REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

For Decision and Information

PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to summarize the deliberations of the Financial Advisory Committee ("FAC") in relation to its meeting (via audio conference) on September 12, 2013.

Part 1 – FAC Recommendations to the Board of Directors

Section 1– Allocations from GPE resources for accelerated funding of a program implementation grant in Somalia (South Central) under the accelerated funding in emergency and early recovery situations guidelines.

Part 2 – Items for Information

Section 2 – FAC Survey

Section 3 – Update on Portfolio Review

List of Annexes

Annex 1 – Attendance List
Annex 2 – Final Readiness Review (Somalia)
Annex 3 – FAC Survey Responses

PART 1 – FAC Recommendations to the Board of Directors

1. Allocations from GPE resources for program implementation grants

Introduction

1.1 Table 1 contains a summary of the program implementation grant application reviewed by the FAC at its meeting on September 12, 2013, including the FAC's recommendations (including agency fees).

Table 1

Country	SE/ME	Allocation Requested (in US$)	Allocation Recommended by FAC (in US$)	Supervision Allocation (in $US)	Agency Fee % and Amount (in $US)	Period	Proposed Funding Source
Somalia (South Central)	UNICEF	1,380,000	1,380,000	N/A	7% - 96,600	1 Year	GPE Fund

1.2 In May 2013, the Board of Directors approved Program Implementation Grants for Puntland (US$ 2.1 million) and for Somaliland (US$ 4.2 million). The remaining US$8.2 million of Somalia's indicative allocation is expected to be utilized for South Central Somalia with a full Program Implementation Grant application scheduled for review by the FAC at its next face-to-face meeting (October 15-18, 2013)

1.3 An application was received for funding under the accelerated funding in emergency and early recovery situations guidelines and was reviewed by the FAC at an audio conference held on September 12 2013. This is the first such application under these guidelines since approval by the Board in November 2012.

1.4 As can be seen from Table 1 above, the FAC is recommending that the Board of Directors approve the full grant amount requested.

1.5 The Secretariat confirmed and FAC agreed that the application meets the eligibility criteria as defined in the guidelines.

1.6 There was broad support for the proposal from FAC members, recognizing that funds are required quickly in order to conduct the activities as early as possible in the new school year. Still, a few questioned in more general terms, whether proposals such as this, with a high proportion of funds dedicated to teacher incentive schemes, and where the full Program Implementation Grant proposal is forthcoming shortly, is an appropriate use of the accelerated funding scheme.

1.7 The FAC spent considerable time deliberating on issues of sustainability related to incentives for teachers, the mechanisms for how the incentives would work, selection of teachers, the need to evaluate the success of the incentives, need to increase the percentage of female teachers, the high management and administrative costs, and the link between the accelerated funding application and the full application that will be reviewed in October.

1.8 The FAC expect that some of these issues will be relevant to the full application and therefore request that additional information be provided for consideration as part of their review in October.

1.9 The Secretariat's Final Readiness Review under the Quality Assurance Review process is provided in Annex 2. The FAC has included recommendations and comments for the LEG, which pursuant to the recommended decision, will be communicated by the Secretariat in its notification of the approval of the allocation. The FAC's comments are presented following the recommended decision:

Recommended Decision

1.10 The FAC recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following decision:

BOD/2013/10-01 –<u>Approval of Allocation for Program Implementation Grant</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the following allocation from GPE trust funds to be used for a Program Implementation Grant as described in the accelerated funding request submitted in September 2013

a. **Somalia (South Central):**

i. US$1,380,000 for a one-year implementation period, with UNICEF serving as Managing Entity; and

ii. US$$96,600 for an agency fee.

2. requests the Secretariat to include in its notification to the relevant Local Education Group of the approval of the allocations, the Financial Advisory Committee's comments on the program set out in BOD/2013/10 DOC 01.

FAC Comments and Recommendations to the Local Education Group

<u>Somalia (South Central)</u>

- The FAC recognizes that the request is a strong proposal for accelerated support in the challenging environment for South Central Somalia and welcomes this first Accelerated Funding proposal.

- The FAC notes that a number of issues identified in this application are likely to be relevant to the main Program Implementation Grant application, therefore the FAC requests the LEG to submit additional information to the FAC for consideration at their next face-to-face meeting in relation to the following comments:
  i. Provide clear clarification on the link between the current Accelerated Support proposal and the Program Implementation Grant application, but also in relation to the link with the Education Sector Strategy Plan, and other related initiatives.

ii. Provide clarification on the selection criteria for the incentives payments to the teachers and whether the payments are top ups to existing teacher salaries or in place of them.

iii. Suggest an evaluation to follow-up on assumption that teacher payment incentives "are expected to motivate and retain teachers". Furthermore requests the LEG to monitor whether the incentives will have a positive impact on decreasing the burden of families' contributions.

iv. Urge a stronger focus on girls' education and, specifically, measures to increase the percentage of female teachers being targeted.

