POLICY FRAMEWORK ON THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP'S ROLE IN HUMANITARIAN AND COMPLEX EMERGENCY CONTEXTS

For Discussion

1. PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to update the Board of Directors on work since the last meeting of the Board in November 2013 on the Global Partnership's possible engagement in humanitarian and complex emergency situations.

1.2 The paper presents options for the possible roles the Global Partnership could play to support education in emergency contexts. We hope to elicit discussion and to generate a better shared understanding of the challenges associated with supporting education in emergencies.

1.3 In developing this paper, the Secretariat consulted key partners in the GPE Community of Interest on Fragile and Conflict-Affected States (including the Global Education Cluster, the International Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), as well as bilateral, multilateral and international non-governmental organization partners). Consultations included three meetings of the Community of Interest and a range of bilateral conversations. In addition, a previous version of this paper was discussed during the GPE Strategy and Policy Committee audio-conference on April 30, 2014.

1.4 The Board is asked to provide guidance to the Secretariat regarding the framework and options presented in this paper to facilitate the development of more operational guidelines on the Global Partnership's role and engagement in supporting education in humanitarian and complex emergency situations.

2. BOARD GUIDANCE REQUESTED

2.1 The Board of Directors notes the work done to identify possible roles for the Global Partnership in supporting education in humanitarian contexts. The Secretariat requests guidance from the Board on the principles of the proposed policy for the Global Partnership for Education's role in humanitarian and complex emergency situations as outlined in this paper and its annexes.

2.2 In particular, the Board of Directors is requested to provide guidance on the following questions:

- Does the Board of Directors agree with the three levels of the Global Partnership's possible engagement in humanitarian and complex emergency situations? (section 5);
- Does the Board of Directors agree with the matrix of proposed engagement by GPE category of countries? (section 4);
- Does the Board of Directors support the potential involvement of the Global Partnership in L3 Emergencies in non-GPE member countries, on a case by case basis, subject to Board agreement? (section 5);
- Does the Board of Directors agree that the Secretariat should further explore possible financing mechanisms? (section 5).

3. BACKGROUND: CHALLENGES FOR EDUCATION IN HUMANITARIAN AND COMPLEX EMERGENCY SITUATIONS

3.1 The scale of needs in humanitarian and complex emergencies

In 2013, the Global Monitoring Report estimated that 50% of the world's out-of-school primary-aged children live in conflict-affected states, totalling 28.5 million children; 55% are girls. Worldwide, children represent half of the 42.5 million people who are refugees or who have become internally displaced, in part as a result of conflict or violence in their countries. Additionally, the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction estimates that 100 million children and young people are affected by disasters annually.

Although it is challenging to define, the number of children and youth of school-going age affected by humanitarian emergencies and needing support, is estimated by the Education Cluster to have reached 18.5 million beneficiaries in 21 countries in 2012, including children, youth, teachers and education officials.

Humanitarian emergencies have significant short-term and long-term impact on education systems:

- serious disruptions in school terms, school assessments and children's ability to learn;
- psychosocial effects of emergencies on children;
- violence and/or attacks against children and teachers;

- protection risks, including sexual violence, forced recruitment, child labor damage/destruction of education infrastructure and materials;
- use of schools for non-education purposes; and
- forced displacement of students and teachers, among others.

3.2 Understanding education in a continuum



Support for education needs has to be secured from the very first phase of an emergency to enable education services to adapt to early recovery interventions that will lead into transitional planning phases. All the pieces of the continuum need to be adequately addressed to ensure education responds to needs throughout a crisis. Evidence shows that underfunding of education systems (and their resilience) has significant impact in the short, medium and long term.

