REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP ANNEX 2: FEEDBACK FROM BOARD SURVEY

For Information

This memorandum provides information on the results of the survey on the Global Partnership's governance mechanisms. The survey was sent to the Board on 8 February 2013 and closed on 22 February 2013.

Preliminary Findings from the Survey Responses

1. **Role of the Board**

- Most of the roles and responsibilities of the Board, as set out in the Charter, were important, other than overseeing the Partnership Meeting and providing input into UNESCO meetings
- Overall call for the Board to further its move to operate at a more strategic level
- The performance of the Board was seen as "middling" in many areas, with room for improvement, including with regards to financial oversight, focusing on results and risk management, as well as advocacy, resource mobilization and enhancing links among partners
- A central issue throughout the survey is how to achieve an appropriate balance and better deliver both on the Board's oversight and fiduciary duties as stewards of the GPE Fund and on the partnership function, i.e. its role as a forum for partners to engage in policy dialogue and strengthen the workings of the partnership

2. **Size/Composition of the Board**

- Responses were very mixed
- African constituencies reiterated the need to divide Africa 2 into two constituencies of a more manageable size
- Many others felt it is premature to add more Board seats without first exploring how to better support developing country partner constituencies
- A few stated that opening up seats to new partners (in particular those not contributing financially) was not justified
- Many pointed to the need to find new ways to engage new partners outside of the Board (communities of practice, Partnership Meeting, etc.)

3. **Constituency Operations**

- Most respondents knew what was expected of the Board members and constituency members
- Many struggling to get adequate feedback from their constituencies in the time given
- Board members are stretched and ways need to be found to support them better in their roles including preparation for Board meetings

4. **Role of Board Committees**

- Very rich inputs
- Establishment of new standing committees had a mixed response: some were strongly resistant, others welcomed new committees, in particular for strengthening the oversight on results and fiduciary accountability
- Mixed support for an Executive Committee and stressed by those who support new standing committees
- Most believe that implementation grant proposal review should continue to be done by the Financial Advisory Committee, and should not be transferred to another committee or a technical panel
- Continuing to use *ad hoc* committees is welcome as issues arise, to "smoothen Board discussions"

5. **Decision-making**

- Approximately two-thirds of respondents feel that face-to-face decision-making is working well
- Recognition of the need for flexibility in decision-making outside face-to-face meetings, but also support for setting out in advance what kinds of decisions can be made outside of face-to-face meetings
- Frustration expressed about conference calls and low participation by developing countries
- Approximately a half-half split on establishment of an Executive Committee

6. **Role of the Secretariat**

- General agreement that the roles as set out in the Charter are important, but performance in many areas is weak and needs improvement

General Information on Survey Responses

Total Number of Complete Responses[1]: 41 (38 English, 3 French)

[1] There were many questionnaires opened and submitted after only answering the first three questions (which were the only questions designated as mandatory), but none of the substantive questions. These were eliminated from the results.

Types of Respondents:

Role in the Partnership	Donor	Developing Country	CSO	Multilateral	PS/PF	Secretariat	Other	Total
Current Board Member/Alternate	8	5	3	1	1	n/a	n/a	18
Former Board Member/ Alternate	2	1	0	0	1	n/a	n/a	4
Current/ Former FAC member	5	1	1	2	1	n/a	n/a	10
Constituency Member	3	1	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	4
Secretariat	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	3
Other[2]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2
Total	18	8	4	3	3	3	2	41

Number of Years in the Partnership:

Less than one year	6	More than two years, less than five years	12
More than one year, less than two years	8	More than five years	13

[2] The Board Chair and the FAC Chair categorized themselves as "other".

The survey response rate was generally good with 18 Board members (plus the Chair) and 10 Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) members (plus the FAC Chair) responding. **However, due to the fact that the responses did not include all of the Board's constituencies, the feedback cannot be equated with that of the Board as a whole, but only to those that responded. As such, it served as a significant input into the work of the GWG, including identification of bottlenecks and prioritization of the issues to be addressed, but was not seen as "instructions" from the Board.**

Part I: Role of the Board of Directors

The answer to the question of "what is the role of the Board" is central to enable the GWG to address the other questions on size, role of the committees, decision-making, etc.