v. Adapt the Result Framework to reflect expected results in 2014 as immediate outcome from the accelerated support.

vi. Concerns that a high portion of grant funding is being used for teacher incentives and encourages the LEG to develop a strategy towards a sustainable solution.

vii. Concerns that management and administrative costs of the grant are high, noting that a number of issues on the budget have been identified in the FAC review

PART 2 – Items for Information

2. FAC Survey

2.1. The terms of reference for the FAC specify that:

The Board of Directors shall conduct an annual assessment of the overall functioning of the FAC, in consultation with the FAC Chair. Such assessment may result in recommendations for changes to these terms of reference, replacement of the FAC Chair and/or individuals acting in the role of FAC member. In the case where a FAC member been assessed as not fulfilling his/her responsibilities, including failing to attend required meetings and discussions, the FAC Chair or the Chair of the Board of Directors, as appropriate may approach the affected constituency to provide them with an opportunity to present an alternative FAC member to represent the constituency/constituencies. The Board of Directors shall approve the replacement of the FAC Chair or any FAC member.

2.2. During 2013, the then Chair of the Board (Carol Bellamy) consulted with the Chair of the FAC (Camilla Helgo Fossberg) as to how this assessment should be carried out. Considering the ongoing work of the Governance Working Group (GWG) and the potential changes to governance structures arising, it was agreed the assessment would take the form of a self-assessment through a survey of FAC members with the information to be provided to the GWG for their deliberations. The report was shared with the GWG in advance of their most recent meeting (5-6 September) and is now being shared with the Board of Directors for information purposes.

2.3. All FAC members and alternates that had attended at least one of the two face to face meetings held between October 2012 and April 2013 or participated in a FAC audio conference were invited to participate in an anonymous survey during June and July 2013. There were 19 potential respondents and 14 of those completed the survey, a response rate of 74%.

2.4. The survey results are disclosed in full in Annex 3 including all comments. Some of the comments have been slightly modified to preserve anonymity but the substance has not been modified in any way. The survey follows the structure of the FAC Terms of Reference.

KEY FINDINGS

2.5. While the majority of respondents felt the time expectation of 25 days per year was accurate, a significant number of FAC members have spent more days than this on FAC matters. The significant increase in volume of grant applications in Round 1 of 2013 being identified as a probable cause. The vast majority of respondents feel that they were able to dedicate the required time to FAC, however a number were not due to clashes with their own regular work.

2.6. While the majority of FAC members were able to consult with constituency colleagues and obtain feedback, a significant number of them expressed concern about a lack of response from constituency colleagues.

2.7. In terms of the FAC's performance of the specific roles outlined in the Terms of Reference (TOR), it is clear that FAC members believe they are performing well in relation to issues of access to funding such as the review of proposals and relevant policies related to eligibility for funding. However, the other aspects of the TORs related more to oversight of implementation (such as annual report on grant portfolio) and policies related to roles and responsibilities of Supervising Entities shows lower levels of satisfaction. Overall, respondents are satisfied that the FAC has performed satisfactorily in relation to the TORs.

2.8. While respondents are unanimous in their view that the FAC has performed in an efficient and effective manner, and expressed strong satisfaction with the performance of the Chair, support provided by the Secretariat, quality of documentation, and overall functioning of the FAC, there were issues of concerns raised by a number of respondents as to whether there was sufficient financial expertise on the FAC, and the short space of time available to review documents when combined with a heavy workload.

2.9. Overall in terms of the most pressing areas to address, it would appear that increased focus on grant implementation is warranted, in addition to ensuring that the composition of FAC members has an appropriate balance of members with technical/education expertise to those with financial/risk management expertise. The functioning of a number of FAC constituencies may also need some examination to ensure they are appropriately engaged, while the need for earlier documentation would no doubt assist FAC members in coping with the heavy workload and would potentially improve engagement of FAC members' constituency colleagues.

3. Update on Portfolio Review

3.1 The Secretariat provided an overview of the draft portfolio review report and updated the FAC on development of the report and the next steps.

3.2 The FAC welcomed the report noting that although, it was a work in progress, it was a substantive piece of work, and congratulated the Secretariat on the progress made.

3.3 The FAC will provide feedback on an updated version of the report to the Secretariat and will dedicate time at the next face-to-face meeting (October 15-18, 2013) to discussing the key issues and potential recommendations arising from the report.

3.4 It was noted that the intention is for the report to be submitted to the Board following the next FAC meeting and to be made publically available on the website following the November Board meeting.

