist, Learning Outcomes, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) presented on efforts to improve the relevance of UIS data through regional approaches to collect data on education indicators, and innovative approaches to collect information on finance in education. Results presented included: (i) public expenditure on education in Sub-Saharan Africa increased by an average of 6% annually between 2000 and 2008; (ii) expenditure in tertiary education in comparison to basic education is very large; and (iii) there is a lack of comparable data on learning outcomes at the international level, although there is a good deal of information available regarding access and out-of-school children.

Discussion

4.4 Board members were generally pleased with the information regarding results and appreciated the level of detail included in the report. They noted that such information was vital to demonstrate to their governments the usefulness of the Global Partnership as well as value for money. Board members stressed the importance of being well-informed in order to make good decisions. Board members requested more information, such as this report, on a regular basis. Some Board members additionally requested that, for future reports, the Secretariat distill the information into one or two pages and include visual content for briefing ministers.

4.5 Some Board members emphasized the importance of ensuring that the Global Partnership was not imposing additional burdens on Ministries of Education, building on already available information rather than identifying new indicators or putting into place additional indicators for monitoring purposes. Joint Sector Reviews could be a key tool for collecting information at the country level, with collaboration between the Global Partnership and UIS or other organizations.

4.6 Board members recognized the challenge that remainsin improving the quality of education. Some Board members asked the Secretariat to identify how it would encourage the Partnership to tackle the challenge of improving quality, especially including course corrections

to make Local Education Groups (LEGs) more effective, sufficiently utilizing large data sets on learning, and determining the role for social accountability, among others.

5. LOCAL EDUCATION GROUPS

5.1 Sandra Barton of the Secretariat gave a presentation showing how over the past year, the Secretariat worked to help increase the effectiveness of Local Education Groups ("LEGs"), including improving how they helpedcountries achieve their national education plans. All GPE developing country partners have LEGs and the recent GPE Monitoring of Aid Effectiveness Survey showed that the GPE process contributed to the formation and work of LEGs. Donors and ministries are typically well represented, although representation of national civil society, private education, and teacher representation remain weak. The quality of LEGs varies greatly. Most are very good at articulating a common agenda, and could improve their ability to track progress on national education plans.

5.2 The steps necessary for improving the effectiveness of LEGs (from all partners) include: (i) more representative LEGs; (ii) better technical support; (iii) support for systematic and consistent monitoring of progress; and (iv) support for sustained country-level focus on aid effectiveness.

5.3 The Global Partnership is working to improve LEGs by: (i) conducting more country visits; (ii) creating profiles of LEGs based on data from the aid effectiveness survey; (iii) analyzing Joint Sector Reviews; (iv) developing terms of reference for Supervising Entities and Managing Entities, and Coordinating Agencies; (v) requiring demonstrated government leadership and representative participation for all new grants; and (vi) advocating strongly for CSO participation in LEGs.

Discussion

5.4 Board members were pleased to hear about the strengthened support at the country level, acknowledging that the Global Partnership should be careful to build on institutions, systems and organizations that are already working in the countries. Some Board members saw great potential for accelerating the strategic priorities of the Global Partnership by working together with the LEGs and emphasized that the Secretariat should provide ongoing support and a facilitative role to the LEGs. Several Board members stressed that this was an area in which the capacity of the Secretariat needed to expand and in which investment was important.

5.5 Some Board members expressed concern at the phasing-out by donors from bilateral cooperation in many countries, given the potential loss of technical advice and expertise to LEGs.

5.6 Board members recognized the importance of ensuring broad representation of all stakeholders in the LEGs, including civil society. They raised the value of an accountability framework for donors as well as the need to encourage individual agency staff to play their roles within the LEGs more inclusively and effectively.

5.7 Board members were pleased that the Secretariat is developing terms of reference for the roles of Coordinating Agency, Supervising and Managing Entity. Some Board members requested additional training or education programs at the country level to provide partners with support and information regarding LEG processes, procedures, and tools, especially during times of transition, when new leaders become involved with the LEGs.

6. ADDRESSING FRAGILE STATES

6.1 Jean-Marc Bernard of the Secretariat gave a presentation which noted that the number of fragile states in the Global Partnership has increased dramatically, and this trend will continue, from one in 2003 to a projected 22 by 2013. There are currently 15 GPE fragile country partners and 36% of current grants were allocated to fragile states. The Global Partnership intends to adopt a systematic approach for working in fragile states, helping countries to develop a transitional education plan that could beused to quickly deploy support and build momentum for a comprehensive plan (the GPE Secretariat is in the process of developing guidelines for transitional plans), providing greater flexibility in engagement and operations (using the more flexible Managing Entity rather than Supervising Entity as an implementation partner) and providing increased support to local processes (more Secretariat missions to fragile states, more technical support, and financing through program implementation grants).

