REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS JUNE 27-28, 2014 BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

INTRODUCTION

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

This report presents a summary of the issues discussed and the decisions made.

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2014

The Board Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00am.

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT

1.1 The Chair welcomed the Board meeting participants and thanked the Secretariat CEO and the rest of its staff for organizing a successful and inspiring Replenishment Pledging Conference. She also thanked the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee for their deliberations the previous evening with respect to the outcomes of the conference in order to provide the Board with an assessment and related recommendations. She noted the importance of an accountability process for the pledges made the previous day, and the need to continue to fundraise over the next four years in an effort to reach the set goal of US$3.5 billion for the 2015-2018 replenishment period.

1.2 The Chair paid tribute to the outstanding leadership of both Carol Bellamy as the first Chair of the Global Partnership's Board of Directors and Geeta Rao Gupta as the interim Chair.

1.3 Changes in Board composition since the last Board meeting announced included a new Alternate Board member for the Donor 3 constituency, Julie Shouldice, Director, Social Development Bureau, Global Issues and Development Branch at the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development. Ms. Gillard thanked the outgoing Alternate Board member for the constituency, Christina Buchan, for her service to the Global Partnership.

Meeting Objectives and Outcomes

1.4 The Chair noted the need for a discussion on the Global Partnership's priorities for the rest of this year. The Board meeting agenda included reports from the three board technical committees on their activities over the past few months. The reports included important recommendations related to grants and innovative financing, and requested guidance on the Global Partnership's role in humanitarian and complex emergency contexts and on the development of the Board's risk management framework. The meeting would also address the outcome of the replenishment, its implications for future programming, and related recommendations with respect to how future allocations should be handled.

1.5 Overview of Agenda and Approval of Meeting Report

1.6 The Chair reviewed the agenda for the meeting and requested comments. None were received.

1.7 The Chair requested approval of the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held in Washington, DC on February 26, 2014 (BOD/2014/06 DOC 05). The Report had been circulated to the Board in March and received no comments at that time. No comments were raised during the meeting.

Decision:

1.8 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/06-02 - <u>February 26, 2014 Board Meeting Report:</u> The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Washington D.C. on February 26, 2014 (BOD/2014/06 DOC 05).

2. REPORT FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2.1 Alice Albright, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), thanked Secretariat staff, the Board, the Board Chair, and her advisor Bruce Wolpe for their hard work since the February Board meeting that had led to the new funding model and the success of the Replenishment event. The event elevated attention for education, including a sense of shared responsibility, secured additional financing, and built momentum for a continuing fundraising effort into 2015. Apart from working to continue to build and diversity GPE's resource base, the CEO emphasized the importance of building a strong results track record, deploying the new funding model successfully, and delivering on the promises made during the replenishment.

2.2 The organization will be striving to achieve results in a global context still full of challenges. The CEO reviewed the state of play in global education, noting the continuing funding crisis in education, the number of children who are not learning the basics, the slowing progress on the number of out-of-school children, educational challenges facing poor rural girls in particular, and the intensifying violence against schools.

2.3 In order to address the challenges in global education, the CEO proposed the following immediate priorities for the Global Partnership: a sustained focus on data and results in education; the development of the next strategic plan; developing and supplementing resources with a focus on innovative financing; additional governance reform including finalizing the risk framework, and; ensuring a strong and effective Secretariat in terms of subject matter expertise, developing partnerships, and advocacy. The Secretariat will leverage the breadth of its partnership, and increased engagement of developing country partners, and strong voice of civil society to ensure a relentless focus on learning outcomes.

Misuse of funds

2.4 Ms. Albright provided an update on misuse of GPE funds since the February Board meeting. An audit had revealed irregularities in 2012 community teacher payments in Madagascar. The country received US$64 million from the Fast-Track Initiative from 2010-2013. She noted she had first informed the Board of the investigation in Madagascar in February of 2014. The investigation is ongoing. Ms. Albright also recalled the Board had been notified in May 2013 of an audit on a US$60 million grant to the government of Zambia under the Fast-Track Initiative. The audit had confirmed US$8,000 in ineligible expenditures. The funds have since been recovered.