ANNEX 1:

MEETING OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 12, 2013, VIA AUDIO CONFERENCE
ATTENDANCE LIST

Chair:

Camilla Helgo Fossberg (NORAD)

Committee Members:

Charles Y. Aheto-Tsegah (Africa 3)

Natalia Cherevatova (in place of Elizabeth King) (Multilateral and Regional Banks)

Jordan Naidoo (UNICEF/UNESCO)

Paula Nolan (Donor 2 and 4)

Margaret Koziol (in place of Artem Stepanenko) (Donor 6)

Swati Narayan (in place of Imad Sabi) (CSO 1 and 2)

Aleesha Taylor (Private Sector and Private Foundations and CSO 3)

Dan Thakur (Donor 3)

Ronald Siebes (Donor 1)

Fanny Gazagne (Donor 5)

Secretariat:

Paul Coustere (Country Support Team Lead)

Joris Van Bommel (Sr. Country Operations Officer and Country Lead for Somalia)

Margarita Focas Licht (Sr. Education Specialist)

Lisa Gomer (Chief Operating Officer)

Jean-Marc Bernard (Monitoring & Evaluation Team Lead)

Padraig Power (Sr. Financial Officer and FAC Liaison)

Apologies:

Hamoud Al-Seyani (Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia)

Minister Alim Hadidja Youssouf (Africa 2)

Sangay Zam (East Asia and the Pacific)

David Atchoarena (UNICEF/UNESCO)

Daniel Nkaada (Africa 1)

ANNEX 2: FINAL READINESS REVIEW

SOUTH CENTRAL SOMALIA
Quality Assurance Review - Phase III
Final Readiness Review
Accelerated Funding Proposal for Education in Emergencies

Proposed Amount: US$ 1.379.600.38
(16.8 % of total indicative allocation of US$ 8.2 million for South Central Somalia)

Version September 12, 2013[1]

COUNTRY BACKGROUND

Since the outbreak of the Somali Civil War in 1991, Somalia has suffered from years of prolonged conflict, piracy, and an inability to deal with cyclical famine. Continued conflict also has led to the formation of distinct regions with separate governing bodies: the self-declared Republic of Somaliland, the semi-autonomous state of Puntland, and South Central Somalia (including the capital Mogadishu and the Galmudug State). Currently, Somalia is undergoing a political transition which brings new optimism and expectations. With support from various partners and a Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Education Plan Development Grant, Puntland and Somaliland have each developed a transitional Education Sector Strategy Plan and in May 2013 the GPE Board approved Program Implementation Grants for Puntland (US$ 2.1 million) and for Somaliland (US$ 4.2 million).

Somalia is a fragile state. The Federal Government faces major challenges to building peace and security, especially in South Central Somalia, and in establishing democratic processes and institutions and strengthening human rights. The semi-arid and arid climatic conditions across the country are also major constraints to development. Though the first tentative steps towards recovery are being taken, the process is slow. Life expectancy is extremely low, infant and child mortality are extremely high, and access to sanitation is very limited. About 60 percent of the Somalia population is composed of nomadic pastoralists, and is heavily dependent on the livestock sector. The gross domestic product (GDP) per capita is estimated to be US$ 284, one of the lowest in the world. The Human Development Index for Somalia is not yet available.

The country has the world's highest dependency on remittances, which account for 35 percent of the GDP. Continued humanitarian assistance is required to help the most vulnerable groups of people and to consolidate current gains in order to prevent future crises. An estimated 1.1 million Somalis are internally displaced, often living in poor conditions. Another one million Somalis are refugees in neighboring countries. The relative political stability in South Central Somalia has led to a rise in the number of returnees, with some 18,000 refugees reported as having returned from neighboring countries since January 2013.

[1] This version reflects the corrections in budget and financial table as outlined in the FRR Addendum submitted to the FAC on September 10, 2013

The humanitarian situation in South Central Somalia remains critical; yet, the country has promising opportunities to break the cycle of repeated crises. The Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) strategy, launched in Somalia for the first time in December 2012, is the first multi-year CAP that will allow for far greater continuity in programming. The approach of the CAP addresses both humanitarian responses and recovery/development programs in Somalia, so that the focus of development assistance moves from emergency aid to strengthening preparedness and building resilience to cope with shocks such as droughts, floods, and food insecurity. This represents a significant shift from a traditional humanitarian approach in Somalia to one which strengthens the resilience of the population, ultimately increasing capacity to deal with unexpected crises. The government of the Somalia Federal Republic acknowledges the importance of education as being one of the most viable and an effective vehicle through such resilience is achieved, but the financing of education interventions is a significant bottleneck.

EDUCATION SECTOR

In July 2012, Somalia officially joined the GPE Partnership as a federal state. Somalia's education sector is divided into three main administrations, the Ministries of Education of Somaliland (MoE Somaliland), Puntland (MoE Puntland) and South Central Somalia, where each ministry functions independently with its own education agenda.

During the 20 years of civil war, more than 75% of pre-existing public schools were either destroyed or closed. State intervention in the education sector has been limited and fraught with difficulties. In response to the growing need for emergency education, privately owned educational institutions known as Education Umbrellas have been established and support education services through non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The Education Umbrellas sustained the education sector during conflict and will continue to play a vital role in re-establishing the sector. With no functional central government, each organization provides education services with its own principles, standards, and design, including curricula and certifications. Going forward, discussions between the government and private organizations will take place to ensure a more coherent approach in education. Only 710,860 children out of an estimated 1.7 million of primary school-aged children are enrolled in school. The overall Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) for across Somalia, as indicated by school level data collected in 2011, is approximately 42 percent.