6.2 Next steps include: (i) increasing the number of Managing Entities; (ii) finalizing guidelines for transitional education plans; (iii) joining the New Deal Initiative; (iv) reviewing methodologies for vulnerability factors analysis (with USAID); and (v) reviewing education plans in Sub-Saharan Africa to analyze how they did or did not address issues of vulnerability. Key issues to tackle include: (i) how to work in countries with unrecognized governments and/or authorities; (ii) how to get quick support to respond to emergency situations; (iii) how to increase financial support to fragile states; and (iv) the need to pay special attention to countries where the Global Partnership is the primary or only donor in education.

Discussion

6.3 Board members supported the increased efforts by the Global Partnership to engage in fragile states, and several Board members supported the proposal to join the New Deal Initiative. There was general agreement that a conflict analysis should be conducted at the country level by the Global Partnership to determine priority target areas and who to work with on the ground (i.e., CSOs or government). One Board member emphasized the importance of cross-sectoral cooperation in working in fragile states. Another noted that the Global Partnership's role is to be a supporter and facilitator of agencies that are already on the ground, rather than an implementing agency.

6.4 Flexibility in operational and procedural approaches was generally supported, including a focus on building institutional and local management capacity, increasing operational speed, providing up-front coordination and extending program implementation grant funding terms to four or five years. However, Board members cautioned that these approaches would require

additional details before the Global Partnership could utilize them, including determining how extending funding terms would affect indicative allocations, and the need to provide accreditation of Supervising and Managing Entities.

6.5 The Secretariat suggested that one approach to increase the speed of engagement in fragile states might involve making 25% (or a similar figure) of the indicative allocation immediately available through partners already on the ground in an emergency situation. The Chair requested that the Secretariat provide a specific proposal to the Board of Directors for accelerated financing in emergency contexts.

7. ADVANCING THE LEARNING AGENDA

7.1 Luis Crouch of the Secretariat gave a presentation noting that to sufficiently implement the Global Partnership's learning agenda as outlined in the Strategic Plan (Objective 3), the Global Partnership will need to achieve the following tasks: (i) clarify goals for learning that are measured, specific and time-bound, such as in the Strategic Plan; (ii) improve the measurement of goals, by supporting UIS, LLECE, SACMEQ, PASEC and other data collection organizations, and by linking written end of term assessments to oral early classroom measurements, improving and standardizing practice in early assessments, and providing a clear link of measurement to instruction; (iii) provide useful knowledge on how to achieve the goals, including knowledge and well-evaluated experiences to improve reading and math and more knowledge on scaled-up efforts that could be placed on websites in a coordinated, simple fashion; (iv) foster a community of practice of key actors in learning areas, including reading and math; (v) kick-start action through efforts such as the GPE reading workshops, which could be used to strengthen communities of practice, and where countries, CSOs and donors could share and agree to act; and (vi) consider broader quality issues, including links to poverty, health, whole-school issues, teacher effectiveness and professional standing, among others.

7.2 Rebecca Winthrop of the Center for Universal Education at the Brookings Institution presented on the Learning Metrics Task Force, which was formed in service of the Education for All Goal 6: improving every aspect of the quality of education, in particular measurable learning outcomes that are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life-skills. The objective of the task force was to answer three questions: (i) what are children learning? (i.e., what areas were addressed beyond literacy, numeracy and essential life skills?); (ii) how canthese skills be measured? and (iii) how can the metrics, once developed, be best implemented? The task force would primarily examine early childhood, primary and post-primary education. The objective was not to develop a comprehensive measurement of every aspect of learning and development, but to provide an entry point and a metric that the development community could rally behind.

Discussion

7.3 There was general agreement among Board members on the importance of the Global Partnership's emphasis on quality and the learning agenda focused on reading and math, although some members noted that they would like to see the learning agenda encompass additional learning areas. Recognizing the need for a focused approach, some members were

interested in exploring ways to provide a more complete approach to learning, including involving agencies that could look at the wider learning environment.

7.4 Some Board members requested additional information regarding the Secretariat's follow-up after the reading workshops, including what the Secretariat and/or others in the Partnership were doing to improve learning. Board members emphasized the need to be clear regarding instruments used to make progress. The Secretariat noted that it was providing follow-up and would provide tracking of country commitments.

7.5 Some Board members suggested involving the LEGs in the Learning Metrics Task Force, as a forum for consultations.

8. UPDATE ON REPORTS OF MISUSE OF FUNDS

8.1 Bob Prouty, Head of the Secretariat, reported that in the case of misuse of funds in Zambia, where the Supervising Entity was the Netherlands, the issue has been largely resolved, with the Local Education Group reporting good progress and strong collaboration on the part of government.

8.2 The last report from the misuse of funds in Kenya, where the Supervising Entity was the World Bank, was communicated to the Board on 11 April 2012. A total of US$27 million was to be returned to the trust fund. The Secretariat sent a team to Kenya and followed up at the World Bank Spring Meetings. At the time of the Board meeting, the funds had not yet been repaid. The Secretariat had been notified that funding would be repaid by the beginning of Kenya's new fiscal year, no later than the end of July 2012.

8.3 It was agreed that the Board of Directors will send a strong message to Kenya that repayment was expected by the end of July 2012. If the Global Partnership does not receive repayment by this time, the Secretariat will recommend that Kenya be considered ineligible for GPE funding and removed from the list of indicative allocations for program implementation grants.