Discussion

2.5 Board members stated that it is critical for the CEO to inform the Board immediately of any misuse of funds, whether alleged or confirmed. In response to the question of what constitutes "ineligible expenditure", Mr. Padraig Power, Senior Financial Officer, noted that ineligible expenditure is any expenditure that is not in line with the purpose for which the grant was approved or the terms and conditions of the grant agreement with the Supervising Entity. This may include actual misuse of funds through fraud or the ineligible expenditure may be due to poor administration where, for example, documentation for eligible expenditures incurred is not appropriately maintained. He noted that lessons learned have been shared where appropriate.

2.6 Board members emphasized that with the conclusion of the Replenishment Pledging Conference, the Global Partnership must now deliver on promises made and must now "switch gear box." It must develop tools related to the new funding model to ensure its simplicity and workability and to enable it to measure and demonstrate results. The Global Partnership must increase its oversight over expenditures with an increased focus on implementation, finance intelligently at global and country level, manage risk factors; and clarify and revise roles and responsibilities of country-level actors and the Secretariat's relationship with these actors. Important factors in increasing oversight include having strong field experience, especially in fragile states, within the Secretariat management, and a review of the Global Partnership's governance structure in terms of communications to the Board and decision-making processes. Governance reform should also continue with respect to the committees to ensure the structure is right, that the committees are performing well and include the right skills, experience and competencies. Some Board members commented that the board committee should work with the Secretariat on the more detailed work which would then enable the Board to focus on more strategic discussions and decision-making.

2.7 Board members noted the dramatic increase in domestic education budgets pledged by developing country partners as compared to donors. One board member commented that it is important for the Global Partnership to rethink how it can use its funds more strategically so that governments use their funds more effectively. It was suggested that GPE funds should not be used to fund recurring costs but should be used to leverage domestic financing. Board members also noted that developing country partner governments are accountable to their citizens for fulfilling their pledges and that the Global Partnership should strengthen the role of the local education group (LEG) in supporting country processes and ministers of education in ensuring commitments are met. Civil society may also help with monitoring outcomes in this regard, as well as in data collection. In addition, it was noted that there are other ways to raise domestic resources for education besides increasing the budget for education.

2.8 Ms. Albright noted that the Secretariat would be taking a more strategic approach to fundraise the remaining US$ 1.4 billion, but to also lay the groundwork for the next Replenishment cycle. Full participation of G7 and G20 as donors is lacking, and the Secretariat will continue to cultivate new donors and alternative sources of funding. She also commented that the Secretariat will be further building upon the momentum of private sector donors to bring more into the Fund.

2.9 Ms. Albright acknowledged that work to operationalize the funding model will continue toward January 1st and the role of the committees needs to further evolve. Secretariat staff have been conducting a series of sector monitoring workshops that have led to a sharing of lessons learned in various areas.

3. DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS PROPOSAL

3.1 The Chair of the Board directed the Board's attention to the Developing Country Partners Proposal (DOC /2014/06 DOC 07). She reiterated the importance of strengthening communication and coordination among the six GPE Developing Country Partner (DCP) constituencies. She stated that in order to build a stronger partnership, the Board needs to ensure that the developing country partners have a stronger voice and can build relationships among the different DCP constituencies. DCPs are at the heart of all GPE activities, and the Board needs to find ways to better listen and interact with the various constituencies. Following the Chair's remarks, Minister Thiam, Minister of Education from Senegal and Board Member for Africa 2, presented the proposal on behalf of all the DCP constituencies.

3.2 Minister Thiam explained that the DCP proposal requests the Secretariat to organize face-to-face constituency meetings for all DCP regions before the next two Board meetings. He reminded the Board about its decision to change to a constituency-based representation model in May 2010 and noted that this change resulted in an increase in the number of developing country partner constituencies represented on the Board, as well as the seats assigned to them. As of March 2014, there are fifty nine DCPs from all over the world divided into six constituency groups: three for Africa (Africa 1, 2, and 3), one for Asia and Pacific, one for Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia and one for Latin America and the Caribbean. The main objectives of this proposal are to strengthen the communication and coordination capacities of DCP constituencies as well as create opportunities for South-South knowledge sharing and learning to enable them to fully assume their roles and responsibilities and better contribute to the effectiveness of the Global Partnership.