The education sector is reviving through the Directorate of Education (DoE) under the leadership of a new Minister of Human Development and Public Services (MoHD&PS). The top priority for the Directorate is to get as many children into basic education as quickly as possible and to restore the functioning of the Directorate. The Directorate of Education continues to be constrained by the lack of financial capacity.

In 2012, the Federal Government of Somalia embarked on a participative, consultative process to develop the transitional Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) for 2013-2016 for South Central Somalia. Currently, the ESSP for South Central Somalia is being finalized with a strong focus on access and on quality, through the construction and rehabilitation of classrooms and the recruitment and training of teachers, as well as the set-up of a teacher management system.

The Federal Government of Somalia is submitting a GPE Program Implementation Grant application for South Central Somalia for consideration by the GPE Board in November 2013. This program will focus on the development of an appropriate Teacher Salary Payment and Management System Framework, and will include the establishment of a payment mechanism for the Framework. If successfully granted, the funds will arrive in early-2014.

Recruiting and providing incentives to teachers is also one of the top priorities of the CAP. In addition, ensuring teachers' recruitment (gender equitably), incentive payments, provision of basic training, and the presence of teachers at schools is a key element of the Education Cluster Strategy 2013 – 2015.

The EU is Coordinating Agency for the Local Education Group (LEG) in Somalia. The LEG has established an Education Sector Committee (ESC) which is chaired by the MoE (co-chaired by UNESCO and the NGO African Education Trust (AET). The Committee is comprised of implementing partners, including: local NGOs; civil society organizations (CSOs); international NGOs (Save the Children UK, Care, CfBT, AET, Islamic Relief, Diakonia, Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) and the Norwegian Refugee Council); multilaterals (UNICEF, UNESCO, WFP); and donors (EU, DFID, USAID). There is also still an active Education Cluster in South Central Somalia. Due to on-going security constraints, some development partners have travel restrictions in place for Somalia. To address this constraint, regular ESC meetings also take place in Nairobi.

APPLICATION SUMMARY

The indicative allocation for all of Somalia was US$14.5 million. Following the GPE Board of Directors' approval of US$4.2 million for Somaliland and US$2.1 million for Puntland on May 21 and 22, 2013, the amount available to South Central Somalia totaled US$8.2 million. Because an accelerated funding request cannot exceed 20% of the indicative allocation available, the maximum request that can be considered for South Central through the accelerated funding mechanism is US$1.64 million, representing 20% of the remaining indicative allocation. The Federal Government of Somalia is applying for an accelerated funding request for South Central Somalia in the amount of US$ 1.38 million (16.8% of the total indicative allocation). This request for accelerated funding is directly related to the Program Implementation Grant proposal which will be presented to the GPE Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) and Board of Directors in October and November 2013.

The proposed program for accelerated funding will provide support for teachers in South Central Somalia. While both existing and newly-recruited teachers will commence their work for the new academic year in September 2013, there is an urgent need to secure teacher incentive payments for the first semester of the academic year 2013/2014. In addition, resources are required for an accelerated training for teachers, prior to the new academic year. Therefore this request for accelerated funding is now being submitted in order to provide support for the beginning of the coming school year.

The proposed program for accelerated support has two components:

(1) *Provision of Accelerated Teacher Training Towards Newly Recruited Teachers* that includes a 15-day Accelerated Teacher Training program ('intensive crash course') for 1000 newly recruited teachers. Under this component, the EU-funded "Strengthening Capacity of Teachers Training in Primary and Secondary Education (SCOTTPS)" will be utilized as it has shown successful results.

(2) *Provision of Incentive Payments Towards Existing and Newly Recruited Teachers* for the first 4 months of the academic year 2013/2014, which envisages the payment of incentives to 1.000 newly recruited teachers and to 535 existing teachers whose salaries are particularly low.

The selection of existing teachers will be based on data collected by the Education Cluster. Education data and information are severely lacking in general in South Central Somalia, and therefore planning specific interventions is often a challenge. Therefore, South Central Somalia will utilize the Cluster data and implement activities through partners that already have incentive payment service delivery structures on the ground. Monthly incentives will be paid to teachers to increase their motivation and retention. While continuing to respond to emergencies, this will aim to: 'improve the quality of education by recruiting, paying incentives to, and training teachers; supporting child-centered learning methodologies; and building the capacity of the Ministry of Education, cluster members, and other education personnel to plan, implement, and manage quality and resilient education programs'.

As for the incentive payments, the Education Cluster members (international NGOs and local NGOs) will implement during the Accelerated Funding period using the existing UNICEF-funded incentives payment structure with the involvement of the DoE. This Accelerated Funding will be utilized to support 535 existing teachers, out of which there are 133 Head Teachers, 101 Deputy Head Teachers, and 301 Teachers (regular), individually receiving an incentive amount of $100, $130, and $150, respectively. It is expected that Cluster members' experiences and expertise, especially from similar processes during the emergency in 2011, will ensure a successful delivery of payments that will enhance partnerships between the Cluster and the Education Sector. Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) will provide similar services to an additional 300 teachers and 18 Head teachers.