Discussion

8.4 There was general agreement among the Board members that strong action should be taken, although some members felt that determining Kenya ineligible for GPE funds would only serve to hurt the children who would not be able to attend school as a result.

8.5 For next steps, the Chair agreed to write a letter to the Government of Kenya urging them to repay funds to the Global Partnership, or risk becoming ineligible for future GPE funding.

9. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

9.1 Camilla Helgø Fossberg, Chair of the Financial Advisory Committee ("FAC") gave a brief overview of the FAC meetings in the past six months, as presented in BOD/2012/06 DOC 08. She noted that active participation was essential, and expressed concern that the participation of members from developing country partners had been very sporadic.

Amendments to the Terms of Reference of the FAC

9.2 The FAC Chair reminded the Board of Directors that during its May 2011 meeting in Kigali, the Board requested that the FAC review its terms of reference and draw up recommendations for clarifying roles and responsibilities, voting, quorum, reporting to the Board, and LEG availability at grant review meetings. The FAC Chair presented the FAC's proposed amendments to the FAC's TORs, and there was general agreement on the recommendation as presented.

9.3 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/06-03 — Revised Terms of Reference for the Financial Advisory Committee:**The Board of Directors replaces the terms of reference for the Financial Advisory Committee with the terms of reference presented in Annex 3 of BOD/2012/06 DOC 07.

Standards for Annual Review of Indicative Allocations for Program Implementation Grants

9.4 The FAC Chair presented a proposed recommendation on standards for the annual review of indicative allocations. The FAC Chair explained that the purpose of standards for the annual review of indicative allocations was to promote the efficient use of funds.The list was based on the funds available, the demand for funds, and a country's eligibility for funds.

9.5 The presentation clarified the following timing for the annual reviews:

- 31 August: cut-off date for information from countries
- Q3 FAC meeting: list of countries reviewed
- FAC recommendation updated before Q4 Board meeting
- Q4 Board meeting: changes approved andcountries informed
- Effective date of new list: 2nd round of the followingyear

9.6 The FAC Chair presented a decision, which approved FAC's process for the annual review as well as a process for reviewing requests above the US$100 million cap (see below). Seeing that there was not a consensus on the second issue, the language was amended to divide the issues into two decisions.

9.7 The following decision was approved by the Board of Directors:

> **BOD/2012/06-04 — <u>Standards for Annual Review of Indicative Allocations</u>:**The Board of Directors approves the standards for annual review of indicative allocations as described in the Report of the Financial Advisory Committee (BOD/2012/06 DOC 07).

Engaging Developing Country Partners with Federal Systems of Government

9.8 The FAC Chair provided background on the need for guidance on engaging with federal states. There are five developing countries interested in joining the Global Partnership that have federal systems of government: Comoros, Nigeria, Pakistan, Somalia and Tanzania. Traditionally, GPE processes and procedures centered on national plans in order to: (i) receive education plan development grants; (ii) join the Global Partnership (endorsement of national education plan); and (iii) receive program development/implementation grants.

9.9 The FAC Chair reported that there are numerous operational challenges to working in federal states: (i) multiple sub-national entities such as education ministries; (ii) multiple sub-national education plans (and the need for multiple development grants); and (iii) multiple local development partner groups (to appraise and endorse plans). Given the potential for multiple applications for program implementation grants and program development grants, the question remains of how to divide indicative allocations across sub-national levels.

9.10 Therefore, the FAC Chair put forth a recommendation as set out in the decision below. The FAC Chair noted that under the proposed decision, five federal states would be able to join the partnership almost immediately.

Discussion

9.11 Board members expressed broad agreement that the Global Partnership needs to engage federal states and there was general support for the recommended decision. A few Board members asked for clarification on who would join the Partnership (i.e., the nation or sub-national government representatives) and how they would be placed in a Board constituency. The FAC Chair clarified that the country would join and would put forward a person to represent the country as a whole.

9.12 It was noted that the phrase “where applicable” in regard to the CSO involvement in GPE processes in federal states should be struck, as CSO involvement is always applicable and the decision was amended accordingly.

9.13 The following decision was approved by the Board of Directors:

> **BOD/2012/06-05 – <u>Engagement with Potential Developing Country Partners with Federal Systems of Government</u>:**
> The Board of Directors approves the following in relation to potential developing country partners that have a federal system of government:

a. **Joining the Global Partnership**: Developing countries with federal systems of government join the Global Partnership as a national entity only (irrespective of the degree to which authority to govern education is devolved to sub-national governments). They will do so by communicating in writing to the Chair of the Global Partnership their commitment to the education Millennium Development Goals and Education for All goals and their support of the development and implementation of sub-national education plans.

b. **Education Plan Development Grants**: In cases where, due to the existence of a federal system, development of a national education plan is not feasible, sub-national governments of eligible federal states responsible for education may apply for education plan development grants of up to US$250,000.