The Charter, which is the main governance document of the Global Partnership, starts with the statement that "The Board of Directors is the supreme governing body of the Global Partnership for Education." The Charter then goes on to elaborate on particular Board responsibilities.

As can be seen below, the responses to the survey generally support most of the roles as already set out in the Charter. A particular issue regarding "enhancing links" is noted below—speaking to the partnership nature of the Global Partnership.

On a general level, respondents stated that the Board's role, as delineated in the Charter, should be limited to the following areas:

- Setting policies and strategies (including objectives)
- Financial oversight (over the GPE Fund, including the Secretariat budget)
- Advocacy and resource mobilization
- Governance oversight (including the Chair)
- Oversight of results and performance (which is currently missing)
- Oversight of risk management (which is currently missing)

The provisions regarding oversight of the Partnership Meeting and providing input into UNESCO meetings should likely be deleted, as respondents did not deem this particularly relevant.

Ratings of Board Roles and Responsibilities listed in the Charter

The survey asked respondents to rate, in terms of both importance and performance, each of the Board's responsibilities listed in the Charter. The following is the feedback provided, where 0 is "inappropriate" (for importance) and "not addressed" (for performance) and 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest.

1. Strategy and Policy-Setting: Charter: The Board of Directors sets policies and strategies for the Global Partnership for Education.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	1	3	35	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	1	9	19	10	39	2

The vast majority of respondents ranked this role as one of the most important roles for the Board of Directors, while most felt that the performance was a "4". One respondent stated, "The Board is performing reasonably well on strategy and plan for GPE, although with a difficult and complex implementation plan process which needs to be gripped more effectively."

2. Setting Annual Objectives: Charter: The Board of Directors reviews and approves the annual objectives for the Global Partnership for Education.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	1	16	21	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
1	1	3	8	19	7	39	2

Most respondents felt that this was very important, and generally well-addressed. One respondent asked in the comments, "What is the "annual objectives for the GPE? We have objectives in the Strategic Plan."

3. Financial Decision-Making: Charter: The Board of Directors makes funding decisions for the Global Partnership for Education trust funds, monitors their utilization and ensures they are being used in line with the Global Partnership for Education's objectives and policies (including those set out in the relevant trust fund governance document), upon recommendations of committees established by the Board as relevant.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	9	14	16	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	6	15	11	6	39	2

Most respondents felt that this role was important, but the performance should be improved. One respondent stated, "Financial oversight is good, following the November Board in Paris where much more information on this was presented."

4. Secretariat Oversight: Charter: The Board of Directors gives direction to the Secretariat, and reviews and approves its annual objectives, outcomes, staffing, budget and work plan.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	2	11	13	13	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	7	12	11	6	37	4

Most respondents felt that this was important, although its ranking is lower than the other areas. One respondent stated in their comments that "giving direction to the Secretariat is only important as part of achieving other Board responsibilities."

5. Advocacy: Charter: The Board of Directors advocates for the Global Partnership for Education, mobilizes resources and frames responses to important global and country specific policy or resource issues that are preventing progress toward the Education for All goals.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	5	4	11	19	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	3	11	12	10	3	39	2

Many felt that this was important, but not being particularly well-addressed. The comments given did not elaborate on why.

6. Resource Mobilization: Charter: See above.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	6	5	10	18	3	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	4	10	10	12	3	38	2

Like advocacy, most felt that this was important but performance needs improvement.

7. Commissioning Working Groups and Oversight: Charter: The Board of Directors commissions working groups and task teams as appropriate and provides oversight to ensure delivery of agreed terms of reference and timeframe.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
1	1	3	16	13	5	38	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	3	14	16	6	39	2

The ranking of this role was “middling”, both in importance and performance. The same respondent, who made the comment quoted above about the Secretariat, also stated that this role was only important in terms of other Board functions.