	Program Component	**Amount (US$)**	**% of total**
1	**Accelerated Teacher Training**	**420,052.50**	**30%**
1.1	Training of Trainers	18,730.00	
1.2	Teacher Exams and Supervision	28,530.00	
1.3	Teacher Training	352,790.00	
1.4	Contingency	20,002.50	
2	**Teacher Incentives**	**779,600.00**	**57%**

2.1	Teacher Incentives	779,600.00	
3	**UNICEF Cross-Sectoral Costs**	**179,947.88**	**13%**
3.1	Security, Knowledge Management, Communication, Overall Management	179,947.88	
	TOTAL	*1,379,600.38* **1,380,000**	**100%**

*Other Agency fees not included in the total grant requested: 7 percent (US$ 96,572.03)

* The total budget in the Proposal is US$ 1,476,172.40 (US$1,379,600.38 + the agency fees of US$ 96,572.03)

A remark has been made by the Coordinating Agency (European Union) on the high additional administrative costs for UNICEF (budget line 3.1 'Security, Knowledge Management, Communication, Overall Management). UNICEF's response is that their Management costs are based on standard direct support costs. Operating effectively in a conflict-affected state like Somalia is very expensive; high level security responses and employing alternative monitoring mechanisms are just two examples of costs that need to be covered. UNICEF has provided a more specific breakdown for these management costs. These cross sectoral support costs are assessed on all contributions to UNICEF Somalia and cover the costs of security, administration and finance support functions (both at central Nairobi level and in the zonal offices), operations (including office rent, utilities, communications, fuel, stationery, information technology (IT), etc.), transport, planning, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. One of UNICEF's strengths in Somalia is its network of sub-offices that ensure direct contact with emerging local authorities and communities, enabling strong programming and use of resources. The allocation for South Central Somalia is 4% to security, 3% to Program Monitoring & Evaluation, and 8% operations, amounting to 15% in total.

QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW PROCESS SUMMARY

The process towards the submission of this Accelerated Funding request has followed the process as described in the GPE Board-approved Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations.

The Local Education Group (LEG), in consultation with the Education Cluster, initiated the process (Step 1) by sending on June 14, 2013, an official notification of interest including: (i) a rationale as to why South Central Somalia is eligible for the Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations option; (ii) the proposed Managing Entity (ME) (related to Step 2 of the process); (iii) information to demonstrate that GPE funds will not displace government and/or other donor funds, but will be in addition to other resources; and (iv) indication of timeframe and estimated submission date (August 15, 2013).

UNICEF has been selected as the ME to manage the Emergency and Early Recovery Funding (Step 2). As a requirement, the Guidelines indicate that the ME should be able to operate in the emergency or post-emergency context and provide rapid scale-up of support. To avoid delays in the transfer of funds, MEs must be selected among agencies that have a Transfer Agreement for the GPE Fund executed prior to the submission of the application. UNICEF in Somalia meets all of these requirements. The Secretariat

confirmed on June 19, 2013, South Central Somalia's eligibility for the Accelerated Funding and subsequently informed the FAC.

The Secretariat has carried out a Quality Assurance Review during the preparation of the proposal (Step 3), by reviewing and giving feedback on draft versions of the program document (QAR Phase II process). In response, the following actions and measures were taken to address the key recommendations from QAR phase II:

i. Clarified links between the current proposal for Accelerated Funding and the proposal for the main Program Implementation Grant; The current proposal is seen as a 'link' until the beginning of the broader program;
ii. Detailed the links between the proposed program and the Education Cluster strategies;
iii. Indicated the geographical coverage of teacher incentive payments, as well as the number of teachers involved in the proposal;
iv. Provided information on other donor's funds and contributions. Information from Education Cluster members as from other partners involved in the education sector support in South Central Somalia has been included;
v. Finalized a result framework for the proposed program.

The submitted application (Step 4) outlining the program for accelerated financing is the result of a consultative process between UNICEF as ME, the LEG (Education Sector Committee, including the Federal Government of Somalia), and the members of the Education Cluster. The proposal:

a. is based on the Education Cluster's emergency needs assessment;
b. provides information on the sources of financing for other emergency and early recovery activities planned and information demonstrating that GPE funds will not displace government or other donor funding; and
c. contains an operational plan indicating activities, budgets, implementation strategies, and a description of how activities will be sub-contracted to other organizations as appropriate.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Secretariat finds South Central Somalia eligible for the Accelerated Funding Option based on the fact that South Central Somalia is on the World Bank list of fragile post conflict states and has received an indicative GPE allocation. Secondly, this country - especially this region- is affected by a crisis for which a humanitarian appeal has been launched and published by the UN Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs, in which education is included. Thirdly, GPE funds will be in addition to other (donor / government) resources.

