REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP

For Decision and Input

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to provide a report of the deliberations of the Strategic Plan Working Group since its report to the Board of Directors at its face-to-face meeting on 7-8 June 2012 in Berlin, Germany. While the Strategic Plan Working Group seeks an interim decision from the Board of Directors, as noted in Section 2 below, it is principally seeking input from the Board of Directors on a number of important questions set out in Section 5 below. The implementation plan has not yet been finalized and the Board of Directors meeting on 19-20 November is an important part of the consultation process prior to the submission of final recommendations to the Board in early 2013.

2. RECOMMENDED DECISION

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

BOD/2012/11-XX — Finalization of the Strategic Plan Implementation Plan:

The Board of Directors:

a. notes the work to date of the Strategic Plan Working Group on developing an implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015;

b. requests the Strategic Plan Working Group, working with the Secretariat, to:

i. continue its consultation of GPE partners to contribute to the development of the implementation plan; and

ii. to finalize the implementation plan, including possible amendments to the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Secretariat budget, and deliver it to the Board of

Directors as soon as possible but no later than 28 February 2013, for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled;

c. urges all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible; and

d. requests the Secretariat to deliver to the Board of Directors, no later than the next face-to-face Board meeting in 2013, a risk management framework for review by the Board of Directors.

3. BACKGROUND

Since the last report to the Board of Directors from the Strategic Plan Working Group, the following has occurred:

- At the Board of Directors meeting on 7-8 June 2012, the Board of Directors passed the following decision:

> **BOD/2012/06-02— Finalization of the Strategic Plan:** 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.

The Strategic Plan 2012-2015 was approved by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference meeting on 31 July 2012. At that meeting, the Board of Directors requested the Secretariat to finalize the Strategic Plan based on the comments made, and to publish it in conjunction with the launching of the United Nations Secretary General's Education First Initiative. The Board of Directors also requested the Secretariat to provide a revised monitoring and evaluation strategy that is aligned to the Strategic Plan (in addition to the other documents requested in decision BOD/2012/06-02).

- Jesper Andersen (Denmark) and Geeta Rao Gupta (UNICEF) were appointed co-Chairs of the SPWG.

- The Strategic Plan was released during the week of 24 September 2012, at the United Nations General Assembly.

- The Chair of the Board of Directors established a Technical Group on Indicators to continue considering the indicators in the Strategic Plan and to report to the SPWG on its findings. (A summary of their report is included as Attachment 1 to Annex 2).

- The Secretariat, working with partners, developed a paper on Objective 4 (teachers). That paper, which has not been reviewed by the SPWG, is presented separately (BOD/2012/11 DOC 04). Following review and input by the Board of Directors on that paper at the November 2012 meeting, the final implementation plan will include actions and deliverable related to this Objective.

4. PROGRESS TO DATE IN DEVELOPING AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

4.1 The Strategic Plan Working Group met twice by audio-conference and once face-to-face. The summaries of the first audio-conference and the face-to-face meeting have been delivered to the Board of Directors. The summary for the final meeting, held on 16 October 2012, is attached as **Annex 1**.

4.2 Work has progressed in developing the implementation plan, and the current version of the plan, still under development and for discussion, is attached as **Annex 2**.

4.3 The SPWG is not currently in a position to recommend a completed implementation plan to the Board of Directors. It considers that greater consultation is required in order to secure the necessary support and to facilitate partners "opting in" to specific deliverables. The SPWG considers that the greatest risk to the success of the Strategic Plan is a lack of partner engagement in its implementation. Securing that engagement, rather than dictating it, has to be a core priority in the coming months.

4.4 The meeting of the Board of Directors on 19-20 November 2012 offers an important opportunity for further consultation and discussion, including around a number of important

unresolved themes that have significant bearing on the content of a final implementation plan. To that end, the draft implementation plan in **Annex 2** is still a work in progress. Most of the deliverables contained therein are not controversial and have already been committed to by the Secretariat, Board of Directors, or other partners.

4.5 The Board of Directors will meet for a preliminary discussion of this paper over dinner on 18 November 2012 in Paris. This focused evening discussion will centre on the implications of the Strategic Plan set out in **Section 5** below. Discussion around the draft implementation plan (**Annex 2**) and consequent decisions will occur during the main Board of Directors meeting on 19-20 November 2012.

4.6 Consultation to date has involved developing country partners, donors, civil society, the private sector and private foundations, and to a lesser extent, international organizations. A summary of aspects of this consultation will be provided to the Board of Directors in a short presentation at the Board meeting.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION

The SPWG has identified seven themes that arise from their discussions of the development of the implementation plan that require input from the Board of Directors and other partners prior to making final recommendations on deliverables under the implementation plan. The SPWG will seek written comments on all of these themes and questions, while discussion by the Board of Directors over dinner on 18 November 2012 will focus on half a dozen of the most critical issues, to be agreed between the SPWG co-chairs and the chair of the Board of Directors.

The seven themes are as follows:

Theme 1: Implications for Education Sector Plans (ESPs)

Overview: The Strategic Goals and Objectives of the Strategic Plan outline a very clear agenda for the Global Partnership over the next three years: a focus on fragile states, girls' education, early grade numeracy and reading, greater focus on teachers and teaching, and greater financing for education. These are all situated within the broader framework of addressing access, equity, learning, and strengthening government systems. However, the GPE model calls for country-led processes, with locally-framed priorities. Is there a contradiction or dynamic tension here? In

addition to some simple deliverables that can be achieved, there are a number of questions that remain to be answered.

Issues for discussion:

- Does the Global Partnership aim to strengthen ESPs developed by countries based on country priorities, or do we compel countries to consider GPE priorities? Are there any funding implications?
- Could lack of progress against core indicators in the results Framework act as a trigger for greater compulsion?
- What is the appropriate balance/nuancing between the country-led model determining all priorities and GPE priorities being taken into consideration?

Theme 2: Implications for the working mechanisms of the Global Partnership

Overview: The GPE model is structured around the Local Education Group (LEG) at the country level. The LEG supports the development of ESPs and selects Managing Entities (MEs) and Supervising Entities (SEs) for GPE financial support to ESP implementation. In practice, the effectiveness of LEGs varies enormously, as does their make-up and representativeness. With more donors exiting bilateral funding of education in many countries, the concept of a LEG with broad membership is now under question. In many countries, civil society organizations, the private sector and the teaching profession are not adequately represented. In fragile and conflict-affected states, LEGs can be more theoretical than real. Accordingly, attention needs to be paid to whether the LEG model is fit for purpose in all countries.