8. Enhancing Links among Partners: Charter: The Board of Directors enhances links among the various partners of the Global Partnership for Education by strengthening channels of communication and collaboration.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	3	6	13	12	5	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	4	11	12	10	2	39	2

Responses were mixed regarding the importance of this role, but as a generalization, its importance is "middling". One respondent states that "the Board could work harder at enhancing links between partners within GPE, particularly regarding the discussion of controversial issues, to ensure that the Board discussions are more streamlined."

9. <u>Chair Oversight</u>: Charter: The Board of Directors gives direction to the Chair, and approves his/ her annual objectives, outcomes, staffing, budget and work plan.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	2	8	13	16	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	7	11	16	4	39	2

Many respondents felt that this was important, and performance was middling. One respondent stated that "The current Chair is very proactive, and does not receive much direction from the Board, potentially consideration should be made of whether the Board should more actively direct the Chair in this way."

10. <u>Oversight of Partnership Meeting</u>: Charter: The Board of Directors oversees the preparation of the Partnership Meeting.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
4	8	11	11	3	2	39	2

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
6	5	10	5	6	3	35	6

Most respondents did not feel that this role was particularly important (and in fact, some felt it was inappropriate). One participant respondent stated that it was not relevant.

11. <u>Input into UNESCO Meetings</u>: Charter: The Board of Directors provides input into the annual meetings of the UNESCO High-Level Group on Education for All.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
6	9	5	8	5	4	37	4

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
8	10	8	5	0	4	35	6

Most respondents did not feel that this role was particularly important (and in fact, some felt it was inappropriate). One respondent stated that they did not feel that the Board or Board members are well-positioned to provide input into the UNESCO meetings on behalf of GPE.

12. Other

Below is a summary of the written comments contained in the surveys for the Board's roles.

a. Survey Feedback for Suggested Additions to Board Roles and Responsibilities:

The following are some suggestions made of additions that should be made to the Board's roles, for consideration by the Working Group:

- Monitor and assess the overall effectiveness of GPE's policies and programs.
- Ensuring accountability and transparency in the allocation and utilization of funds to developing country partners.
- Promoting a combination of appropriate governance and partnership approaches to maximize impact of the partnership.
- Reviewing past performance (e.g. annual reports, country performance, evaluations).
- Discussing and monitoring risks.

b. Survey feedback on Performance

The main point made in relation to the Board's performance is the need to improve its monitoring of the use of funds and the results from them. In addition, more support to the developing country constituencies was emphasized. Please see accompanying document for the detailed comments.

Part II: Size/Composition of Board Membership

The question of the right size of the Board and composition is somewhat based on the role of the Board as discussed in the previous section. As set out in the Board's decision, this issue needs to be prioritized, as a recommendation will be expected at the next face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors on 21-22 May 2013.

Overall, the response was very mixed. The survey posed two questions with answer choices on this topic. The results are set out below.

Question 6: The Board of Directors currently includes 19 constituencies, each with a Board Member and an Alternate Board Member who take on the responsibility for collecting the views of the constituency for input into the Board's discussions. Recognizing the need to continually improve and support constituency operations, which of the following best describes your view on the size and composition of the Board?

Answer	Number/Percentage
The current size/composition is about right and should not be changed	17/43%
The size of the Board is too big and therefore unmanageable	4/10%
The constituencies are not represented sufficiently, and the Board size should be increased	10/25%
Other	9/23%

Question 7: The current decision of the Board is that there be an equal number of seats and votes for each of the donor and developing country partner constituencies (the principle of balance/equity). Which of the statements below best describes your view on the importance of this decision in the composition of the Board?