The proposed implementation period for the Accelerated Funding is less than one year (the maximum implementation period as set within the Guidelines), and the requested amount is less than the maximum 20% of the total indicative amount available for South Central Somalia.

The proposed program has been developed in a transparent and collaborative manner;

the application is in-line with the Guidelines. The proposal is aligned with the priorities of the CAP, and there is a clear link with the (draft) remaining Program Implementation Grant program document, which will be submitted to the FAC and Board of Directors in its meetings in October (FAC) and November (Board).

The current political context of South Central Somalia offers opportunities to improve the education sector but is also still rather fragile. The GPE processes and funding can be used as a catalyst for a more coordinated, harmonized, and focused effort to support the education sector. Implementation of any education program in the Somali context remains complex due to the extreme conditions, volatile financial context, and fragile environment. The engagement of the new Directorate for Education, the collaboration with the Education Cluster and the LEG is a positive development and will ensure collaborative monitoring of the program. The application is being submitted by the European Union Delegation, Somalia Unit, on behalf of the Government and its development partners. The ME modality provides a reasonable probability of successful implementation in a context where there is low implementation capacity in government systems. This accelerated funding will be essential to secure the start of the school year while waiting for the finalization of the Education Sector Strategy Plan and the remaining GPE Program Implementation Grant. These accelerated funds bridge the support to South Central Somalia from a more fragmented approach to more systematic and sustainable development of the Education Sector in South Central Somalia with a more active role of the Federal Government of Somalia.

ANNEX 3: FAC SURVEY RESPONSES

Is the time expectation accurate?

Answer Choices	Responses
YES	57.14% 8
NO	42.86% 6
Total	14

- I think this is an over-estimate. 20 days would be more accurate. It may be less than 20 days, but it's important to have this ceiling for planning purposes.
- I think Between 38-45 days
- 50 days
- Answer is yes if look at second half 2012 and first half 2013, because amount of work for second half 2012 was considerably less than first half 2013. If it stays like this year than 25 days a year is not enough taking into account analyzing documentation, coordination within constituency and FAC meeting itself.
- 35 days
- I think it was more like 30 days June 2012 to June 2013. This is certainly true in the case of a big constituency. It should be highlighted that this 30 days is over and above 'non' FAC engagement with GPE processes
- It may be a few days more than the 25 days estimated, but not much.

Have you been able to dedicate the expected time to FAC duties?

Answer Choices	Responses
YES	71.43% 10
NO	28.57% 4
Total	14

- I tried to follow and read all documents sent, and provide comments if there any. Some FAC activities plan in the same time of local activities such as the face to face meeting in October 2012 was at the same time as a Joint Annual Review in my country.

- Which, of course, involved late-night, on-the-plane, in-the-restaurant last minute reading and note-taking as well, but overall the interest makes finding time possible...

- but more than 25 days to fulfill the expectations accurately

- Sometimes, my regular work schedule interferes with the time. This keeps me away from some activities and the timely submission of responses to issues.

- I'm a FAC alternate, and have covered one FAC meeting for our constituency representative but haven't been doing the full FAC member job. Altogether in the past 12 months I've probably spent about 12 days on FAC duties.

- Because of other completing demands on my time.

- Mostly, though it would be phenomenally helpful to give us a little more time with the documents, to provide better support/instructions for the analysis of grants, and also to have a better sense of the FAC's oversight responsibilities.

Have you been able to consult with constituency colleagues?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	78.57% 11
No	21.43% 3
Total Respondents: 14	

- But I would have liked to interact more with them and receive more feedback from them. Based on the lessons I learnt so far, I am hoping to facilitate better consultations for the next meeting

- Consultation took palace partially. Not all constituency colleagues responded.

- But I have not received comments. I have sought input from relevant parts of my own institution.

- I have presented feedback from FAC meetings but have not had the expected response.

- Our constituency is challenging to work within due to disparate interests, language barriers, and differing levels of commitment to the work of the FAC. There are also some disagreements within our Constituency regarding how to raise issues during FAC meetings and obligations for the seated FAC representative to represent all views accurately and fairly.

Were you sufficiently informed and briefed by your constituency following consultations to contribute to the FAC work?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64.29% 9
No	35.71% 5
Total Respondents: 14	

- My constituency is not very responsive on FAC concerns. I therefore attempt to highlight any contentious or particularly relevant issues to ensure that they are aware of what is happening.
- Some constituency did not provide a response, In some also I did consult with constituency colleagues.
- See above - I did not get the full feedback that I would have liked, but there are many explanations for this.
- Yes by the ones that took an active role in analyzing the documents.
- But I have not received comments. I have sought input from relevant parts of my own institution.
- Very few members of the constituency have responded with views that have helped in preparing me for meetings and responding to issues.
- When not on the FAC myself, I have had to repeatedly request information from our Constituency.

For each of the FAC's roles and responsibilities as described in the TOR, please rate how satisfied you are with the FAC's performance and please provide any relevant comments that you have.