In addition, the question of country eligibility for program implementation funding has arisen in the context of deliberations of the Financial Advisory Committee. Currently, eligibility is limited to countries that are IDA eligible in Categories i and ii, and fragile and conflict-affected states and Small Island Developing States in Category iii. This eligibility requirement is proving problematic as the movement between Category ii and iii from year-to-year occurs regularly.

Issues for discussion:

- Is the LEG fit for purpose? Should the model be reviewed in any, some, or all circumstances?
- Could donors continue to support elements of in-country technical capability even if their bilateral funding has decreased/phased out?
- Is the representation of civil society, the teaching profession and the private sector in the development and monitoring of ESPs a GPE requirement, aspiration or guideline? Can their greater engagement offset the declining donor technical presence?
- What are the next steps for the Civil Society Education Fund?[1] How can the partnership support greater engagement and participation of civil society at the country level?
- Should the Board of Directors amend the current country eligibility for program implementation grants? If so, what might those be?
- Does the Board composition need to be reviewed to include emerging donors and Middle Income Countries ("MICs")?

Theme 3: Implications for partners and linkages

Overview: A core question for each member of the Global Partnership when considering the Strategic Plan is: "what are the implications for us?" This is not something that can be dictated, it is for members to determine how they will contribute to the Strategic Plan, when, and with what level of commitment. That said, there are already some strong areas of partnership and linkages among partners that are delivering some important outcomes.

Issues for discussion:

- What is the role of the Secretariat in facilitating/fostering greater linkages across the partnership at both the local and global levels?
- How can institutions/organizations incorporate into their own mandates the directions of the Global Partnership that have been agreed upon, and ensure that their messaging is consistent at the global and local level?

[1] A session dedicated to this issue is scheduled for the Board of Directors meeting in November 2012.

- How does GPE broaden the reach of the partnership and bring other actors better into its workings, such as networks, other UN agencies, MICs, etc.?
- What does "membership" of the partnership mean in terms of expectations and commitments to specific action?

Theme 4: Implications for resource mobilization

Overview: The Strategic Plan is ambitious in terms of overall financing for education and also for the GPE Fund. However, there are important caveats to note. While most GPE developing country partners have increased government financing for basic education, this is by no means the case in all. Therefore, the additionality of GPE funding needs to be considered. Moreover, much has been made publicly of the substitution effect of GPE funds on IDA funding for education, though this could equally apply to many bilateral agencies. More evidence is needed to determine whether GPE funding has led to a net increase in funding for basic education globally. To this end, a more strategic approach to resource mobilization needs to be employed and specific plans need to be established in the lead-up to the next replenishment cycle.

The Strategic Plan highlights the importance of the efficiency and effectiveness of education financing, and the importance of value for money. Part of this agenda is seeking greater engagement with Finance Ministries, something that the education sector has not succeeded in doing. It also includes developing a common understanding of "value for money" as it applies to the partnership and then using it as a core tool in assessing the effectiveness of investments.

Issues for discussion:

- Should increases in domestic financing be a requirement to access program implementation funding from the Global Partnership? Does this apply equally to fragile states?
- Should additionality be a requirement (e.g., IDA, funding from SEs)? Can displacement of funding be measured accurately?
- How is "Value for Money" defined across the partnership?
- What is the role of the Global Partnership in global advocacy for education? What is the role of the Secretariat and what are the roles of individual partners?

- How can the partnership work effectively to increase the engagement with Ministries of Finance?
- How far are donors, governments and other partners prepared to go in identifying future funding flows to aid transparency, predictability and planning?

Theme 5: Implications for knowledge-sharing

Overview: The Strategic Plan contains several references to the need for greater knowledge-sharing, innovation, moving successes to scale, etc. How this can be done efficiently and cost-effectively is a vexed question. In today's world of high technology, there are a myriad of knowledge sources and it will be important that the Global Partnership does not duplicate what already exists. At the same time, sifting the available knowledge and feeding true, relevant successes into planning processes to take to scale remains elusive.

Issues for discussion:

- What is the role of the Global Partnership in knowledge production, assimilation and distribution? Does it require its own dedicated knowledge platform? What is the role of the Secretariat?
- How can knowledge/innovation be assessed? Does it need to be?
- How can successful innovations be included in the development of ESPs and taken to scale? Does the GRA have a role to play here?

Theme 6: Implications for assessment and accountability

Overview: A summary of the recommendations of the Technical Group on Indicators is included as **Annex 3** to this paper. Items for Board consideration are:

1) Whether a phased approach to improving indicator production is acceptable.
2) Whether the GPE Board is willing to issue more of a mandate on reporting or is willing to accept a gradual approach based on capacity-building.
3) Whether the Board is willing to consider the fact that there will be considerable costs in producing the indicators, and is therefore willing to call upon the Secretariat and/or a working group to come up with a concrete cost proposal.

One of the recurrent questions in the preparation of the Strategic Plan has been "how does one assess the value-added of the partnership"? Also, the lack of a risk management framework for GPE needs rectifying and regular monitoring of it is required.

Issues for discussion:

- How should the value-added of the partnership best be assessed?
- How should an annual self-evaluation by the Board of Directors best be conducted?
- What should be included in a GPE risk management framework?

Theme 7: Implications for financing modalities

Overview: The Strategic Plan calls for greater alignment of education funding and more on-budget financing, as well as greater use of sector budget support. This has been raised as a concern by the FAC and the Board, yet progress on this front is elusive. All sorts of modalities are currently in use including project funding, basket funding, program funding, budget support and various hybrids therein. While it is not possible to be proscriptive over other bilateral and multilateral funding modalities, there does need to be more progress made on the use of program implementation funding.

If one takes the Paris/Accra/Busan development effectiveness agenda as a starting point, the default funding modality for program implementation grants should be education sector budget support. Clearly, this will not be applicable in all contexts. The preferred funding modality of Supervising Entities also has an influence. However, more consistency and progress is needed.