The cost of repairing such effects and redressing the situation to ensure students and teachers are able to go back to school often falls on Education Cluster partners working with all relevant ministries, government entities and other units responsible for emergencies. This is featured prominently in the Consolidated Appeals Process. The main objective of humanitarian education plans is to support the coordination efforts of affected governments to minimize interruptions to education and/or interventions to recover education infrastructure, materials and support to secure retention of students and teachers. This approach provides the basis for a smoother recovery for the education system. In a number of countries, the Education Cluster has successfully transferred operations to Ministries of Education and relevant partners. In most instances, however, continuous emergencies or worsening situations prevent this from happening.

⇨ ***Any consideration of the Global Partnership for Education's engagement should be related to early recovery interventions that will lead into transitional planning and response phases***.

3.3 Humanitarian funding gap

Education in emergency situations remains severely underfunded. Education has consistently received the smallest proportion of the amount requested by any humanitarian sector. In 2012, education accounted for only 1.4 percent of humanitarian funding, down from 2.4 percent in 2010 and far below the needs of countries affected by emergencies. In 2012, only 26 percent of the modest amount requested for education through Consolidated Appeals Processes (CAPs)– US$313 million—was received in humanitarian crises, leaving a funding gap of US$233 million. The Education Cluster estimates that as a result of the funding shortfall in 2012 alone, over 13 million beneficiaries – the vast majority of whom are children – were not supported with vital education interventions included in humanitarian response plans in over 20 countries.

In 2013, in spite of growing education needs in large-scale (or L3) emergencies, education accounted for only 2 percent of humanitarian funding, with a bigger funding gap of US$247 million – from a requested US$409 million — with 40 percent coverage.

- ⇨ ***Any consideration of the potential role of the Global Partnership in financing humanitarian interventions and mobilizing humanitarian aid for education must focus on remedying such low funding levels and have a catalyst function.***

3.4 Coordination gap

A number of actors and coordinating bodies play a key role in humanitarian emergencies, alongside existing coordination mechanisms in development cooperation settings. Humanitarian coordination in the education sector is led through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Global Education Cluster, jointly coordinated by UNICEF and Save the Children, which brings together humanitarian agencies, Ministries of Education as well as other relevant Ministries, INGOs, local NGOs and CSOs, among others. UNHCR has a clear mandate related to ensuring quality education for refugees.

The Education Clusters should have links with the Local Education Groups. This could be strengthened through better governance structures on both sides. Both the Education Cluster and/or the Local Education Group are coordinating and decision-making mechanisms which may have overlapping priorities in fragile and conflict-affected countries and in complex and protracted emergencies in particular. Although many GPE partners are represented in both groups, there can be a considerable degree of disconnect in agendas (including timelines), priorities and funding discussions around education needs resulting in funding, planning and

operational gaps. Such a disconnect requires careful consideration and review. This review should include an effort to bring together partners from development and humanitarian fields to conceptualize what resilience really means at different stages (prevention, humanitarian, fragile, long-term development).

- ⇨ ***Any consideration of the Global Partnership for Education's funding role should include a review of opportunities and ways of augmenting coordination between development and humanitarian education partners, with the end goal of outlining education priorities alongside needs that are sensitive to evolving contexts and are framed by a continuum of preparedness and provision (humanitarian emergency response, early recovery, building/strengthening resilient education systems).***

4. A FRAMEWORK FOR ENGAGEMENT OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

4.1 The Global Partnership's mission is to galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable. To achieve its mission, the Global Partnership has identified four core strategic goals to focus on improving education quality, increasing equity in access to education, reaching marginalized populations, and building strong national education systems. Achieving those strategic goals requires a strong involvement in fragile, conflict-affected and emergency contexts, to assure concerted action on quality, equity, and systems, including in early recovery or transitional stages. Therefore, the first objective in the GPE Strategic Plan 2012– 2015 is to assure that fragile and conflict-affected states are able to develop and implement their education plans. In support of this sector plan work, the GPE Strategic Plan specifically mentions helping to bridge the divide between emergency response and education development activities.