	1 (Most Satisfied)	2	3	4 (Least Satisfied)	N/A - The Role is Not Performed	Total
1A. Develop policies (including eligibility of countries) relating to the funding of support to countries for the development and revisions of education plans and GPE program development.	14.29% 2	57.14% 8	14.29% 2	7.14% 1	7.14% 1	14
1B. Develop policies (including eligibility of countries) to support to countries for implementation of education plans, including grants for countries that become ineligible for program implementation grants and performance incentives.	7.14% 1	64.29% 9	21.43% 3	7.14% 1	0% 0	14
1C. Develop policies related to the roles and responsibilities and accountabilities of Supervising Entities and Implementers (as defined in the Global Partnership for Education Fund Governance Document).	7.14% 1	50% 7	28.57% 4	14.29% 2	0% 0	14
2. Review proposals and make recommendations for allocations from the Global Partnership for Education resources to support implementation of education plans in eligible developing country partners.	64.29% 9	28.57% 4	0% 0	7.14% 1	0% 0	14
3. Review, on an annual basis, the indicative allocation list for program implementation grants approved by the Board of Directors and make recommendations for changes.	35.71% 5	28.57% 4	21.43% 3	14.29% 2	0% 0	14
4. Analyze country-level processes (application and implementation) for program implementation grants, as part of the FAC's general oversight function.	21.43% 3	35.71% 5	28.57% 4	14.29% 2	0% 0	14
5. Provide annual reports on the grant portfolio (including program implementation grants, education plan and program development grants and Global and Regional Activities), including disbursements, budgets and implementation progress and make recommendations on future funding priorities and strategies.	7.14% 1	28.57% 4	42.86% 6	14.29% 2	7.14% 1	14
6. Review quarterly financial reports and discuss, as needed.	21.43% 3	35.71% 5	7.14% 1	14.29% 2	21.43% 3	14
7. Review its terms of reference on an as-needed basis for the purpose of recommending any changes to the Board of Directors.	7.14% 1	42.86% 6	28.57% 4	7.14% 1	14.29% 2	14
8. Overall, are you satisfied that the FAC has fulfilled its mandate in accordance with the TORs?	21.43% 3	64.29% 9	14.29% 2	0% 0	0% 0	14

- I think the FAC has fulfilled its mandate adequately. However, it is also clear that the extent to which the Secretariat enables the FAC to fulfill its function is under-recognized.

- I think I as a member of FAC tried to do my best, but some time there is conflict of between my responsibility as a member of FAC and my responsibility in MOE.

- My view is based on the 1 meeting that I attended in April, and about which I was very positive.

- The eligibility of countries via the construct of the NPF and the terms of reference of the FAC itself (e.g. support for participation of alternate members on the FAC and sub-committees) need to be reviewed periodically

- The progress report will be discussed later. Overall I find the work "good enough". Members seem prepared and often have been briefed by others. Discussions are open and frank. The Board has in general accepted FAC recommendations.

- Portfolio reporting needs to be clearer and give a stronger picture of results achieved against results expected. The FAC has pushed for better performance on this but it is still not strong enough. On SEs and MEs, the FAC has made progress on due diligence requirements which is positive. However weakness in portfolio reporting is a gap in terms of accountability of SEs/MEs. In addition to this work on overall costs has been delayed. Scrutiny of costs within proposals should be more evidence-based - potentially this is an area where the FAC needs to consider what it requires from the QAR in order to make its assessments. The FAC has conducted one annual review of the indicative allocation list. The last Board meeting agreed that the indicative allocation system needed some review and risks had not been managed effectively enough. This is partly the result of piloting and learning from a new system and is a FAC and Board responsibility, but remains an area for improvement. The FAC has not reviewed quarterly financial statements.

- Too much time on country applications at the expense of other processes

For each of the following questions, please rate how satisfied you are and provide comments and/or suggestions for improvement where appropriate

	1 (Most Satisfied)	2	3	4 (Least Satisfied)	N/A	Total
1. How satisfied are you that the FAC has the right mix of skills and experience across its membership to fulfill its role?	**28.57%** 4	**50%** 7	**14.29%** 2	**7.14%** 1	**0%** 0	14

- I'm relatively satisfied. The one area that could be improved is in relation to the finance. It seems that most of the FAC members started out with a programming focus and later acquired finance or budgeting skills.
- I appreciate very much the mix, the skills, and the views that the different FAC members bring, and even more so the openness of the discussions
- The FAC remains dominated by northern countries and members. The southern regional representatives are invariably less informed of their constituency positions. This is primarily because the constituency design is faulty with small countries representing constituencies with large population sizes e.g. South Asia.
- The FAC is very strong on education technical and field experience. It is less strong on financial and risk management issues e.g. ME/SE due diligence requirements, indicative allocation and financial forecasting risk.
- Not enough finance skills or rather a skewed skilled set towards education at the expense of finance

2. How satisfied are you with the performance of the FAC Chair?	**71.43%** 10	**21.43%** 3	**7.14%** 1	**0%** 0	**0%** 0	14

- Camilla is really an excellent Chair, almost perfect!
- Camilla has devoted significant time to this and has been a very effective Chair with an excellent sense of how and when to present issues to the Board.