Issues for discussion:

- Does anything specifically need to be done to increase the quantum of program implementation funding that is provided as education sector budget support?
- Should this be the preferred default modality with clear justifications provided for any diversion from this approach?
- How do we assure that preferred modalities are the most effective in terms of achieving outcomes?

6. NEXT STEPS

Following discussion by the Board of Directors at the November 2012 Board meeting, the SPWG and Secretariat will conduct further consultations across the partnership on the implementation plan. A final version of the plan will be delivered to the Board of Directors as soon as possible, but no later than the end of February 2013 for consideration by the Board of Directors.

ANNEX 1:

STRATEGIC PLAN MEETING

VIA AUDIO-CONFERENCE

16 OCTOBER 2012

MEETING SUMMARY

---

1. **Background**: On 16 October 2012, the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) held a meeting via audio-conference. The main objective of the meeting was to discuss the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan. The agenda for the meeting is attached to this Meeting Summary.

2. **Attendance**: Audio-conference meeting participants included the following:

   a. **SPWG members:**

   Jesper Andersen (Co-Chair, Denmark)
   Geeta Rao Gupta (Co-Chair, UNICEF)
   Greg Butler (Microsoft)
   Beth King (World Bank)
   Joseph O'Reilly (Save the Children, UK)
   Bob Prouty (GPE Secretariat)
   Farid Tanai (Afghanistan, on behalf of Minister Farooq Wardak)
   Chris Tinning (AusAID)
   Sally Waples, Jo Bourne, Jennifer Stockill (UK, on behalf of Simon Bland)

   b. **Secretariat members:**

   Luis Crouch
   Michelle Freeouf
   Michelle Mesen
   Tal Sagorsky
   Charles Tapp

   c. **Observers:**

   Carol Bellamy (Chair of the Board of Directors)

   d. **Apologies:**

   Minister Koumba Boly Barry (Burkina Faso)
   David Edwards (Education International)

3. **Summary of last meeting on 29 September 2012:** The Chair noted that the meeting summary from the SPWG face-to-face meeting on 29 September was circulated to the SPWG and the Board of Directors. Having received no objections, the summary was approved.

4. **Brief update on consultations:**

   a. Charles Tapp (Secretariat) reported that, after the SPWG face-to-face meeting on 29 September 2012, it was clear that more input was needed from developing country partners. So far, discussions with The Gambia, Ghana, Zambia, Bhutan and Georgia had taken place, and a meeting is scheduled with Afghanistan next week.
   b. Developing country partners had expressed general support for a more proscriptive approach regarding GPE priorities. However, they had also noted that there was a disconnect between the education sector plan and how funds were being allocated, and this should be rectified (with funding processes being more reflective of the plan). Most believed that their Local Education Group (LEG) was working well, but civil society and private sector involvement could be strengthened. There was consensus that additionality was important and should be a benchmark for qualifying for GPE funding.
   c. The Secretariat would prepare a more detailed summary once more consultations are completed.
   d. The SPWG agreed that it might be useful to distribute a questionnaire to developing country partners after the face-to-face Board meeting in November 2012, based on discussions by the Board of Directors.

5. **Draft of Implementation Plan**

   a. Many members of the SPWG agreed that the current draft was an improvement. The group liked the clarity of the deliverables, the less proscriptive approach, and the simple and clear format.
   b. Regarding the "actions" included under the objectives of the Strategic Plan, the SPWG noted that these needed to be entirely captured in the deliverables, and a cross-checking exercise should be undertaken by the Secretariat.
   c. SWPG members proposed adding a "line of sight" for each objective, in order to outline for those who were not as familiar with the Plan what problem each objective addressed, and what the Partnership needed to do in order to solve it. This could possibly be captured by adding a "rationale" column to the document.
   d. There was some disagreement as to whether the Plan should be divided along themes or objectives. The SPWG agreed that the Secretariat would present a new draft, attempting a hybrid between linking the deliverables to the objectives, and not losing the sense of the themes, because some objectives were cross-cutting.
   e. The SPWG agreed that the development and monitoring of a risk framework was something that the Board of Directors should be asked to agree to in principle at its next face-to-face meeting.
   f. The SPWG agreed to a two-tiered approach for a draft Implementation Plan to go to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting. This would involve an articulation of deliverables that could be committed to right now, without further Board decisions, and secondly an articulation of the broader implications and issues that the Board would need to consider requiring more work at a future date.

6. **Technical Group on Indicators paper:**

   a. Luis Crouch (Secretariat) provided an update on the Indicators Technical Group paper which was circulated to the SPWG. The Technical Group advised against being proscriptive, in contrast to the advice from developing country partners. There was a general consensus among the Technical Group that the focus should be on advocacy and awareness-raising, rather than mandating indicators.
   b. The Technical Group raised the issue of resource/organization implications, particularly for the global agencies (like UNESCO Institute for Statistics) that would be compiling the data.
   c. The Technical Group noted that eight times more data existed on health than on education, and although the benefits of gathering education data were clear, there was a need for resources in order to do so. The Secretariat would develop an Executive Summary of the Indicators paper to be submitted as supporting information for the discussion on the Strategic Plan at the next face-to-face Board meeting.

7. **For consideration at the Board of Directors face-to-face meeting (19-20 November 2012):**

   a. The SPWG agreed that it was not likely to be in a position to request the Board of Directors to approve the implementation plan at the next face-to-face meeting, but rather would ask the Board for feedback as part of the consultation process.

   b. The Board of Directors would receive a cover memo, draft Implementation Plan (or discussion Implementation Plan) and an Executive Summary of the Indicators paper.

   c. The working dinner on 18 November 2012 would be an informal discussion. The discussion during the Board meeting would focus on deliverables and the specific areas of short-term focus that were needed to finalize the plan by January 2013.

8. **Next steps:** The following next steps were agreed:

   By 19 October 2012, the Secretariat would circulate a new draft of the implementation plan and an executive summary of the paper from the Technical Group on Indicators to the SPWG for final written comments by 22 October 2012. The Secretariat would finalize the Board papers with the SPWG co-chairs by 24 October 2012, in order for all documents to be sent for translation into French in time for the upcoming face-to-face Board meeting.