Answer	Number/Percentage
It is very important and must be the basis for any changes to Board composition in the future	13/34%
It is important but may be overridden if not possible to meet other needs	14/37%
It is not important, and based on the size of developing country constituencies, their representation should be increased without an increase to the representation of donor constituencies.	7/18%
Other	4/11%

The most popular answer is that the current size/composition is about right. A significant proportion of the Board feel that the Board size should be increased, some of which noted in their comments, was needed to sufficiently represent the developing country partners. Many stated that they did not necessarily support an increase in Board size, but a redistribution of seats to accommodate the larger groups. Several would like to see a justification for any new seats, including how this will solve current issues constituencies are experiencing or how it will contribute to the partnership writ large, in particular, as the larger the Board becomes, the more inefficient it becomes. However, the feedback on the basis for that redistribution is still very mixed in regards to balance and equity. One felt that balance was not an issue as the Board generally acts on a consensus basis, and the purpose of being on the Board is to have a voice.

In addition, in response to Question 9, which asked whether respondents' answers to the questions would change if the role of the Board was to change, 25/32 (78%) responded no, and many of the 9 respondents who did answer yes, stated that it would depend on how the Board role would change.

Set out below is a summary of other comments made in response to Question 8: **Please provide any comments regarding how the views of developing country partners, new and emerging donors, the private sector and private foundations and UN agencies can be represented in the partnership, either through the Board or other means.**

Overall: Many suggestions were made to not increase the Board size, but to establish other means (partnership meetings, regional meetings, communities of practice, etc.) to incorporate the views of new partners into the workings of the partnership.[3] Establishing observer status was also suggested, although one respondent did not support creating permanent observer seats, but to invite possible new members to attend meetings as observers for relevant agenda items. Once again, more support (both logistical and financial) to developing country partners to assist in their participation was emphasized.

Developing country partners: African Board members articulated the need to divide the Africa 2 constituency because of its size. One respondent stated that there is a need for a clear articulation of what we expect constituencies to bring to the Board and how adding another seat would benefit the Board and the partnership. Evidence is needed, and it is not enough to say it is large and there are many differing viewpoints. Others noted that the issue that needs to be addressed is the internal coordination of the developing country seats rather than adding new seats and that there is need for more support to the developing country partner constituencies. One developing country member stated that developing country representation should not be at the ministerial level, but at the director level so they have time to do the work.

[3] Note the s. 4.1.5 of the Charter states that the Partnership meeting will "provide a communication channel for all stakeholders who are not included in the constituencies of the Board of Directors."

UN seats: A few respondents stated that the UNESCO and UNICEF seat should be combined and include other UN agencies. One suggested that UN agencies should be given an observer seat with no vote. In addition, one suggested that UN agencies should have "proof of impact" before being brought on board.

Private Sector/Private Foundations: Three respondents supported dividing the private sector and private foundations seat, with no particular reason given. One respondent recognized that since the private sector does not see themselves as donors and the private foundations do it is obviously difficult to reconcile their positions. Another respondent stated that there is no evidence or argument of the need to split. One stated that the views of the private sector and private foundations that do not as of yet contribute financially can be in other fora instead of the Board, for example, a high-level panel, sub-committees and technical task force. Another suggested increasing representation of the private sector and private foundations to address diversification of funding.

Emerging donors: There was no support expressed in the responses for giving potential new and emerging donors a seat on the Board. One respondent noted the need to see a clear articulation of what the partnership wants from new and emerging donors, as this would help to inform how to include them. Others stated that they do not think it would be appropriate to give Board votes to donors who are not contributing to the GPE Fund. Another stated that since the purpose of GPE is to make necessary funds available for endorsed plans, new and emerging donors must show concrete examples of their commitments before getting status as a donor *per se*. It was recognized that new and emerging donors could have a lot to bring to the partnership—not necessarily financial contributions but valuable experience and knowledge. Their views could be incorporated into other fora instead of the Board.