3.3 He noted that over the past years, the voices of the six DCP constituencies have not been sufficiently heard at Board meetings or in GPE's decision-making processes. The lack of DCP engagement affects effectiveness of overall governance structures and organs of the partnership by shutting down the opportunity for DCPs to contribute to Board deliberations. In order to foster mutual understanding, respect, and trust among the constituencies, Minister Thiam called Board members to approve the financing of DCP pre-Board constituency meetings. These meetings would not only allow consultation on Board decisions but would also provide the opportunity for exchanges on best practices and experiences. The meetings would also facilitate the development of communication and action plans for all DCP constituencies. Minister Thiam emphasized the need to set out activities that will strengthen and build capacities among members, including how to better use constituency networks and structures to improve partnership at regional levels and promote information sharing and South-South cooperation to positively transform a country's education sector through the incorporation of best practices.

Discussion:

3.4 Following Minister Thiam's presentation, the Chair opened the discussion. While the Board was generally in favor of approving a dedicated budget to organize constituency meetings to strengthen the engagement of the DCPs, some Board members expressed concern about the mechanisms and resources needed. Other Board members suggested that some bilateral donors might also be willing to cover some of the costs, such as the German BACKUP Initiative – Education in Africa (BACKUP Education) which has, in collaboration with the GPE Secretariat, supported experience sharing and pre-Board preparation for the Africa constituencies in the past.

3.5 Several Board members stressed the importance of making every effort to lower the costs. Some Board members requested the Secretariat in coordination with the DCPs to look at a broader range of mechanisms and to evaluate different options. Minister Thiam noted that the host country would be encouraged to pay for the meeting venue and to support some of the costs. He also stressed that consultants may only be hired when GPE staffs are not available. In response to questions raised regarding the budget, the CEO explained that the budget proposed was a provisional estimate based on the expenses paid by BACKUP Education for similar activities. She further noted that in the implementation phase of the project, the most cost effective options will be examined.

3.6 Some multilateral agencies suggested taking advantage of international conferences to organize ministerial side events on GPE issues. Minister Thiam responded that indeed the Africa 2 ministers have already been setting up meetings in the sidelines of recent international conferences and will continue to do so. However, the proposed constituency meetings are intended for the technical experts that are most familiar with GPE processes on the ground and could exchange ideas with their counterparts in other ministries before briefing the ministers on their deliberations.

3.7 Some Board members suggested piloting the process for one year before agreeing to include these meetings in the Secretariat's future annual budgets and requested the Secretariat to present a report to the Board upon completion of the pre-Board constituency meetings in order to review the success of this mechanism in comparison to other options.

3.8 The Latin America and Caribbean constituency noted the difficulties their constituency has encountered by operating in three different languages, and welcomed the initiative as an opportunity to strengthen their engagement in the partnership. The Board members recognized the value of face-to-face meetings for enabling strong engagement among the DCP partners, including using this opportunities to discuss issues that Board doesn't have time to address, and agreed on the need to specify goals for these meetings, particularly focused on strengthening capacity building.

3.9 The Chair noted general support for the proposal and the need for further reflection on how to best strengthen DCP communication and coordination. The CEO also strongly supported this proposal. The Chair then thanked Minister Thiam and the Board members for the quality of the discussion.

3.10 Based on comments received by the members, the Board considered and approved the following amended decision language:

BOD/2014/06-03 – <u>Financial Support to Strengthen Communication and Coordination among GPE's DCP Constituencies</u>: The Board of Directors:

a. requests the GPE Secretariat to organize two face-to-face pre-Board constituency meetings for the six DCP constituencies, in advance of the next two face-to-face Board meetings, to allow each DCP constituency to: (i) prepare and consult on the Board decisions to establish a consensus-based constituency position; (ii) develop and finalize costed communication and action plans for each individual constituency; and (iii) share experiences with regard to implementation of the new funding model in order to inform the Board of progress being made.

b. agrees to allocate no more than US$ 700,000 to the GPE Secretariat from the GPE Fund to include all event planning, meeting logistics and travel arrangements for meeting participants, in order to organize said meetings, while making every effort to lower costs; and

c. requests the Secretariat to submit an evaluation and progress report and options for minimizing future costs to the Board following completion of the pre-Board constituency meetings in order to review the success of this mechanism in comparison to other options.

4. REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, RISK AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

4.1 The Chair invited Minister Thiam, the Chair of Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee (GERF), to introduce the Report of the GERF. The GERF Chair provided a brief overview of the GERF terms of reference, work completed to date and agenda of the next GERF face to face meeting. He briefly presented the GERF on going priorities for 2014, which include the following topics: the determination of available resources (including the prioritization if needed and the annual review of the current and forecasted financial position), the framework on roles and responsibilities at global and country level, the Risk Management Framework, the Hosting Memorandum of Understanding and the policy on misuse of funds. Minister Thiam then introduced the GERF recommendations on Innovative Financing.

Innovative Financing

4.2 Minister Thiam summarized the deliberations of the GERF held in Dakar in May, as presented in BOD/2014/06 DOC 08. He reminded the Board that a provision of US$ 125 million for future programming and unanticipated events with a notional amount of $100 million that may be used for innovative financing was approved by the Board during the June 2nd Board audio call.

4.3 With regard to the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) loan buy down pilot, Minister Thiam noted that the report developed by the consulting firm "Lion's Head Global Partners (LHGP)" is a basic document which is a useful first step. The paper set out a road map for the execution of the Loan Buy Down pilot with IDB. He also stressed that the IDB pilot program will take 18 months to 2 years to produce outcomes and will be limited to GPE eligible countries that have ongoing or will have IDB non-concessional loans.

4.4 Minister Thiam also stressed that the Lions Head paper identified a range of additional potential innovative financing options about which it would be interesting to have further details and analysis especially regarding the most promising options for the Global Partnership. In this regard, the GERF identified the need for more clarity on requirements to access funds and on how to proceed with these particular initiatives.

4.5 Based on this analysis, the GERF recommended that the Secretariat further develop the IDB loan buy down pilot program, to consider further the range of leverage funding mechanisms identified in the LHGP report, to open these initiatives to the largest number of interested countries, to engage in a demand-driven approach and to set out parameters for innovative financing options deemed viable for countries and partners.

Discussion:

4.6 The Chair of the Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC) noted that beyond the financial issues, innovative financing strategies and mechanisms should jointly be reviewed by the SPC and the GERF. The CEO and the Chair of the GERF agreed on this proposal. The CEO also suggested that this issue should also involve the CGPC, taking into account the country grants perspective of such programs.

4.7 Board members agreed that further work should be done on the IDB pilot in order to start implementing it. The CEO noted that with the $400 million pledge by the IDB for innovative financing with the Global Partnership, there is an opportunity to strengthen dialogue with the Middle East. Some Board members asked for clarification on the eligibility criteria

recommended by the GERF. The Senior Financial Officer explained that there are 31 countries eligible for the pilot. As 27 of these countries are expected to have access to a Maximum Country Allocation (MCA), they must use some or all of this allocation to participate. The remaining 4 countries, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Djibouti, West Bank & Gaza do not have access to a MCA and therefore would need to apply separately to access funds from any provision for innovative financing.

4.8 Some Board members expressed their disappointment that more progress on innovative financing had not been made since the November 2013 Board meeting in Addis. With regard to the broader search for innovative financing options, Board members agreed that much more work needs to be done, especially on the operational framework, concepts, parameters, capacity building at country level and timeframe for implementation. There is also a need to further develop incentives and graduation instruments to access additional funding. Minister Thiam responded that the Board should only focus on strategic questions and should defer to the Secretariat all technical questions related to the framework and definition of the range of possibilities. The Senior Financial Officer explained that the GERF's recommendation was that all GPE countries would be eligible. Countries eligible for a Maximum Country Allocation may use some or all of it for innovative financing. Other GPE countries may apply for funding from the US$100 million provision. There were differing views expressed on eligibility. Some Board members did not think that countries receiving a program implementation grant should necessarily be compelled to use part of their grant for innovative financing but should also have access to the $100 million provision. Many Board members felt that more work was needed to determine eligibility for a broader innovative financing program and that issues like graduation, fragility, etc. should all be considered.