c. **Appraisal and Endorsement**: A sub-national education plan must be appraised and endorsed by a Development Partner Group. The Development Partner Group may operate at the national and/or sub-national level. The Board of Directors requests the Secretariat to work with country-level stakeholders to determine what is feasible and most effective.

d. **GPE Program Development Grants**: In cases where there will be multiple program implementation grants due to the existence of multiple education plans at the sub-national level, Supervising Entities or Managing Entities appointed at these levels may each apply for a GPE program development grant of US$200,000 to 400,000. Where one Supervising Entity or Managing Entity is operating in several sub-national regions, only one grant will be given, unless a strong justification is provided by the Supervising Entity or Managing Entity to the Secretariat for the need for more than one grant.

e. **Indicative Allocations for Program Implementation Grants**: GPE indicative allocations for program implementation grants apply to all countries at the national level, including those with federal governments. In cases where the national and sub-national levels are in agreement on how to divide the national indicative allocation among sub-national levels, this decision will be respected by the Board of Directors and applications will be reviewed using the normal program implementation grant review and allocation processes. In cases where more guidance is required from the Global Partnership, in particular in cases where the country is subject to the US$100 million cap, it shall be provided by the Secretariat, subject to agreement by the Board of Directors after recommendation by the Financial Advisory Committee. Once a developing country partner's full national indicative allocation has been allocated by the Board of Directors, any sub-national entity in that country which has not had an allocation must await a new three-year indicative allocation.

f. The federal government will typically be the first point of engagement for the Global Partnership.

Liberia Program Revisions

9.14 The FAC Chair provided background on the Liberia program. In May 2010, the Catalytic Fund Committee approved a US$40 million program implementation grant for Liberia, with the

World Bank acting as Supervising Entity, which was signed in September 2010. There were numerous delays in the first year of the program, with only US$1 million disbursed out of a projected US$6 million. The LEG decided to restructure the program and advised GPE of this in May 2012. Material changes to program elements were proposed, with a 2-year extension.

9.15 The FAC reviewed the proposed revisions on an expedited basis and recommended their approval by the Board, with a few comments.

Discussion

9.16 Board members expressed broad support for the revisions. One Board member noted that, contrary to a worry expressed, USAID was not discontinuing support for teacher training programs in Liberia. Others added that there were lessons to be learned from the situation regarding working in fragile states.

9.17 **The following decision was approved:**

> **BOD/2012/06-06 — Revisions to the Liberia Program Implementation Grant:** The Board of Directors approves the revisions to the implementation grant program in Liberia, approved in May 2010, as set out in BOD/2012/06 DOC 07 Addendum.

Requests for Program Implementation Grants above the $US100 Million Cap

9.18 The FAC Chair noted that the decision of the Board of Directors applying the cap allows for exemption from the cap in "exceptional circumstances". The countries to which the cap applies are Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Pakistan, Ethiopia, and Nigeria. These countries would take up 59% of all GPE funding if they all received their uncapped grant amounts.

9.19 The FAC Chair presented a process by which countries could make a request exceeding the cap, which included an initial opinion from the FAC to the LEG. She explained that the factors that would be used in issuing such an opinion included current GPE resources, domestic resources, donor funding available,good past use of donor funding, the exhaustion of other funding sources, and clear evidence of need.

9.20 The FAC Chair noted that some FAC members opposed any above-cap requests. As presented in the FAC Report, to address their concerns it had been suggested that only countries with past GPE funding could request an exception or that an exception could be granted only after assessment of the first year of grant performance. These suggestions were not fully supported by the FAC, and clarity from the Board of Directors would be needed, keeping in mind that a reversal of the possibility of exceptions would require a new Board decision.

Discussion

9.21 There were divergent opinions on how to handle exceptions to the US$100 million cap on indicative allocations. One Board member felt that there should not be a "procedure for exceptions," otherwise all countries would apply. Additionally, some felt it would not be good to have almost 60% of funding in five countriessince the marginal impact of the above-cap funding on the policy dialogue would be expected to be modest in these countries and would reduce implementation funding elsewhere. Others strongly supported a process for applying for an exception, contending that such a process could have a catalytic effect in drawing additional (non-GPE) funding to a country.

9.22 Given the lack of consensus on the "capping" part of the recommendation, the Chair of the Board of Directors called for a vote.

9.23 The following decision was approved by majority vote:

> **BOD/2012/06-07 — Consideration of Requests for Program Implementation Grants above the US$100 Million Cap:**The Board of Directors approves the process for the consideration of requests for program implementation grants above the US$100 million cap as described in section 4.2.5 of the Report of the Financial Advisory Committee (BOD/2012/06 DOC 07).

Update on Top-Up Discussions

9.24 The FAC Chair gave an update on the FAC's discussions regarding providing results-based funding (top-ups) around the three GPE priority areas of girls' education, fragile states, and quality and learning outcomes. There are no internationally-recognized indicators for quality and learning outcomes to use for the Needs and Performance Framework. The Secretariat had provided a proposal to the FAC, recommending a pilot with a cash-on-delivery system for progress on learning outcomes.