Strategic Plan 2012-2015
Board of Directors Working Group
Audio-conference Agenda
16 October 2012, 9:00 am – 10:30 am EST

(90 minutes)

Discussion Item	Action Requested
1. Welcome and attendance	No action needed
2. Summary of SPWG face-to-face meeting on 29 September 2012(document attached)	Acceptance of minutes
3. Brief update on consultations	For information
4. Rough draft of Implementation Plan (documents attached): • Discussion of format/approach • Discussion of content	For comments
5. Technical Group on Indicators paper (document attached)	For comments
6. What will the SPWG ask the Board of Directors to consider/do at the next Board face to face meeting (19-20 November 2012)?	For agreement
7. Next Steps • Finalising documents to be sent to the Board by 5 November 2012 • Board working dinner to discuss implementation plan: 18 November, 2012	For agreement
8. Any Other Business	To be determined

ANNEX 2: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN DISCUSSION PAPER

Introduction

The Global Partnership is a voluntary coalition built around a common vision and purpose. The Implementation Plan aims to make greater cooperation and partnership more feasible, to help remove some of the obstacles to a collective achievement of the Strategic Goals and Objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan. It is expected that partners will choose to "opt in" to key areas of interest. This will also be a key indicator of the success and value-added of the Global Partnership and will in and of itself be monitored closely.

This discussion paper is separated into two parts. **Part A** outlines the core implementation factors required in addressing the Objectives contained in the Strategic Plan and the means of strengthening the partnership.

Part B sets out a series of "deliverables" necessary to achieve the outcomes sought in the Strategic Plan. At this stage, the deliverables remain very much in draft for further consultation and are for the most part uncontroversial. Timeframes have been suggested and also some initial thinking on participating partners where work has already started and partners are already engaged. Over the coming months the Global Partnership will seek further guidance from partners over which deliverables they wish to engage in.

The paper also contains three attachments: (1) a report from the Indicators Technical Group, (2) risks associated with the Strategic Plan and (3) an illustrative risk taxonomy for the Global Partnership.

In developing this early draft of the Implementation Plan, it was clear that there are a number of themes that cut across many aspects of the Strategic Plan that require further discussion and agreement from the Board of Directors before taking forward more concretely. Put simply, some further strategic guidance is required before a comprehensive Implementation Plan can be finalized. These cross-cutting themes and the issues to be addressed are contained in the cover note to this paper.

PART A: Translating the Strategic Plan to Implementation

Objectives of the Strategic Plan

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

Overview:

The Global Partnership is currently working with 18 fragile states, with four more predicted to join the Partnership and apply for funding before the end of 2014. Fragile states represent well over half of the countries coming forward for funding in the next two years and US$550 million in funding. The challenges facing fragile and conflict affected states in terms of developing and implementing their education sector plans, including accessing GPE support to do so, include: low planning capacity; limited reach of government within the country; weak civil society; weak government systems; lack of suitable partners to work with; constraints on effective and timely use of resources; civil disruption due to conflict; and lack of external financing for education, especially in conflict and humanitarian emergencies. Historically, fragile states have found it harder to access GPE funding (though that is now changing with the introduction of Transitional Education Sector Plans) and have also faced longer delays in spending funds that are allocated. Few plans have paid adequate attention to conflict analysis and peace-building opportunities through education.

The Global Partnership can do much in supporting a greater attention to education in fragile and conflict-affected states, including through some simple adaptations to its own processes and procedures. By 2015, the Partnership aims to address these challenges, through the deliverables outlined in this plan, in order to achieve the following:

- Revise GPE endorsement and funding mechanisms to be more fit for purpose
- Expand Supervising and Managing Entity eligibility for program implementation
- Mobilize additional $500 million in bilateral and other funding beyond current commitments
- Education plans informed by comprehensive conflict analysis
- Increase support for better coordination and plan development
- With INEE, bridge the gap between emergency response and development

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

Overview:

The Global Partnership intends to support and strengthen the work of partners involved in addressing girls' education, particularly with partners under the UN Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI). Challenges that developing country partners face in delivering gender equitable education services include: tools and metrics to address gender equality in education quality have been underutilized or are not fully developed; teacher effectiveness and gender sensitivity in the classroom is limited by the extent to which teachers are unaware of proper patterns of behaviour toward children and by the effects of centralized teacher distribution and accountability; a lack of formalized early support for gender sensitivity in education sector plans; a lack of targeted financial support for girls to participate in secondary school as well as gender imbalances in senior management positions within the education sector.

The Global Partnership can help to sufficiently address the challenges developing country partners face in promoting gender equity in the basic education sector, by supporting and scaling up work that is already being done by its partners, as well as changing some of its own processes. By 2015, the Partnership aims to address these challenges, through the deliverables outlined in this plan, in order to achieve the following:

- With UNGEI, establish gender equality indices for education quality
- Improve teacher effectiveness to help bridge the gender equality gap
- Ensure that all education sector plans are gender-responsive
- Allocate specific funding for activities that address gender imbalances in transition to secondary school
- Promote the inclusion of more qualified women in senior education sector roles

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

Overview:

Recent studies reveal an alarming trend among GPE developing country partners, that, while making good progress in increasing the number of kids in school, education systems struggle to help their children develop strong literacy and numeracy skills. In many countries, the problem begins in the very early grades, when many children have not had access to early childhood education and are not cognitively, socially, emotionally or physically prepared to learn. Another challenge lies in the lack of appropriate reading materials, particularly materials that are in a child's native language; at least one study has found that almost 75 percent of children in southern African countries did not have a basic textbook for reading or mathematics. Nearly 50 percent of the global population of children who do not attend school live in regions where the school's language of instruction is rarely used at home. Teachers are often unaware of current pedagogical practices appropriate for literacy and numeracy instruction, teach in a language that is unfamiliar to students, or do not include adequate time for reading and numeracy during the school day, due to curriculum requirements, poor school management, or absenteeism, among other reasons. Although Early Grade Reading Assessments (EGRA) and Early Grade Mathematics Assessments (EGMA) are becoming more common, there continues to be a lack of regular, appropriate assessments to address specific problems in the areas of literacy and numeracy, and to enable teachers and officials to track student progress.