Part III: Constituency Operations

Recognizing that constituency operations can be improved, the survey asked a series of questions to identify the issues that constituencies are experiencing. The feedback from this section shows that clearly more work could be done to support the constituencies in their ability to consult widely. Resources will be needed at the Secretariat level (human resources and technological) to provide such assistance.

In response to the question, "**How do you rate your constituency's input into Board discussions over the past two years? (1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest)",** the following were the results of the 35 respondents:

Answer Choice	Responses/Percentage
1	0
2	3 (9%)
3	14 (40%)
4	13 (37%)
5	5 (14%)

In response to the question of what areas could be improved, most responded that their internal coordination should be improved and that increased Secretariat support should be provided (including orientation). In addition, there was feedback that the Board's discussions are too focused on the operational level rather than the strategic level.

With regard to particular bottlenecks, the following is the feedback on Question 14: **Constraints/bottlenecks to effective constituency operations: Please indicate your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements:**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
The role of the Board Member and Alternate Board member are clear.	0	6	23	7	36
My constituency has adequate systems in place to promote input from all constituency members into GPE discussions and decisions.	1	10	13	11	35
I know who is in my constituency and have updated contact information for them.	0	2	17	16	35
My constituency members provide me feedback on GPE matters when requested.	1	15	9	9	34
The materials for Board/committee meetings provide enough information for me to provide good feedback for Board discussions.	1	6	24	4	35
The materials for Board/committee meetings are delivered far enough in advance to enable adequate constituency consultation.	1	14	17	3	35
I face language barriers with regard to participating in GPE governance matters.	18	13	4	0	35
I have adequate time to dedicate to fulfilling my role in GPE's governance in addition to my regular work duties.	0	12	20	2	34

From the responses given, it appears that the challenges are related mainly to the timing of the delivery Board papers, receiving feedback from constituency members and having systems to collect it. While the quality of papers was generally seen to be acceptable, one respondent stated that they would look for more guidance from the Secretariat/Chair/CEO in the future in relation to flagging significant issues in covering emails as opposed to merely receiving papers. Respondents generally know what the role of the Board member and Alternate Board members are, who is in their constituency, and only a few face language barriers.

A significant number face time constraints in being able to fulfill their duties in addition to their regular job duties. One respondent stated that they have 2 persons working full time on GPE governance. Another stated that in particular, issues dealing with legal issues require more lead-time.

In addition, a few comments were made about leveraging technology to promote better support and participation of constituencies. However, another stated that there was a “digital divide” evidenced by the poor Internet network connectivity in some countries. In addition, an African member stated that proper consultation is impossible to do with the number of countries in their constituency.

Part IV: Role of Board Committees

Role of the Financial Advisory Committee

One of the questions for the GWG to consider is the role of the FAC, in particular in implementation grant proposal review. One of the recommendations of the Evans review is to establish a technical panel to review proposals (as is done in both the GFATM and GAVI). It is also recognized that the FAC workload is very heavy (and potentially increasing) and there may be other areas in which Board input may be needed.

The survey feedback generally supports the FAC's continuing role in implementation grant proposal review. In addition, most respondents do not believe that implementation grant review should be taken on by another committee, and there was even less support for establishing a technical panel. While the assessment of the quality technical input provided at the country level was mixed, a strong majority did not believe that grant proposal recommendations should come directly from the Secretariat.

Question 15: The Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) currently has the role of recommending program implementation grants for approval to the Board of Directors. Please indicate your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Implementation grant proposal review and recommendation to the Board should continue to be part of the FAC's responsibilities.	1	4	12	18	35
The FAC's responsibilities should be limited to development and oversight over financial and programmatic policies and a new Board committee should be established for implementation grant proposal review.	10	17	7	1	35
Implementation grant proposal review and recommendation to the Board should be the responsibility of an independent technical body rather than a Board committee.	14	13	5	3	35
The development of implementation grant proposals receives adequate technical input at the country level through the Local Education Group and through the Secretariat's quality assurance processes.	4	13	15	2	34
Implementation grant proposal review and recommendation to the Board should be the responsibility of the Secretariat alone.	22	13	0	1	36