9.25 The FAC's concerns were the following: (i) was there evidence that results-based funding worked? (ii) who would be included in the pilot and how much would each receive? (iii) would the cash-on-delivery scheme use existing country systems or create something different? The FAC stressed the importance of relying on country systems already in place and working with countries that had solid monitoring and evaluation systems required for these mechanisms.

9.26 The FAC would continue to discuss the issue and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors when ready.

Discussion

9.27 One Board member noted that the issue was a great opportunity to advance on learning outcomes.

Minimum Standards for SE and MEs and Upcoming FAC Meetings

9.28 The current GPE Fund Governance document limits eligibility for agencies serving in the role of the Supervising Entity and Managing Entity to donors (bilateral) and multilateral agencies represented on the constituencies of the Board of Directors. As the Partnership grows and looks to diversify its Supervising and Managing Entities (possibly including CSOs), it might be beneficial to develop standards, which would also help explain the SE/ME role more clearly.

Upcoming FAC Meetings

9.29 The FAC Chair reported that thenext face-to-face FAC meeting would take place in Oslo, 28-29 June, and would discuss four program implementation grant applications (Ghana, Nicaragua, Sudan, and Vietnam). The FAC would make recommendations to the Board of Directors in July via audio-conference. The FAC would also discuss top-ups and minimum Supervising and Managing Entity standards, as well as review the portfolio.

9.30 The FAC Chair advised that the next face-to-face FAC meeting after Oslo would likely take place in Washington, D.C., althougha date had not been finalized. At the meeting, the FAC expected to review up to 10 grant applications, conduct the annual review of the indicative allocations list, and finalize its recommendations on top-ups and standards for SEs and MEs. The FAC would aim to have grant recommendations in time for the next face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors.

10. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

10.1 The Chair raised a decision point on agreeing on themembers of the GPE Ethics Committee.

10.2 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/06-08 — Ethics Committee:** The Board of Directors approves the following membership of the Ethics Committee:
>
> Chair: Susan Hopgood (President, Education International)
> Member: François Nadeau (Legal Counsel, Canadian International Development Agency)
> Member: Christian Salazar (Deputy Director, Programs, UNICEF)

11. POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS PROTOCOL ON MISUSE OF TRUST FUNDS

11.1 Nancy Pinto of the Secretariat made a presentation on the proposed policy (BOD/2012/06 DOC 07). She noted that the Global Partnership is a partnership and not a separate legal entity, and is taking steps to handle the misuse of funds when it occurs. Supervising and Managing Entities use their own procedures and policies in handling GPE funds and treat them as their own. The Board of Directors has the authority to withhold funds from the Supervising and Managing Entities and from developing country partners. The

Secretariat discussed the possibility of establishing minimum standards for Supervising and Managing Entities in consultation with partners.

11.2 The role of key partners in handling the misuse of funds includes the following: (i) the Board of Directors will decide whether or not to approve allocations; (ii) developing country partners will establish internal controls and report on misuse; (iii) Supervising and Managing Entities will carry out fiduciary duties; (iv) LEGs will monitor implementation and potential issues; and (v) the Secretariat will be the focal point for communications with the Board on misuse.

11.3 The following steps would be taken when misuse was discovered: (i) when information is provided to the Head of the Secretariat, the Head will share it with the Chair; (ii) the Head and the Chair could choose to share the information with a restricted email list (composed of Board members, Alternate Board members, and one representative from each GPE donor partner that have each signed a confidentiality statement); and, if appropriate, (iii) information could be disclosed to the public.

Discussion

11.4 Most Board members were glad to see progress in this area and generally supported the policyalthough several requested changes to the wording of the decision. Some concern was raised around the confidentiality statement for members of the restricted email list, since many agencies are required to report misuse of funds immediately to others in their agencies. One member noted that in the past the Global Partnership hasbeen slow in clawing back funds from countries that have misused them and would need to improve on this. One member requested the inclusion of additional preventative measures for misuse of funds, including external audits and exclusion of those found to misuse funds from pooled funds.

11.5 The decision was revised according to comments and requests made by Board members. Wording for the confidentiality agreement was not included. Because of additional changes, one Board member noted that they would not be able to approve before sharing the revised wording with their organization. The Chair called for a vote.

11.6 The following decision was approved with one abstention:

> **BOD/2012/06-09 — Policy and Communications Protocol on Misuse of Global Partnership for Education Trust Funds**: The Board of Directors:
> (i) approves the Policy and Communications Protocol on Misuse of Global Partnership for Education Trust Funds, as attached as Annex 1 to BOD/2012/06 DOC 06 Version 2; and
>
> (ii) requests the Financial Advisory Committee to develop criteria for imposing temporary or permanent ineligibility for access to GPE Trust Funds of a Supervising Entity, Managing Entity, developing country partner, civil society organization, private sector organization or any other organization found to have engaged in Misuse (as defined in the Policy).

12. STATUS OF THE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES PROGRAM

12.1 Bob Prouty, Head of the Secretariat, presented on the Global and Regional Activities Program ("GRA"), the successor of the Education Plan Development Fund (EPDF) and is devised to encourage the participation of all GPE partners. It had been changed because in its previous iteration it was not fit for purpose, did not include enough institutional engagement by the Global Partnership as a whole, and lacked clear guidance on how GRA funds would be allocated.