The Global Partnership has a unique opportunity to address the challenges involved in improving literacy and numeracy, by supporting the work of its partners as well as providing increased support and assistance to developing country partners. By 2015, the Global Partnership aims to address these challenges, through the deliverables outlined in this plan, in order to achieve the following:

- Support efforts to increase early childhood education, especially for the more marginalized
- Ensure there is adequate time devoted to reading and numeracy in the early grades
- Support qualified teachers equipped with the right approaches to teach reading and numeracy
- Provide appropriate reading materials

- Promote mother tongue instruction for reading where appropriate
- Promote appropriate and regular assessment of reading and numeracy progress

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

Overview:
NB. This section will be completed once the Board of Directors has considered the teacher policy paper at its face-to-face meeting on 19-20 November 2012 (see BOD/2012/11 DOC 04).

By 2015, the Global Partnership aims to address these challenges, through the deliverables outlined in this plan, in order to achieve the following:

- Increase engagement of the teaching profession in LEGs
- Support education plans that focus on increasing the quality of teaching, along with the percentage and number of qualified teachers
- Support the engagement of the teaching profession on standards of practice in GPE-endorsed countries
- Support improvements in the deployment, remuneration and working conditions of teachers

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

Overview:
Overall funding for education is currently falling a long way short of meeting the Education for All goals by 2015. The latest Education for All Global Monitoring Report claims that the global additional funding requirement for education is US$16 billion per annum. The Global Partnership estimated the realistic unmet funding requirement in GPE-endorsed countries between 2012 and 2015 to be US$8 billion. External financing for the education sector has been largely restricted to traditional OECD-member ODA with an average of only 5.6% of aid budgets allocated to basic education in 2010, and the aid budgets of OECD Development Assistance

Committee donors are now mostly in decline. The proportion of domestic government expenditure on education varies significantly in GPE-endorsed countries, though the GPE model has succeeded in seeing domestic funding increase on average by 6% per annum over the past 5 years. That said, inefficiencies in partner government systems and financing mechanisms can severely impact budget effectiveness. In many countries, the easier to reach regions benefit much more from education financing than more remote areas, a product of inequitable resource allocation. Budget tracking of both domestic and external financing for education tends to be weak, reducing transparency and predictability. Much of the external financing is project-based and insufficiently aligned, let alone integrated with government budget processes.

The education sector has yet to make a compelling case for further investment, thereby linking financing with results and value for money. By 2015, the Global Partnership aims to address these challenges, through the deliverables outlined in this plan, in order to achieve the following:

- Strengthen resource mobilization to reach fundraising targets
- Advocate for increased external and domestic funding
- Engage with emerging donors and non-state actors to ensure greater alignment with national education plans
- Set targets for external and domestic financing based on careful analysis of national education plans
- Promote efficient and equitable allocation of financing for education
- Produce a value for money strategy
- Improve transparency and budget tracking

Strengthening the Partnership

The Strategic Plan highlighted five areas where the partnership should be strengthened. Within these five, a series of outcomes were presented which are directly linked to the implementation deliverables outlined in Part B of this document.

A. Greater engagement in support of Local Education Groups, sector planning and country level processes

Outcomes sought:

- Strengthened Secretariat Country Support Team further with more frequent country engagement
- Greater reinforcement of the roles and responsibilities of the different actors at country level
- Expanded number of bilateral and multilateral agencies taking on supervising and managing entity roles
- Donor partners and international organizations increased funding that is on budget and aligned with country education plans
- Increase significantly the proportion of implementation grant resourced allocated to pooled funds or sector budget support in non-fragile states

B. Strengthen risk management and streamline processes and procedures

Outcomes sought:

- Increased transparency in the use of allocations from the GPE Fund
- GPE processes changed to be more nimble and fit for purpose, especially in fragile and conflict-affected states
- Increased streamlining of planning processes and strengthened accountabilities for implementation of program implementation grants

C. Strengthen the role of civil society and the private sector in the partnership

Outcomes sought:

- Greater civil society, teaching profession and private sector and private foundation involvement in Local Education Groups and in policy dialogue at the country level, developing grant applications and joint sector reviews
- Map the involvement of international corporate and foundation investments in education at the country level and develop mechanisms to improve coordination and alignment with education plans, as well as innovations within them
- Private sector engaged on pre-service teacher training, in-service training, and support through information technology and telecommunications, use of mobile telephony to facilitate the payment of salaries and other aspects of education sector improvement, such as monitoring of teacher attendance, provision of teaching materials and delivery of curricula through information technology

D. Greater focus on development effectiveness, value for money and results

Outcomes sought:

- Study on value for money
- Regular reporting measured against the Results Framework, including the indicators from the Strategic Plan
- Greater cooperation and coordination between partners collecting data and analysis thereof
- Greater development effectiveness for all partners.
- Better reporting on effectiveness of GPE Fund grant portfolio
- Pledge commitments under replenishment processes fully monitored and reported
- Functioning and effectiveness of the Local Education Groups assessed
- Board self-evaluation

E. Seek out, nurture, evaluate and support scaling-up of innovations

Outcomes sought:

- Successful innovations are evaluated, promulgated and scaled up, where appropriate
- Promote existing and new open-source, knowledge-sharing platforms to share information regarding innovations and best practice and make it available to the LEGs. Greater focus on knowledge-sharing and lessons learned.
- Expanded partnership to foster exchange of evidence-based policies

PART B: Deliverables

These deliverables are an initial draft and will be subject to further consultation. Deliverables highlighted in yellow still require further additional decisions by the Board of Directors.

- Further deliverables pertaining to improving teacher effectiveness will need to be added following the Board of Directors' consideration of a draft paper on the subject at its face-to-face meeting in November 2012 (BOD/2012/11 DOC o4).

- The column headed "Areas of Impact" refers to the five objectives contained in the strategic plan and the five areas of strengthening the partnership also contained in the plan. Please see Part A for full details.

- The column headed "Partners" still requires much work as members of the partnership opt into different deliverables.

- The following list of deliverables is not broken out into headings and may appear somewhat daunting. Different methods of categorizing the deliverables have been reviewed by the SPWG, such as by Strategic Plan Objective (difficult since most deliverables impact a number of Objectives) or by partners (also difficult since there are multiple partners and also most partners have yet to "opt-in"). For now, there is no categorization, but a logical format will be developed prior to a final implementation plan being submitted to the Board of Directors for agreement early in 2013.