3. How satisfied are you with	**57.14%**	**28.57%**	**14.29%**	**0%**	**0%**	14

	1 (Most Satisfied)	2	3	4 (Least Satisfied)	N/A	Total
the support provided by the Secretariat?	8	4	2	0	0	

- It is unfair to have only the Secretariat responding to country proposals. The countries should be allowed to respond to questions from the FAC.

- The Secretariat has provided a really strong lead and support in some areas e.g. financial forecasting and management where Padraig has very effectively turned around GPE systems to meet FAC and Board needs. Country focal points have supported the FAC very well in terms of presenting, answering questions etc. on proposed programmes. However QAR completeness and quality, and portfolio reporting, has been more variable. Programme proposals have sometimes come to the FAC incomplete and the QARs do not always address key issues e.g. results framework and costs.

4. How satisfied are you with the quality of documentation provided for FAC review?	**35.71%** 5	**50%** 7	**14.29%** 2	**0%** 0	**0%** 0	14

- There has been a vast improvement in this area.

- It's a lot of work and I appreciate the effort the Secretariat makes. In the April meeting, more than once comments were made requesting some additional documentation (donor overviews, for example), which means that the document preparation could be improved by a notch, from its current excellent status

  Some of the documentation is excellent but as indicated in (3), some is more variable.

	1 (Most Satisfied)	2	3	4 (Least Satisfied)	N/A	Total
5. How satisfied are you that you have sufficient time to review the documentation and seek consultation with your constituency colleagues in advance of a FAC meeting?	**14.29%** 2	**42.86%** 6	**28.57%** 4	**14.29%** 2	**0%** 0	14

- Receiving the list of potential applications well ahead of time has helped because I am not able to flag colleagues for their future engagement. The level of consultation and feedback within my constituency is relatively limited though, and additional time would not make a difference.
- This is based on my experience of 1 meeting. For the next meeting in October, I have already started by alerting my constituency to the upcoming country grant applications and will certainly ensure better consultation and feedback...
- The password protection of the website makes the process cumbersome, but the Secretariat has been very helpful to provide the documents via email
- Generally there is enough time to review the documents and to seek input from constituency members, but there have been delays this year.
- Sometimes the quantity of documentation prevents an in-depth study which affects the depth of discussions, though generally the issues presented are in order.
- This has worked well for us, but we are a small constituency.

6. In terms of the functioning of FAC meetings, are you satisfied with the mix of audio and face to face meetings?	**23.08%** 3	**69.23%** 9	**0%** 0	**0%** 0	**7.69%** 1	13

- Can't really comment, as I have not participated in an audio meeting. Two f-t-f meetings, though, are very reasonable, and needed.
- But we need to ensure that we have participation from developing countries in audio meetings.
- I think we should include the Internet written comments on issues, which provides opportunity to contribute views and opinions on issues.
- I have only participated in face to face meetings.

	1 (Most Satisfied)	2	3	4 (Least Satisfied)	N/A	Total
7. Overall, How satisfied are you that the FAC has performed in an efficient and effective manner?	**28.57%** 4	**71.43%** 10	**0%** 0	**0%** 0	**0%** 0	14

- It would be better to organise the meetings as a matter of principle (not tokenism) as far as possible in Southern countries as many representatives seem far removed from the ground realities of developing countries which often influences their decision-making in favour of efficiency (of donor spends rather than economies of scale) over effectiveness (of universal delivery of the right to education of good quality).

- The quality of discussions and the seriousness that the membership attaches to the work are an indication of the effective and efficient way that the FAC has approached and handled its responsibilities.

- I think the FAC has overall performed well. However I think its remit is very wide and this has had an impact on (1) getting the right skill set for the full remit - the committee is stronger on technical education issues than on governance, financial and risk issues (2) its ability to cover the full range of needs which GPE has especially at this time of significant change within the Partnership - purely because of workload and time restrictions. Ideally GPE needs committee consideration of GRA, more focus on programme implementation, accelerated consideration of costs, and much more besides. It's not realistic for the FAC to take all of this on, especially with the approvals workload high, as it is currently. Additionally, there are differing views within the committee about how far it should scrutinise grant proposals from country. Some members favour an in-depth consideration; some argue that GPE should accept recommendations from the country level. Resolving this issue clearly will be important for the FAC's future role. My view is that unless the FAC is scrutinising proposals closely, it is not adding value. GPE needs an assessment process which should either be the FAC (in which case it needs to carry out real scrutiny of proposals in order to recommend them to the Board), or some sort of reformed QAR process which is sufficiently robust for the Board to have confidence in. At present there is a QAR process which is variable, and some difference of views within the FAC about its mandate to scrutinise grants.