Discussion

12.2 There was general agreement among Board members to support the GRA, since it represents a good way to improve interagency cooperation, especially around the post-2015 agenda. Board members requested that the GRA manual be aligned with the Strategic Plan and the GPE Fund, with explicitly stated goals, results and processes, and assurance of good governance in place. There was some concern expressed around the amount of time spent on developing the GRA, particularly in light of the impending break of funding for the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF), which had been supported by the GPE in the past.

12.3 The Secretariat agreed to finalize a GRA manual and circulate it to the Board of Directors as soon as possible. One Board member suggested that the Board of Directors need not make all decisions for the GRA, and that some may be delegated, but that it should approve the overall framework.

13. SECRETARIAT WORK PLAN AND BUDGET

13.1 Bob Prouty presented an 18-month work plan and budget for the Secretariat, both of which would be updated following approval of the final Strategic Plan for 2012-2015. The budget was developed for 18 months, based on a request by the Board of Directorsin November 2011 in Copenhagen to change the Secretariat's operational calendar from fiscal year to calendar year.

13.2 The development of the work plan and budget was guided by the Strategic Plan objectives and enabling approaches and included proposals for increased budget and staffing. To achieve the goal of increasing the volume, effectiveness and efficiency of funding for the education sectors, the Secretariat will work to achieve fundraising targets, secure at least six new donors contributing to the GPE Fund, support advocacy for funding to basic education, work on the development of an education bond, support the use of the most aligned modalities and work with partners on improved financial data management tracking. The Secretariat also intends to improve portfolio reporting, support the increase in the pool of Supervising and Managing Entities, deliver and support partnership and regional meetings, create, nurture and support knowledge-sharing platforms and services, and achieve a measureable increase in the visibility of the Global Partnership in key audiences. The Country Support Team would receive the largest increase in terms of budget, due to a proposed increase in Secretariat support to developing country partners. A revised Secretariat budget and work plan would be sent to the Board after approval of the Strategic Plan.

Discussion

13.3 Board members understood the rationale for an 18-month period to allow the Secretariat's budget to be aligned with the calendar year. However, most Board members felt that the work plan and budget in its current form did not provide enough detail to enable them to justify an overall increase in budget to their respective governments. Some Board members also felt that the Secretariat could find additional areas of increased efficiency and cost savings within the budget.

13.4 Board members requested the Secretariat to revise the budget with additional detailsregarding deliverables and costsand submit it for Board approvalby no objection before the end of June 2012, to allow the Secretariat to continue operations.

14. WORK PLAN AND BUDGET OF THE CHAIR

14.1 The Chair presented a 6-month budget for approval by the Board of Directors. Following the discussion, the Chair agreed to submit a more detailed account of expenditures by the end of June 2012.

14.2 Board members supportedthe Chair's proposed increased engagement with developing country partners, particularly with regards to meeting with ministries of education, ministries of finance, and heads of state.

15. WORK PLAN AND BUDGET OF THE TRUSTEE

15.1 The Trustee presented an 18-month budget for approval by the Board (BOD/2012/06 DOC 13).

15.2 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/06-10 — Trustee Budget:** The Board of Directors approves the budget of the Trustee of US$710,600 for the period of 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2013.

16. EVANS REVIEW

16.1 This session continued the Board's earlier discussion during the Board Retreat on 6 June 2012, following the presentation by Dr. Alison Evans, Director of the Overseas Development Institute on the Secretariat's hosting arrangements.[2] Responding to questions raised prior, Dr. Evans noted that although the Global Partnership had been given several options to clarify roles and responsibilities between the Secretariat and the World Bank as the host, these options had not been acted upon. Dr. Evans suggested that the Board of Directors agree to implement Stage 1 of the "Status-Quo Plus" plan outlined in the Hosting Review presentation and move on to Stage 2, if Stage 1 was not satisfactory. Dr. Evans suggested that immediate next steps would

[2] http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Berlin%202012/Board%20Presentations/03_GPE%20Hosting%20Review%20-%20Options.pdf

include the identification of performance benchmarks to determine whether Stage 1 was working and whether the Global Partnership was fully committed to a clear path of action.

Discussion

16.2 Board members agreed in general to adopt Stage 1 of Dr. Evans' report.

16.3 There was general agreement to form a Board Working Group, based on the Reference Group, to develop benchmarks and to carry out the next steps of Stage 1.

16.4 The following decision was approved:

> **BOD/2012/06-11 — Evans Review:** The Board of Directors takes note of the presentation by Dr. Alison Evans at the meeting of the Board of Directors on 7-8 June 2012 (the Presentation), which recommends a staged process for improving the operational and administrative effectiveness of the Global Partnership for Education, including the Secretariat.
>
> The Board of Directors:
>
> (a) requests the Chair to form a Board Working Group that will work with Dr. Evans to produce a detailed plan for the implementation of Stage 1, "Status Quo Plus," as described in the Presentation, by no later than the end of July 2012 (the Final Report); and
>
> (b) agrees to consider the Final Report at a meeting to be scheduled.