4.9 A majority of Board members agreed that countries already have a range of relationships with financial agencies and that the aim is not to "reinvent the wheel". The role of the Secretariat should be mainly to setting up the parameters on which countries could develop their programs. Minister Thiam strongly agreed, noting that countries should use these GPE funds to leverage additional funding. This program should be driven by country demand.

4.10 Minister Thiam concluded that this proposed Board decision is mainly an extension of the current mandate to follow up on this issue, to open the analysis to other mechanisms and to open the eligibility to additional countries. Some Board members suggested to split the decision language between the IDB loan by down on one hand, and the broader initiative.

4.11 At the end of the discussion, some Board members expressed doubts that there is still not a strategic vision at Board level and that this issue has not evolved since the last Board decision in November 2013. Responding to these remarks, the CEO emphasized that innovative financing takes time to implement and the Board may expect an update at the next Board meeting but not the implementation of an entire program. The CEO offered to organize a side briefing session on innovative financing mechanisms during the December Board meeting. She noted that in the meantime the Secretariat will reflect further on the relevant approaches for the Global Partnership. The CEO informed the Board that the Secretariat needs to hire a Senior Innovative Finance Officer with specific skills and experience in order to move this initiative forward.

Decision:

4.12 The following amended decision was approved:

BOD/2014/06-04 — Innovative Financing to Leverage Other External Funding:

In recognition that the pilot with the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) will take 18 months to 2 years to produce outcomes, and further noting the wide range of potential instruments and partners that can help leverage additional funding for educational outcomes using GPE grants, the Board of Directors approves the following:

a. the IDB pilot will be open to all GPE eligible countries that are also IDB eligible countries. The Secretariat and the GERF, in close coordination with the Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC), will develop an operational framework for the IDB pilot which at a minimum should outline:
   i. the application process;
   ii. how much external financing GPE funds should leverage;
   iii. the link to the new funding model requirements and incentives; and
   iv. the maximum amount of GPE funds that would be available for each eligible country.

b. the Secretariat and the GERF, in close coordination with the SPC, will present an analysis with options to the Board of other innovative finance mechanisms of interest to partner countries.

5. Executive Session

5.1 The Chair announced that the Board was now going to have an Executive Session and asked that only Board members, Alternate Board members, the CEO and the Chief Operating Officer, Lisa Gomer, remain. She asked all observers and members of the Secretariat to leave the room. During the session the CEO gave the Board an update on the status of the recruitment effort of the Chief Technical Officer. The recruitment could have posed a conflict of interest for the partnership. The CEO explained the conflict and how it was resolved.

6. REPORT OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

6.1 The Chair invited Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly, Chair of the Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC), to introduce the Report of the SPC. The SPC Chair provided a brief overview of the SPC terms of reference, work completed to date and priorities for the remainder of the year as reflected in the Committee's work plan. He encouraged a discussion about how the Board at large can engage in the work of the committees.

Discussion:

6.2 Responding to the priorities for the SPC, one Board member cautioned about setting issue-based priorities for the committees on grounds that it may commit the Global Partnership to certain issues prior to the finalization of the new strategic plan. Another Board member urged caution against over engineering the next strategic plan as the main role of the Global Partnership is to implement the global education goals. The Board member noted it is important, however, to get building blocks in place for the strategic plan on broader work such as advocacy.

GPE Role in Humanitarian and Complex Emergency Contexts

6.3 The Chair of the SPC introduced the work done on developing a proposal on GPE's role in humanitarian and complex emergency contexts in consultation with the community of practice on fragile states. He invited the Board to provide guidance to the committee after hearing the presentation. The Chair of the SPC especially thanked Joris van Bommel, Country Lead, for the quality of his work in developing the paper for the Board's input.

6.4 Joris van Bommel, Senior Education Officer, presented the BOD/2014/06 DOC 09. He noted the importance of further clarifying the role of the Global Partnership in humanitarian and complex emergencies taking into consideration its capacity, the mandate of other partners and the demand from countries. He noted that during the replenishment conference the role and the added value of the Global Partnership were addressed in various sessions, including the one organized by "Education Cannot Wait."

6.5 He summarized the collaborative work undertaken through the community of interest and presented a matrix summarizing options for GPE's possible engagement. He stressed the distinction between countries that are members of the Global Partnership and others, further noting current eligibility requirements for program implementation grants and other means of engagement.