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
1	1 A, C	Produce guidelines, format and technical support for the development of Transitional Education Sector Plans to be used in some fragile and conflict-affected states	Guidelines completed by January 2013 Technical support is ongoing	Secretariat, International Institute for Education Planning, INEE
2	1, 2, 3, 4 A	Guidance for Education Sector Plan (ESP) development to be revised and reviewed annually to reflect Strategic Plan priorities, including to encourage inclusion of early grade reading assessments, gender responsive action plans, early childhood development (ECD) focused on marginalized children and specific actions to support teachers	Revision completed October 2012 Annual reviews 2013, 2014, 2015	Secretariat
3.	1, 5 A,B	Accelerated funding in emergencies approved by the Board of Directors in November 2012 and ready for implementation by January 2013.	November 2012 / January 2013	Secretariat, FAC, Board of Directors
4.	1, 3, 5 A	Develop and disseminate tools that promote conflict-sensitivity in ESPs and Transitional ESPs, including a focus on the equitable distribution of resources	2013	INEE, UNICEF
5.	2 A	UNGEI focal point in each LEG established and supported to take a leadership role to ensure gender analysis of ESPs and ESP monitoring and evaluation efforts	July 2013	Secretariat, UNGEI (Secretariat and Country Focal points) LEGs

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
6.	1, 5 A, C	Board of Directors considers and approves expansion of eligibility for ME role to include civil society organizations. Donors to the GPE Fund approached to confirm that expansion is consistent with their own policies and procedures. Guidelines for assessment and review of potential new MEs reviewed by the FAC and recommended to the Board for approval.	May 2013	Secretariat, FAC, Board of Directors
7.	1, 5 A, C	GPE Fund contribution agreements amended and GPE Fund Governance document amended to provide for expanded SE and ME eligibility	Dec 2013	Secretariat, Donors
8.	1, 5	Board of Directors to set targets for increasing the number of organisations that can serve as SEs and MEs	Nov 2013	Secretariat, Board of Directors
9.	1, 5 A, C	Determine additional tools and guidelines for operating in humanitarian emergencies, conflict-affected and fragile states, including greater transparency on costs and management structures of SEs and MEs	June 2013	Secretariat, FAC, Board of Directors
10.	5 C	Board of Directors to consider expansion of country eligibility for program implementation funding beyond IDA Categories i and ii.	May 2013	Secretariat, Board of Directors
11.	5 A, B, C	Greater support to government and civil society partners to establish stronger country-level coordination mechanisms, including in monitoring implementation of ESPs and Transitional ESPs	Ongoing	Secretariat, CSO 1, 2, 3, Constituency groups

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
12.	4 A, C	Promoting and supporting the objective of increased capacity of teacher organisations and governments to involve teacher representation in LEGs, ESP development and Joint Sector Reviews to make sure teacher views inform key policy and monitoring actions		
13.	5 A, C	Civil Society Education Fund evaluation and next steps reviewed by Board of Directors: Follow-up program financed and in place	Nov 2012 Early 2013	
14.	A, B, D	Review and streamline reporting requirements from LEGs so they are not overburdened, while ensuring at the same time that core, consistent, minimum standards of reporting occur across the partnership	2013	Secretariat, Board of Directors, LEGs
15.	1, 2, 3, 4 A, C	Promoting and supporting the objective of strengthened capacity of governments, local donor agencies (including Coordinating Agencies and SEs/MEs) to engage civil society, private sector and teacher representatives in sector dialogue	Ongoing	
16.	A, B	Communications campaign launched on dissemination of revised GPE processes and norms and taken up by all donor and multilaterals partners, international CSOs and others to ensure consistent messaging from their HQ to staff working in LEGs.	ASAP	
17.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 A, B,C, D, E	Members of the partnership progressively, transparently and publicly indicate their contributions to the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan in terms of new actions and linkages	Ongoing through 2013	All partners

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
18.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	For each objective, a delineation of roles and responsibilities among the partners is achieved at both global and national levels	First attempt: November 2013 Then ongoing	
19.	1 A, C	Facilitate the linkages, coordination and communication between the LEGs and the Education Cluster in humanitarian emergencies and conflicts	Ongoing	LEGs, Education cluster
20.	3 D, E	Establish communities of practice at global and country level on early grade reading and early grade numeracy	Already in place, but working on improving outreach	Literacy: AusAID, DfID, USAID, UNESCO Bangkok, Save the Children, Molteno Institute for Language and Literacy, SIL LEAD, other NGOs. Numeracy: GIZ, Save the Children, Plan, other NGOS.
21.	2 D, E	Build on existing mechanisms (UNGEI etc) to strengthen communities of practice for girls' education	December 2013	Secretariat, UNGEI (Secretariat and Country Focal points) LEGs
22.	5 C, D, E	Accelerate momentum for stakeholder interest in education, working with Education First, UN Special Envoy and other partners	Ongoing	Secretariat

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
23.	5	Bring other UN agencies and development banks into existing constituencies of the Board	2013	Board of Directors, Chair, Secretariat
24.	3 D, E	Establish and nurture partnership-wide knowledge platforms and exchanges, including with support from the GRA, aimed at sharing of evidence-based good practices, especially from other low-income countries and MICs.	2013/2014	Board of Directors, Chair, Secretariat
25.	5	Resource mobilization strategic directions considered by the Board (including discussion of e.g. better use of Asian Development Fund, IDA replenishment processes to address financing needs)	November 2012	Secretariat
26.	5	Full resource mobilization plan with budgets, projections and targets approved by the Board of Directors	May 2013	Secretariat, Board of Directors
27.	5 D, E	Value for Money guidelines and benchmarks established and subsequently annually assessed	November 2013, and ongoing thereafter on an annual basis	Secretariat, Board of Directors
28.	5 D	Annual portfolio review to include an assessment not only of where the money was spent, but how and to what effect	Annually	Secretariat, SEs, MEs
29.	5 D	Regular Board assessments of performance of SEs and MEs, based on Portfolio Review	Annually	Board of Directors, SEs, MEs

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
30.	5	Facilitate greater engagement with ministries and ministers of finance to improve effectiveness and efficiency of government financing of education.	Ongoing	
31.	1, 5 A, B	Support to LEGs in ensuring appropriate content in sector budgets and incorporate flexible financing mechanisms to allow government and donor education funding to be reallocated to emergency response and recovery	Ongoing	Secretariat, LEGs
32.	5	Develop a clear narrative about GPE's role in the global architecture and make and maintain a compelling case for investments in education	Early 2014	SEC
33.	5	Annual forward-looking financing report analyzing resource gaps in education at country and global levels	May each year	Secretariat
34.	5 A, D	5 new donors actively engaged in LEGs and bringing significant new, aligned funding to ESPs	By 2014	Secretariat
35.	5 D	Monitoring of external financing from all partners in the LEG undertaken annually as part of standard reporting	Ongoing	LEGs
36.	2, 3 D, E	GRA to support evidence and knowledge platforms on innovative solutions for gender equality, as well as expanding and sharing knowledge/experience on interventions, programs and financing for ECD, especially for marginalized children	June 2013	UNICEF, WB, GIZ.