4.2 The Global Partnership could engage in humanitarian and complex emergency situations in three areas: advocacy, coordination and financing. Before exploring these possible areas, a distinction has to be made between categories of countries according to GPE membership:

- ***GPE member countries eligible for Program Implementation Grants:*** These countries are GPE members and already have or are preparing to request a GPE Program Implementation Grant.
- ***GPE member countries not eligible for Program Implementation Grants:*** These countries are not eligible for GPE Program Implementation Grants

under the new Funding Model. However, they are part of the Partnership, and might request GPE support for Education Plan Preparation and other technical support.

- ***Non-GPE member countries:*** These countries are not GPE members and are not eligible for any GPE funding.

4.3 The matrix below identifies a possible engagement of the Global Partnership by category of countries, based on their eligibility for GPE Program Implementation Grants:

	Advocacy	**Coordination**	**Funding**	
			Existing GPE Funding	**Additional Funding**
non-GPE member	YES	NO (*)	Not Applicable	NO (*)
GPE member but not eligible for funding	YES	YES	PARTLY Possibility of using Education Plan Development Grant	PARTLY (*)
GPE member and eligible for funding	YES	YES	YES Already existing mechanisms (Operational Framework + Accelerated Funding)	YES Through a Revolving Fund

(* See Section 5 below for a possible further involvement of the Global Partnership in non-GPE member countries in the case of a declared L3 Emergencies)

5. SUGGESTED ENGAGEMENT OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP IN HUMANITARIAN AND COMPLEX EMERGENCY SITUATIONS

As mentioned above, the Global Partnership could engage in humanitarian and complex emergency situations in the following three areas:

5.1 Advocacy Role

The scale and impact of a crisis in education needs may compel all actors to support joint efforts to mobilize the international community. The Global Partnership and its Board constituencies could play an advocacy role to secure international attention and to support calls to mobilize funding in support of education needs in UN-led humanitarian appeals. This advocacy role will go beyond generally making the case for investments in education in humanitarian emergencies towards specifically advocating for additional attention and funding through existing Consolidated Appeal Processes of the United Nations Office for the Consolidation on Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in countries facing a humanitarian crisis.

Rationale: As a global network dedicated to reach the most marginalized and as a co-organizer of Education Cannot Wait, the Global Partnership is expected to play an advocacy role. Depending on the nature of the crisis, other global actors and coordinating mechanisms have been established specifically to operate in emergency situations (e.g., OCHA, the Global Education Cluster, UNHCR and UNICEF). The Global Partnership has a clearer mandate to focus on the development and implementation of education sector plans with a focus on convening all partners, promoting country ownership and improving development effectiveness in education.

Concrete Action: Active engagement in advocacy by the Global Partnership's Board Chair and CEO with the international community, in addition to a strong focus on communications and external relations.

Consequences for GPE Secretariat resources: The proposed engagement would translate into additional work, mainly for the Partnership and External Relations Team (Communications, Donor Relations and Advocacy) within the GPE Secretariat.

5.2 Convening and coordination role

The current humanitarian aid and coordination architecture is mainly restricted to short timeframes – often defined on an annual basis. However there is a need to secure adequate

coordination mechanisms for all relevant actors to adopt stronger medium-term thinking in education plans through crucial support in the early stages of an emergency. This role, focussing on stronger and common short and medium-term planning, also provides an important opportunity to bridge the gap between direct humanitarian funding and development aid.

Rationale: The GPE model is able to focus on the early recovery stages with a perspective of the long-term strengthening/building of education systems. This support would highlight a clearer comparative advantage to support a continuum in education across contexts by supporting stronger coordination between the Education Cluster and Local Education Groups. This includes linking humanitarian funding and coordination processes (around OCHA-led humanitarian appeals and strategic plans) whilst strengthening medium-term planning, facilitating the development of sound and credible transitional ESPs focussing on a bridge towards early recovery and system building, and providing a tool for resource mobilization. This convening and possible coordinating role should certainly not lead to additional coordination layers. It should rather support relationships across the existing country-level architecture (e.g., LEGs and the Global Education Clusters) and how that could be mirrored at the international level, where applicable.