Establishment of New Standing Committees

The survey posed the following question regarding the establishment of new Board committees: **Question 16: The FAC and Ethics Committee are the only standing committees of the Board of Directors. Additional Board input is provided by working groups with limited mandates (in scope and time). Do you think that the establishment of further standing committees is necessary? If so, what areas should they cover and how should they relate to the FAC?**

Of the 25 responses, 9 (36%) were against the establishment of new standing committees. There was some support for establishing more *ad hoc* committees, including for input into the post-2015 agenda. A few respondents suggested splitting the FAC's work into two committees.

The following were some of the ideas for new standing committees:

- Global and Regional Activities grants
- Monitoring and Evaluation/ results
- Finance and audit (financial forecasting and management, fraud and misuse, audit, due diligence (especially for new Supervising/ Managing Entities))
- Resource mobilization
- Executive Committee
- Governance Committee
- Policy Committee
- Administrative Committee

Part V: Decision-making

A majority of respondents felt that decision-making at face-to-face meetings is working well, although some expressed in their comments that often decisions are rushed through without enough discussion. One noted that the reasons face-to-face meetings are effective is because of the strong Chair.

Respondents were generally equally divided about the efficacy of decision-making outside face-to-face meetings. The low participation of developing country partners in teleconferences was noted, as was the difficulty of the medium in general.

While a strong majority agreed that the Board should agree in advance about what kinds of decisions may be taken outside of face-to-face meetings, an almost equal number of respondents thought that the Chair and CEO should have flexibility in modes of seeking Board decisions, which is somewhat contradictory. The need for flexibility was recognized in the comments.

Regarding delegation to committees and the Secretariat, the results are also extremely mixed; however, there is more support for delegation to committees than the Secretariat. It was noted that any delegation must be clearly set out in writing.

The establishment of an executive committee received very mixed support with 43% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and 57% agreeing or strongly agreeing. One respondent felt that there was not enough evidence of the need for an Executive Committee.

Question 17: Please indicate your agreement/disagreement with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Decision-making by the Board during face-to-face meetings is working well.	1	10	22	4	37
Decision-making by the Board outside of face-to-face meetings (audio-conference and no-objection decisions) is working well.	5	18	14	0	37
The Board should agree in advance on what kinds of decisions may be taken outside of face-to-face meetings.	2	3	22	9	36
The Chair and CEO should have flexibility in modes of seeking Board decisions based on needs.	0	9	20	6	35
More decision-making authority should be delegated to committees by the Board.	0	17	14	5	36
More decision-making authority should be delegated to the Secretariat by the Board.	4	18	9	4	35
The establishment of an Executive Committee, made up of a sub-set of Board members would facilitate efficient decision-making between face-to-face Board meetings.	6	9	11	9	35

Part VI: Role of the Secretariat

1. Support to Partnership and Governance Bodies: Charter: Providing support to the Partnership, the Chair, the Board of Directors and its committees, working groups and task teams to help them fulfill their roles and responsibilities and maintain progress toward the strategic objectives of the GPE.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	1	1	8	28	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	2	8	15	11	36	5

Respondents felt that this was very important, and performance was middling.

2. <u>Support to Meetings</u>: Charter: Providing support and coordination for the organization of Global Partnership for Education meetings, including preparation of meeting agendas and meeting organization.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	4	12	22	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	3	15	18	36	5

Respondents felt that this was very important, and performance was generally good.

3. <u>Resource Mobilization</u>: Charter: Supporting resource mobilization efforts.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	0	6	12	19	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	3	15	9	8	36	5

Respondents felt that this was important, but its execution could be improved.

4. <u>Data Reporting and Communication</u>: Charter: Working with all partners to promote effective communication and data reporting at all levels, particularly strengthening communications at the country level and enabling clear messages on progress to be conveyed at the global level and to the media.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
1	0	3	7	10	17	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	2	9	15	7	3	35	6

Respondents felt that this was of middling importance, and performance is quite poor. It is noted that one respondent stated, “All the data stuff is more complex in terms of roles and responsibilities and others could be handling the country-level communications. Secretariat simply cannot and should not have a budget for that.”