17. EXTENSION OF TERM OF THE CHAIR

17.1 An executive session of the Board of Directors (Board members and Alternates only) was held to discuss CEO recruitment and the performance review of the Chair.

17.2 Following the discussions at the Executive session, it was reported that the following decision had been approved by the Board of Directors during the session:

> **BOD/2012/06-12 — Extension of the Term of the Chair:** The Board of Directors:
>
> (a) approves the extension of the term of the Chair of the Global Partnership for Education to 31 December 2013 and requests UNESCO, as the host of the Chair position, to make all necessary arrangements for such extension;
>
> (b) recognizes that, following the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer, there may be possible changes to the description of the role of the Chair in the Charter; and
>
> (c) requests the Chair to present a one-year budget, for the approval by the Board of Directors, at its next face-to-face meeting.

18. SPOTLIGHT ON THE PARTNERSHIP

18.1 Ronia Hoelzer, of the German BACK-UP Initiative explained that its program, called Education in Africa, supports African countries to increase access to funding and to make more effective use of disbursed funds. The initiative is demand-driven, follows gender-sensitive and conflict-sensitive approaches, and places special emphasis on the involvement of civil society. There are two funds within the Initiative: one is fast and flexible and primarily provides training to partners, and the second supports a pan-African knowledge hub, a forum for knowledge-sharing with special emphasis on fragile states, and a strengthening of South-South cooperation.

18.2 Following the presentation, the Chair agreed to include additional examples of good practices in future Board meeting agendas.

19. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

19.1 Mike Kelleher of the Secretariat presented on the proposed communications strategy, and suggested that the Global Partnership communicate in such a way that a general audience could easily understand how the partnership works. There are three elements to this strategy: visibility, support of LEGs and knowledge sharing.

19.2 The communications strategy proposesto deliver information about the Global Partnership's work through a variety of platforms, including its (fully bilingual) website, blog, events such as the UN Secretary General's upcoming initiative on education, traditional media events and social media, among others.

19.3 There was not enough time to deliver the full communications strategy presentation and proposal, or for the Board to discuss it. The strategy willbe discussed further for approval at a later time.

ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANTS LIST

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Abt, Wendy	Deputy Assistant Administrator	USAID	United States	Alternate Board member, Donor 6
Almeida, Afonso	National Advisor	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Alshafe, Nagi	President	Sudanese Network for Education for All (SNEFA)	Sudan	Alternate Board member of CSO 2
Andersen, Jesper	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Constituent of Donor 4
Anten, Louise	Head of education and research division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Constituent of Donor 1
Archer, David	Head of Education	ActionAid	United Kingdom	Board Member of CSO 1
Ayariga, Mahama	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Education	Ghana	Board Member of Africa 3
Barton, Sandra	Country Support Team Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Beardmore, Sarah	Policy Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Bellamy, Carol	Chair	CHAIR	United States	Chair
Bernard, Jean-Marc	senior education specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Bland, Simon	Head, Global Funds Dept	DFID	United Kingdom	Board Member of Donor 3
Bourne, Jo	Education Policy Team Leader	Department for International Development	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Bridges, David	Operations Analyst	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Brinkhaus, Michaela	Desk Officer for Primary Education	Fed. Ministry for Economic Coop. and Development	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5
Cauldwell, Jonathan	Senior Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Constituent of Multilateral Agency
Charton-bigot, Hélène	Head of gender and human development department	Ministry of European and Foreign affairs	France	Constituent of Donor 5
Christensen, Olav Rex	Sr. Public Finance Specialist	World Bank	United States	Alternate Board Member, Multilateral & Regional Banks