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
37.	2 D, E	Evaluate and promote impact of positive experiences of quotas in promotion of female professionals in the education sector	October 2013	Secretariat, UNGEI (Secretariat and Country Focal points) LEGs
38.	3, 4 D, E	Review and revise textbook procurement best practice	March 2013	WB, various NGOs
39.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 C, D, E	With partners, host regular knowledge fairs to promote knowledge exchange, innovation etc.	First one in late 2013	Secretariat
40.	D, E	Board of Directors to determine role of Secretariat and broader partnership in knowledge collection and dissemination based on an independently-produced policy options paper	May 2013	Secretariat, Board of Directors
41.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 D	Approval by the Board of Strategic Plan indicators and means of verification, including budget implications	Early 2013	Strategic Plan Working Group, Board of Directors
42.	B	Risk management framework adopted by the Board of Directors and reviewed annually	May 2013, and ongoing thereafter on an annual basis	Secretariat, Board of Directors
43.	2 D	Working with LEGs, UNGEI to lead and facilitate agreement on gender equality indicators for girls' learning	2013	UNGEI and Secretariat

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
44.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 A, D, E	Country tracking systems, including national statistics units, to be strengthened to monitor effectively implementation of education sector plans, including status of early grade reading and numeracy action plans and gender action plans	Ongoing	
45.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 C, D	Support transparent use of data at the country level for parents, teachers and policy makers	Ongoing	
46.	1,2,3,4,5 A, B, C, D, E	Community of practice established around innovation	2013	PS/PF constituency
47.	D	Establish framework for Board self-assessment and conduct annual Board self-evaluation	Annually in November	Board of Directors
48.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 A, B, C, D, E	Independent evaluation of the Global Partnership to occur every four years	TORs agreed and contract let late 2013 Report in 2014	Secretariat, Board of Directors
49.	A, C	Monitor country level processes to track inclusion of national civil society and private sector actors in dialogue, monitoring and policy formulation	Ongoing	LEGs, Secretariat
50.	5 D	Ideally, all GPE program implementation financing to be reflected in partner country finance bills as “on budget”	ASAP	

Item	Area of impact Objective Number Strengthening the Partnership letter	Deliverable	Deadline	Partners (to date)
51.	5 A, D	Engagement with LEGs in identifying the most aligned modality effective in a given context, including identifying a range of funding mechanisms to ensure rapid response in situations of emergency, early recovery and conflict		
52.	5 D	Triennial development effectiveness report	2014	Secretariat
53.	5 D	Assess and identify constraints to effective donor financing modalities for education		
54.	1, 5	Promote the delivery of the three key policy prescriptions in the 2012 Call for Action coming from September High Level Meeting on education in humanitarian emergencies and conflict environments.	Ongoing	EC, INEE, Save the Children, UNICEF and other co-conveners
55.	1, 5 B	Explore targeted funding for activities that address gender imbalances in transition to secondary school	Secretariat, FAC, Board of Directors	2013/14

ATTACHMENT 1 TO ANNEX 2: Consideration of Indicators

Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators

Report to GPE's Strategic Plan Implementation Working Group

Indicators Technical Group
18 October 2012

Executive Summary

As of September 2012, the Global Partnership for Education has a new Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) has been requested by the Board of Directors to develop an implementation approach for that Strategic Plan. The Chair of the Board of Directors established a technical group nominated by Board members to look at the indicators in the Strategic Plan and make recommendations as to the feasibility of measuring those indicators as a crucial aspect of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. This report presents the conclusions of that technical group.

The group concludes that while there are many technical challenges that would have to be met, and innovations that would have to be generated, there are no fundamental scientific problems in measuring any of the indicators. However, there are serious issues regarding mandate, practicality, and cost with some of the indicators in the Strategic Plan. Most of these costs would have to be borne by partners such as UNESCO Institute for Statistics and/or the Global Monitoring Report and others, not by the Secretariat. It is therefore imperative to be open about these cost implications.

In general, the group supports the idea that the Global Partnership should push for a sharp departure from business as usual by having ambitious, innovative, and specific objectives that require indicators which have heretofore not been gathered. Without stretching the comparison, the group notes that the health sector uses far more output, input, and process indicators, and that, again in comparison, the education sector navigates with very few instruments. Partly for this reason, the health sector is far more able to both articulate a narrative about its successes and actually manage its processes so as to succeed, in particular with a view to “final” outcomes such as lowering child mortality. All this suggests that, though costly to collect, some of the new indicators for the education sector are worth pursuing, and that the Board of Directors should make a commitment to their pursuit.

However, not all indicators are likely to face equal implementation and cost issues. Thus, the Board of Directors can prioritize which indicators to focus on at first. The group has characterized the indicators in the Strategic Plan into four groups whose production could be taken in phases (or whose results would come in phases even if one started at once):

1) those that are already collected but whose collection needs improvement—an example includes most of the access and completion indicators already in use but which are not always perfectly produced or fully reported, and also slight but powerful adaptations in the use of such data, such as age-specific ratios;
2) those whose methodology is increasingly known and accepted but which require some further agreement and whose cost is unlikely to come down, but whose benefits are also extremely high—an example includes methods of assessing and tracking learning outcomes;
3) those for which a methodology still needs work, whose current cost is high but could come down, and whose benefits are high—an example includes methods for reporting according to disability, which requires improvements and agreements on how to measure disability at lower cost than is currently the case; and
4) those whose cost is very high and is likely to remain high, whose methodology is very uncertain, whose standardization is least likely, and which seem least binding for the tracking of policy execution—examples include ways to measure the percentage of resources spent at school level, or calculation of certain sub-national indicators that require regional population projections that are not often available.