5. <u>Sharing Lessons Learned</u>: Charter: Facilitating the sharing of lessons learned and data collected from developing country partners within the Global Partnership for Education in a timely manner.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	7	6	7	16	37	4

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	3	13	7	7	4	34	7

While most respondents felt that this was very important, its performance is generally seen as poor. One respondent noted that, "The Secretariat's role on lessons learned should be a facilitator, not a big actor in the process."

6. Support for in-country processes: Charter: Providing support, where required, to the LEG and Coordinating Agency to strengthen the in-country process, in particular in the following ways:

i. taking the lead in collecting information on the country processes leading to education plan endorsement, and sharing this with other partners in the Global Partnership for Education; and

ii. providing quality support to the planning and monitoring processes, including the Joint Sector Review.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	1	3	9	25	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	2	9	10	10	4	35	6

The vast majority thought this area was very important, but performance is low to middling. One respondent stated that the Secretariat needs to reconsider current resources directed to supporting the Local Education Groups. Another stated that the quality of country support is varying.

7. Monitoring of Education Funding Information: Charter: Collecting, monitoring, and sharing, among partners, global and country-level information on all funding amounts and sources associated with delivery of the endorsed education plans.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	2	2	11	7	15	37	4

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	5	6	14	5	5	35	6

This role was ranked lower than other areas, and its performance was also ranked low.

8. Supporting Board on grant proposal process: Charter: Providing support to the Board of Directors and its committees in the Global Partnership for Education trust fund proposal process and providing accurate financial information and in monitoring of the utilization of Global Partnership for

Education trust funds in line with Global Partnership for Education's objectives and policies (including the relevant trust fund document).

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	5	16	17	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	2	9	14	10	35	6

This is another area that was seen as important, but performance was middling.

9. <u>Oversight of disbursements with safeguards</u>: Charter: Providing support to the Board of Directors and its committees in their oversight of the efficient and effective disbursement of the Global Partnership for Education trust funds with appropriate safeguards and accountability.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	0	0	3	15	20	38	3

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
0	1	4	10	14	6	35	6

This is another area that is seen as important with middling performance.

10. <u>Addressing Issues of Policy, Data, Capacity and Finance</u>: Charter: Helping coordinate the efforts of GPE to address issues and priorities related to policy, data, capacity and finance.

Importance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
1	1	4	9	9	12	36	5

Performance Ranking

0	1	2	3	4	5	Total	No answer
1	3	8	12	6	6	36	5

The views expressed on the importance of this area are mixed, with performance reviews also mixed. Note that this role is essentially the reason for establishing the GRA. One respondent noted that they do not understand what it means.

11. <u>Other</u>:

Suggestions made for additions include monitoring and evaluation and results reporting (this can be incorporated into provisions that are already there), running the Needs and Performance Framework/allocation of funds (perhaps too detailed), and working with new and existing SEs and MEs to support them (note that this is generally included in the GPE Fund document).

Part VII: Role of the Chair

Survey Feedback: Unfortunately, there was a technical issue with the survey on this question for an unknown reason and so the quantifiable responses cannot be analyzed. Below is the additional feedback from the comments section:

- The Chair role must remain focused on political leadership, representation, resource mobilization, supervision of GPE Board meetings. The creation of a vice-Chair would be welcomed in order to second the Chair and have a better balance of representation of the different Board categories (for instance, have a North/ South alternance between the Chair and the vice-Chair). It is unfortunate that clear repartition between the Board Chair and the CEO is not proposed at this stage as it gives little opportunity to clarify the different roles. This should be addressed as an urgent matter.

- I think this needs clarification. I see the CEO as being the CEO of the Secretariat, not the CEO of the partnership. In fact, having a CEO of a partnership would not make sense. If this is the case then the roles and responsibilities are fairly clear.