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Cortese, Laurent	Senior Education Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Crouch, Luis	Team Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Da Rin, Jenny	Assistant Director General	AusAID	Australia	Board Member, Donor 2
Degnbol, Tove	Head of Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Alternate Board Member, Donor 4
Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Planning and Reform of Education	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Constituent of Africa 2
Doignon, Yann	Online Communications Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Duncan-Adanusa, Irene	General Secretary	Ghana National Association of Teachers	Ghana	Board Member, CSO 3
Durston, Susan	Associate Director Education Programmes	UNICEF	United States	Alternate Board Member,Multilateral Agency 2
Dworack, Sandra	Policy Advisor	Oxfam Germany e.V.	Germany	Observer
Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Constituent of CSO 3
Endo, Tomoya	Section chief	Ministry of Finance	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Evans, Alison	Director	ODI	United Kingdom	Presenter
Fossberg, Camilla	Head of Education Section	NORAD	Norway	Presenter (FAC Chair)
Fouilhoux, Monique	Adviser to the General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Constituent of CSO 3
Freitas, João Câncio	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Alternate Board Member, Asia & The Pacific
Fuerst, Barbara	Manager Programmes and Advocacy	Save the Children	Germany	Observer
Geier, Barbara	Teacher	GEW	Germany	Observer
Golden, April	Operations Analyst	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Gonzalez-Canali, Gustavo	Head of Health and Human Development Department	Ministry of Foreign affairs	France	Alternate Board Member, Donor 5
Goudiaby, Gisele	Board Logistics	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Griffiths, Paul	Asst. Director General, Multilateral Programs and Effectiveness Branch	Australian Agency for Intl. Development (AusAID)	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Guadalupe, Cesar	Senior Programme Specialist/Learning Outcomes	UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)	Canada	Observer
Gutiérrez, Francisco	Head of the Education Division	AECID	Spain	Alternate Board Member, Donor 2
Haba, Sharon	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Education	Rwanda	Board Member, Africa 1
Habibyar, Mohammad Shakir	Assistant to the Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constituent of Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia
Hæreid Seim, Olav	Director	UNESCO	France	Alternate Board Member, Multilateral Agency 1
Hamlaoui, Souad	Executive Assistant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Hertel, Ulrika	Programme Manager	Sida	Sweden	Constituent of Donor 4
Hoelzer, Ronja	Program Manager, German BACKUP Initiative Education in Africa	GIZ	Germany	Observer
Jahr de Guerrero, Karin	Senior Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
James, Owain	Global Co-ordinator	Global Campaign for Education	United Kingdom	Observer
O'Reilly, Joseph	Head of Education	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member, CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Kaboré, Ibrahima	Secrétaire Permanent	Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation	Burkina Faso	Constituent of Africa 2
Karjalainen, Marja	Deputy Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Board Member, Donor 5
Kelleher, Mike	Lead Int. Affairs Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
King, Elizabeth	Education Director	World Bank	United States	Board Member, Multilateral & Regional Banks
Koziol, Margaret	Policy Advisor, Basic Education	USAID	United States	Constituent, Donor 6

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Kvitashvili, Alexander	Rector	Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University	Georgia	Board Member, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Legault McGill, Ryan	Analyst	CIDA	Canada	Constituent of Donor 3
Lindenthal, Roland	Head of Education Division	Fed. Ministry for Economic Coop.and Development	Germany	Observer
Malpica, Rocio	Senior Counsel	World Bank	United States	Trustee
Manickchand, Priya	Minister	Ministry of Education	Guyana	Alternate Board Member Latin America & the Caribbean
Martins, Zeferino	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Mozambique	Alternate Board Member, Africa 1
Mesen, Michelle	Board of Directors Liaison	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Mizuno, Keiko	Senior Advisor (Education)	Japan International Cooperation Agency	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Mowe, Kjersti	CSEF Communications and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	Norway	Observer
Murphy, Lynn	Program Officer	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	United States	Alternate Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
Pearce, Caroline	Head of Policy	Global Campaign for Education (GCE)	United States	Observer
Pessi, Jefferson	Coordinator	Education International	Belgium	Observer
Pinto, Nancy	Team Coordinator, Finance, Portfolio and Administration	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Prouty, Robert	Head	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Reissmann, Christine	Director, Global Initiatives Directorate	CIDA	Canada	Alternate Board Member, Donor 3
Roth, Martina	Director Education Strategy Research Policy	Intel Corp	United States	Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
Sagorsky, Tal	Board Operations Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Ibrahimi, Salem	Advisor to the Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Sall, Ibrahima	Ministre de l'Education Nationale	Ministère de l'Education Nationale	Senegal	Board Member, Africa 2

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Savanella, Teresa	Senior Adviser, Education	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Italy	Constituent, Donor 5
Schmidt, Caroline	Operations Analyst	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Schmitt, Sylvia	Advisor education	German Cooperation (BMZ/GIZ)	Germany	Constituent, Donor 5
Schoenfeld, Dorothea	Advocacy Officer	Kindernothilfe	Germany	Observer
Seeger, Anna	Education Advisor	GIZ	Germany	Observer
Snijders, Vincent	Deputy Head, Sr. Education Advisor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Constituent, Donor 1
Taniguchi, Satoshi	Official	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Constituent, Donor 6
Taylor, Aleesha	Director of Special Projects - Education Support Program	Open Society Foundations	United States	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
Tilmanis, Lara	Constituency Coordinator	Private Sector Private Foundation Constituency	United States	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
Truong, Sally	Acting Director, Sectoral Funds Section	Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Uellendahl, Fiona	Observer	World Vision	Germany	Observer
van Ojik, Bram	Director DSO	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Board Member Donor 1
Wardak, Farooq	Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Alternate Board Member, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Waruku, Boaz	Programme Manager	ANCEFA - Africa Network Campaign on Education for All	Kenya	Constituent, CSO 2
Wilmshurst, Euan	Head of International Affairs	Pearson International	United Kingdom	Constituent, Private Sector/Private Foundations
Winthrop, Rebecca	Director and Senior Fellow	The Brookings Institution	United States	Presenter
Yamamoto, Yuji	Official	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Board Member, Donor 6
Young, Grace	Financial Officer	World Bank	United States	Trustee
Zwahlen, Anne	Deputy Head SC|DC West	Swiss Development	Switzerland	Alternate Board Member Donor 1

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
	African Department	Cooperation		