Concrete Action: The Global Partnership's model to convene a wide range of partners to develop and agree upon a sound (transitional) education sector plan could be adapted to take into account the early stages of an emergency. This could result in increased coherence and bridging emergency and early recovery challenges. This role should be considered upon request from a Local Education Group and/or the Education Cluster.

Consequences for GPE Secretariat Resources: The proposed engagement would mean a more active role of the GPE Secretariat at country level (Country Support Team). A convening and coordinating role could also be accomplished through collaboration with GPE development partners.

5.3 Funding role for education in humanitarian and emergency situations

Education needs are grossly underfunded in many humanitarian or complex emergency situations. The Global Partnership could play a role in providing increased funding for education needs in humanitarian and complex emergency situations. This support would be complementary to existing funding mechanisms led by OCHA and coordinated through the Global Education Cluster, UNHCR and other GPE partners involved in UN-led humanitarian appeals.

Rationale: The Global Partnership's comparative advantage will focus on a perspective towards medium and long-term development of education systems and, related to humanitarian aid, focus on the transition from direct humanitarian funding to development aid. This will be based on an emergency or (transitional) education sector plans which should go beyond a one-year humanitarian response plan. The Global Partnership would play a more active role in securing additional financing for education in humanitarian and complex emergency situations. In addition to the possibility of reorienting existing funding to address emergency needs (an existing option in the GPE Operational Framework for Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States), could reflect on going beyond this Operational Framework and create options for additional resources to address emergency needs. Such additional funding will be complementary to existing funding mechanisms led by OCHA and other humanitarian development partners.

5.3.1 Using existing funds as a response to education needs in emergencies

The Global Partnership is already able to financially support education in emergencies in GPE member countries eligible for a Program Implementation Grant. There are two possibilities:

- ***Accelerated funding option***

  In a GPE member country eligible to apply for a Program Implementation Grant with an indicative allocation available, but where a GPE grant has not yet been approved by the Board of Directors, or where the country will need to reapply because of a completely new situation from relative stability to instability, the country may apply for up to 20 percent of the indicative allocation provided by the new Funding Model (20 percent of the Maximum Country Allocation), using the existing Guidelines for Accelerated Funding in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations. The remaining allocation may then be applied for using the normal application procedure.

- ***Reorienting funds from an approved Grant***

  If a context changes from (relative) stability to instability (for example during a humanitarian crisis) in a GPE member country with an approved GPE Program Implementation Grant, chapter four of the Operational Framework (see Section 3.2) may be considered. The Local Education Group (LEG) will have to agree whether a previously approved program can be implemented as planned, or whether restructuring or redesigning the approved program is necessary. If an Education Cluster is operational, it must be

involved in these discussions and GPE funds may eventually be redirected to an emergency response.

5.3.2 Additional funds for education needs in emergencies

In addition to using existing funds to address educational needs in emergencies, countries facing a crisis might need additional funding, ideally from humanitarian and recovery budgets. The Global Partnership can play a role in mobilizing such additional funding by creating additional funding windows, such as for example a GPE Revolving Fund for Humanitarian and Emergency Responses. Such a window would be funded on an ongoing basis (or could be based on funding committed by donors, potentially as a result of their Replenishment commitments or by targeted funding from donors for specific emergencies), with adequate levels of funding to be used in humanitarian and complex emergency situations. Eligible countries (see matrix below) would be able to access funding to support the implementation of transitional education programs, related to a UN-led humanitarian appeal, while reinforcing planning processes towards early recovery, rebuilding of the education system and/or focusing on resilience of (parts of the) existing system. The GPE accelerated funding mechanism option could be used for this process.