Each indicator in the Strategic Plan may be classified into one of those four groups.

In addition, the group noted that the reporting and acceptance of those indicators by the developing countries in the partnership would take some time and should not be made a matter of top-down imposition but of gradual technical empowerment. Experience with other indicators currently in use, such as the various enrolment and completion rates or ratios, suggests that until or unless ministry of education officials come to see the indicators as useful in the management of their own systems, reporting to the global

community is likely to be weak and is, in any case, not really enforceable. In that sense, capacity-building, advocacy and intellectual conviction seems a more solid route towards indicator production. All this goes along with the technical considerations explained above to also suggest a phased approach. However, it is important to note that capacity-building, conviction, and advocacy tend to cost more than simply mandating. (But since mandating is unlikely to produce results anyway, its cost-effectiveness is not clear.)

Items for Board consideration are:

1) Whether a phased approach to improving indicator production is acceptable.
2) Whether the Board of Directors is willing to issue more of a mandate on reporting (perhaps as a condition of membership) or is willing to accept a gradual approach based on capacity-building.
3) Whether the Board of Directors is willing to consider the fact that there will be considerable costs in producing the indicators, and is therefore willing to call upon the Secretariat and/or a working group similar to the one which produced this document, to come up with a concrete cost proposal for each of the four (or perhaps the first three) categories of indicators.

ATTACHMENT 2 TO ANNEX 2: Risks Associated with the Strategic Plan

The primary risks associated with the successful delivery of the Strategic Plan are enumerated below. The deliverables in the implementation plan attempt to mitigate some of these risks over which the Global Partnership has some element of control. Further mitigation measures will be included in the proposed risk framework that will be prepared for the Board of Directors by May 2013.

- Partners do not engage in Plan implementation
- Partners do not have any ownership of the Plan
- Board of Directors does not approve various decisions necessary to facilitate Plan implementation
- Inadequate resources applied to key areas of bottleneck
- The Global Partnership faces a significant reputational event that undermines confidence
- Significant funding shortfalls to the GPE Fund
- Significant funding reductions to education, be it domestic or external
- Global financial crisis
- Secretariat performance
- Inability of the Global Partnership to measure and report on results
- Agendas within the partnership are dominated by specific constituency groupings rather than shared by the whole partnership
- Inability of the education sector to present a compelling narrative on why investment in the sector makes sense

ATTACHMENT 3 TO ANNEX 2: Illustrative Risk Taxonomy for the Global Partnership

Supporting the recommendation to the Board of Directors that it establish and regularly monitor a risk framework, this annex outlines a possible methodology and risk taxonomy. This is merely illustrative and is not being proposed with any specificity.

For current purposes, risk is being defined as any factor that impacts the ability of the Global Partnership to achieve its development objectives. A regular risk assessment facilitates a systematic and comprehensive review of risks by the Board of Directors. Sound risk information should guide decisions at all levels.

Attached is illustrative **risk taxonomy** for the Global Partnership. In it risks have been categorized at the following three different levels:

i) Risk Area: risks are organized around four major categories aimed at supporting GPE's mission.

ii) Risk Cluster: Under each risk area, risk clusters provide groupings of different risks related to each other.

iii) Risk Dimension: These are the specific risks that the Global Partnership faces.

Risk Assessment:

To assess risk each risk dimension should be rated separately in terms of i) its likelihood and ii) its impact. In this way it is possible to prioritise where risk mitigation attention is most required. For example, even if a risk has a high likelihood, if it will have a low impact, then it will not be a priority for attention, compared for example to a high likelihood, high impact risk.

Set out below is an illustration of what one risk dimension might look like in terms of assessment:

Business Continuity: Risk that business is disrupted, critical data or assets are lost or not available when needed due to either significant internal or external events.

e.g. Business disruptions of time critical business processes due to epidemics, terrorist attacks, weather disasters, accidents etc.

Likelihood	*Very High* ____	*High* ____	*Moderate* ____	*Low* ____
Impact to GPE	*Very High* ____	*High* ____	*Moderate* ____	*Low* ____

RISK TAXONOMY AND CATEGORIES

Risk Area Level 1	Risk Cluster Level 2	Risk Dimension Level 3
Strategic	Partnership Strategy and Governance	1. Strategic Plan
		2. Results measurement
	Partnership Governance and Structure	3. Organizational structure: global vs. country-level governance
		4. Leadership
		5. Partner commitment: roles and responsibilities
		6. Partnership culture
Operational	Activities Supported by the Partnership	7. Country and activity eligibility
		8. Partnership model, policies and guidelines
		9. Design and preparation of partnership activities
		10. Design and preparation of activities funded by GPE (including aid effectiveness principles)
		11. Implementation/supervision of partner activities
		12. Implementation/supervision of partnership activities funded by GPE
		13. Financial management, procurement, and disbursement in GPE trust funded activities
		14. Fraud & corruption under GPE trust funded activities
		15. Performance monitoring (including Aid Effectiveness)
	Board Operations	16. Constituency establishment, relations, communications, Board member selection
		17. Constituency voice
		18. Work plan priority-setting
		19. Performance monitoring
		20. Managing conflict of interest
	LEG Operations	21. Work planning, staffing, communications
		22. Managing conflict of interest
		23. Joint Sector Review monitoring
	Secretariat Operations	24. Human Resources: Strategic staffing, recruitment, succession planning, performance management
		25. Work plan: coverage, priority-setting, performance monitoring

Risk Area Level 1	Risk Cluster Level 2	Risk Dimension Level 3
		26. Resource management/Host agency relations
		27. Business continuity
		28. Legal liability
Stakeholders	Partner Agency Relations	29. Board relations
		30. Donor relations
		31. CSO relations
		32. Private sector/Private foundation relations
		33. Other stakeholder relations
		34. Other external relations
Resource Mobilization	Education Sector	35. Domestic financing 36. External financing 37. Innovative financing
	GPE Trust Funds	38. Funds availability
		39. Donor diversification