- The role of the Chair cannot be considered in isolation from the role of the CEO. The answers above assume that the CEO will take responsibility and accountability for some of the more operational functions currently performed by the Chair.

Part VIII: Other

Please find below all the responses to the question: **Please list any other comments you have regarding GPE global governance mechanisms that you feel need to be addressed and are not covered by the questions in this survey.**

- Very well designed survey!
- The governance role of the GPE Board vs the World Bank Board is not addressed in this survey and is not clear to Board members.
- Great work has been done. The representation is a credit to the partnership. There has to be something which donors and partners sign up to leave behind their multi-bi-lateral agendas or interests. The very existence of the partnership is to leave behind such agendas and serve the needs of education systems and learners. At present there is too much influence from these agendas. It would be more prudent and result in more credibility if the Secretariat is funded out of the general pool and be totally answerable to the Board, and not be able to accept bi-lateral contributions for programmes.
- Main challenges: - Have a Board that is representative from a partnership point of view, but able to make decisions in an efficient manner. An executive committee for decisions during the year might be an option. - Real engagement of developing country partners and Southern NGOs: How to strengthen their participation?
- As a member of a developing country beneficiary of GPE grant we would like to commend the GPE governance structure for their efforts to lead and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable.
- Recognise that each partner within GPE needs to greater align Board presence with on the ground implementation presence. This could better be facilitated by having a greater insight into the planned travel/ outreach of the Secretariat, which would enable greater flagging internally with partners/ donors and ensure that the partnership on the ground is stronger.
- I think the relationship between the Chair and more broadly the board and the Secretariat needs to improve and assume that this will happen - or at least I certainly hope so - with the appointment of the new CEO. I also think decisions for the board need to be framed better and the CEO needs to be seen to support the development and finalisation of these during board meetings.
- Clear repartition between the Chair and the CEO roles.
- An issue that is only covered indirectly is the monitoring of the utilization of GPE grants and the

oversight of effective and efficient use of the GPE grants. It is not clear within the governance of GPE where and how this is covered.

- An active role of the secretariat in the support to Local Education Groups and support to developing countries constituencies are key priorities. A new division of labour between the CEO and the Chair should be welcomed.
- Please rethink your approach to thinking through governance and make it more flexible and less centrally driven all decision making. Currently there is limited opportunity for opt in participation and this needs to be a critical component of the GPE. Yes it needs a board and it needs to a tight process around finances, but it also needs fit for purpose governance beyond the financially related work.
- How should visibility of GPE be enhanced in-country? Local Education Groups consist of donors who have their respective local assistance strategies, albeit based on the Education Strategic Plans of countries. Hence these partners, notwithstanding their contribution to implementation grant proposals, are more inclined to meeting the targets set under their plans instead of committing to abroad based plan like the GPE. This unfortunate disconnect has implications for crediting GPE with results from the work done. SE/ME are perceived or consider themselves owners of the GPE activities. This has to change and country ownership must be taken up seriously if the GPE is to become more visible locally. The lack of visibility has a potential to undermine resource mobilization since fatigue could set in to minimize results and effect. Simply, when developing country partners own the GPE processes with support from the Secretariat, GPE visibility will be enhanced at the local level.
- Reaching consensus on governance mechanisms will be difficult while the current diversity of view on the precise nature and purpose of GPE remains unresolved. An important bi-product of this survey will be to enable a stocktake of these diverse views and their implications for potential changes in governance arrangements.
- Promote understanding of GPE governance organs among all constituencies.
- The effectiveness of the FAC is not questioned in this survey, but should be further explored. The division of roles and responsibilities between the CEO and the Chair is presented, and the role of the Chair delineated. The role of the CEO is not however presented. It would be important to map the functions of the former Head of Secretariat and identify the gaps which may be present which the new structure as this relates to the effectiveness of the Secretariat.