Concrete Action: The Global Partnership would need to determine the needs for additional funding and the type of funding instruments that could be used. This analysis would consider whether the GPE Fund could be used or whether an additional funding window, separate from the GPE fund, would be a better option. A type of (revolving) fund would receive targeted additional funds from donors earmarked for a particular humanitarian crisis. This type of funding modality would be dependent on donor funding streams and humanitarian priorities. Funding would be deployed to cover gaps in early recovery situations, and should be additional and not substitute existing funding for first phases of a humanitarian response. Such a window should be an instrument to leverage additional funding from partners which do not necessarily provide funding via UN-led humanitarian appeals.

The GPE Secretariat and the LEG would trigger the adapted GPE accelerated funding process, working with the Education Cluster and relevant humanitarian agencies. An adapted process of the accelerated funding mechanism would be created for this process. As mentioned above, the additional funding should be based on a (transitional) ESP, linking the direct humanitarian response to more structured planning for two to three years. As with the current accelerated funding mechanism, it should be able to assure funds at country level within two months. In this mechanism a Managing Entity or Supervising Entity would be selected to manage or supervise the additional resources.

The operational details for humanitarian funding will need to be elaborated and will have to be submitted to the Board of Directors at a later stage. Further details have to be worked out including options for how the funding might be generated, proportion of replenishment income, and general contributions to the GPE Fund or to a new window to support education in specific humanitarian emergency contexts.

Consequences for GPE Secretariat resources: This option would be a new funding stream and GPE tools and mechanisms would need to be developed to outline funding modalities, disbursements and links with existing, generic humanitarian funding streams. The amount suggested for the fund would be based on an analysis of existing funding gaps in humanitarian funding to education and an estimation of possible donor contributions.

5.4 Further engagement in L3 Emergency Situations

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. It is a unique forum involving the key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. The IASC has agreed that major sudden-onset humanitarian crises triggered by natural disasters or conflict which require system-wide mobilization (so-called "Level 3/L3" emergencies) are to be subject to a Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation (henceforth referred to as 'L3 activation'), to ensure a more effective response to the humanitarian needs of affected populations. This exceptional measure will only be applied in circumstances where the gravity of the situation justifies mobilization beyond normally expected levels, while recognising the complementarity of humanitarian systems. The designation of an L3 emergency is issued by the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), on the basis of an analysis of five criteria: scale, complexity, urgency, capacity, and reputational risk.

5.5 GPE engagement in L3 emergencies in GPE member countries eligible for Program Implementation Grants is being clarified in the above proposed matrix of GPE Engagement in humanitarian and complex emergencies situations. The GPE Board of Directors may consider additional engagement in GPE member countries not eligible for Program Implementation Grants and for non-GPE member countries in the event of an L3 Emergency in one of these countries. Designation of an L3 emergency could trigger a review by the Global Partnership of potential added value in these exceptional situations where national capacities are overwhelmed.

5.6 Such a review could include the following procedure:

- Upon L3 emergency activation, the Local Education Group and/or the Education Cluster may make a request for additional GPE support.

- The Global Partnership may in those cases play an active advocacy role. However, the GPE Board of Directors may decide in those cases that the Global Partnership can also play a coordinating and funding role, on an exceptional basis. Such a role may be considered if various donors would be willing to provide additional targeted funding for the specific L3 emergency through the Revolving Fund option.

5.7 In the event of GPE involvement in an L3 emergency, the Partnership will communicate its involvement to the United Nations Under-Secretary General and Emergency Relief Coordinator (USG/ERC) as Chair of the IASC Principals, in order to achieve alignment with the humanitarian system at the global level, and ensure that the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team is appraised of the Global Partnership's role in supporting education needs in the specific L3 emergency.

6. THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF THE GLOBAL PARTERNSHIP

Related to the possible roles for the Global Partnership's engagement in humanitarian and complex emergency situations, the following comparative advantages for the Partnership have been identified:

6.1 Bridging the gap between emergency interventions and development activities. The GPE approach to supporting fragile and conflict-affected states aims to build a bridge between emergency interventions and long-term development activities, and to mobilize additional funding for education during emergencies. The Global Partnership is the only entity that systematically promotes the development of ESPs in fragile contexts and therefore represents a significant effort to bridge the gap between emergency, recovery, and development. The convening role, a strong feature of the GPE process, requires humanitarian and development partners to work together throughout an application process to assure a solid process at country level. The Global Partnership is able to leverage support from an array of humanitarian and development education stakeholders, ensuring education priorities in humanitarian, early recovery and transition phases align with a partner country's transitional education priorities. By promoting collaboration between emergency specialists and development specialists, GPE support is intended to reinforce coordination between emergency interventions and long-term

development activities. The link and collaboration with the broader Local Education Group is crucial in this regard.

6.2 The convening role of the Partnership around solid processes at country level. The Global Partnership adopts a comprehensive framework and a progressive approach to provide adapted support to partner countries based on their specific context. The Global Partnership promotes coordination and harmonization among donors and reliance on (transitional) education sector plans which have to consider any humanitarian and emergency contexts.

6.3 Greater capacity to address emergencies in GPE partner developing countries. The Global Partnership has already been involved in major emergencies and crises, including the earthquake in Haiti in 2010 and the conflicts in Mali in 2012 and in the Central African Republic in 2013. The GPE approach, as outlined in the Operational Framework for Effective Support I Fragile and Conflict Affected States, has been established in consultation with key partners (INEE, the Global Education Cluster, among others). Current GPE interventions in emergency and early recovery situations are based on the needs assessments of the Education Cluster, as described above, and have been agreed upon by Local Education Groups.

6.4 Increased funding. By linking its funding support to complement existing humanitarian funding sources available to the education sector, the Global Partnership aims to play a catalytic role in mobilizing additional financing specifically for education needs in humanitarian emergencies.

6.5 Flexibility to adapt quickly. The Global Partnership is flexible and able to adapt to such environments. To deal with the diversity and complexity of fragile and emergency situations, the context is always the determining factor and starting point. A tailored approach is therefore needed, which requires substantial flexibility. The Global Partnership is no exception, but has an advantage: its capacity to build on the expertise and experience of its partners. The Global Partnership is able to consider several options with its partners at the local level.

7. NEXT STEPS

7.1 The deliberations and guidance of the Board of Directors arising from the June 27–28, 2014 Board meeting will be used by the Secretariat to finalize the policy framework for consideration by the Board in the second half of 2014 after which the operational framework will be developed.

7.2 The Secretariat will continue to work closely with the GPE Community of Interest on Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries and with the relevant Board Committees.

ANNEX 1:

Improved policy and practice for GPE support of conflict-affected and fragile states

In recent years, the Global Partnership for Education has made good progress on improving its readiness to support fragile and conflict-affected states. In May 2013, the GPE Board approved an Operational Framework for Effective Support to Fragile and Conflict-Affected States. This Operational Framework adapts GPE processes to better respond to fragile and conflict-affected situations. The objective of the Operational Framework is to provide clear guidance to the Global Partnership and ensure efficient support in these situations. Chapter 4 of the Framework also recognizes there must be flexibility to revise programs to changing circumstances (from relative stability to instability) and opportunities to redirect (existing) funds to address emergency needs.

The ongoing work and planned expansion of agencies eligible to serve as Supervising or Managing Entities in a wider range of contexts is also relevant.

Further, the GPE Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations (BOD/2012/11-12), aim at providing better support to GPE member countries in crisis where no grant has yet been approved.

The Global Partnership has adopted a flexible, "progressive" approach toward education plans in fragile contexts. Countries can develop transitional Education Sector Plans (TESPs) when applicable and appropriate. This will enable them to develop full ESPs while implementing the transitional plans.

In collaboration with the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), the Partnership has developed guiding principles to assure ESPs will be more 'conflict and crisis sensitive.'