6.6 The Senior Education Officer concluded the presentation by explaining what is or could be the Global Partnership's added value. He specifically emphasized the experience of the Global Partnership (in South Sudan, Somalia, Central African Republic), on its flexibility and capacity to adapt quickly by knowing processes at country level, on its capacity to bridge the gap, on its experience to work in a fast way, and on the ability to translate experience from global to country level.

Discussion:

6.7 Some Board members focused on the importance of having a continuum between humanitarian aid and development. The Global Partnership could contribute to address the continuum by fostering contacts with all ministries involved. As an example, some Board members shared the experience related to the crisis in Lebanon, focusing on the decision of the government to stop its own education work to create a specific emergency framework. Several Board members agreed that the Global Partnership should do a lessons learned from the Lebanon crisis.

6.8 A majority of Board members valued the advocacy role of the Global Partnership, noting that the Global Partnership has already demonstrated its strong capacities in this area. It was stressed that the Global Partnership should be further involved by using its global voice to make education a priority in the Consolidated Appeal Process. More specifically, the Global Partnership's added value could be focusing on better assessment of education needs. The Global Partnership could build a strategy for a needs analysis and identify activities where GPE is effective and ready to intervene. For example this analysis may include the cost of having children back to school.

6.9 Regarding the coordination role, some Board members noted that local actors should be promoted to coordinate clusters and the Global Partnership could take advantage of its partners who have strong experience in coordination (such as UNICEF and Save the Children). Echoing these comments, other Board members noted that "coordination" may not be the appropriate terminology and that in time of crisis "responsiveness" is the key. They valued the comparative advantage of the Global Partnership to link expertise over the various phases (emergency, reconstruction and development) and supported flexible approaches depending on contexts and capacities. Some Board members recognized that the Global Partnership could contribute to better coordination among cluster and local education groups. Responding to this last remark, the Senior Education Officer informed the Board that the Global Partnership works with clusters at both global and country level.

6.10 Some donors valued existing funding mechanisms, such as the Central Emergency Relief Fund which has been specifically created to fill the gaps. A Board member noted that results from the accelerated funding option should first be analyzed before considering further new ones. Some Board members agreed that further analysis is needed. The CEO agreed that this issue should be further discussed, focusing on a better understanding of what types of financing mechanisms the Global Partnership needs to support humanitarian and complex emergencies.

6.11 Board members strongly supported the approach of the matrix of the Global Partnership's possible engagement. Nevertheless, some Board members expressed concern about the Global Partnership's capacities and the need to focus on its core business. That is why they considered that at least for an initial period, the Global Partnership should only focus on member countries with regard to advocacy, coordination and a financing role. In non-GPE countries, the Global Partnership's engagement should be limited to advocacy. Other Board members invited the Secretariat to address the potential impact of a crisis occurring in a GPE eligible country on neighboring countries.

6.12 A member of the private sector constituency strongly stated the interest of its organization in the engagement with the Partnership at country level, noting opportunities to further identify innovative mechanism for additional resources.

6.13 The CEO noted that there is consensus on a further engagement of the Global Partnership in humanitarian and emergency contexts, but that more work is needed to determine the best options and the best way to finance any GPE engagement.

Post-2015 Development Agenda

6.14 The SPC Chair invited Sarah Beardmore, Advocacy Officer at the Secretariat, to provide an update on the process underway to develop new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and post-2015 goals for education.

6.15 Education is highly likely to be adopted as a thematic focus in the SDGs. The Advocacy Officer acknowledged the roles of UNESCO and UNICEF as co-leaders of the education component. In addition, UNESCO has facilitated, with UNICEF, widespread consultation ending in the development of seven targets for the new Education for All (EFA) Agenda.

6.16 On behalf of the Secretariat, the Advocacy Officer proposed three key priorities for the Global Partnership that are in line with its original mandate: 1) advocate for a comprehensive equitable education goal in the post-2015 agenda; 2) focus on achieving a robust post-2015 education agenda that is relevant for and supports the poorest countries; 3) provide finance and support planning for the implementation of the post-2015 agenda in GPE partner developing

6.17 She assured the Board that the Global Partnership is ready to support the initial stages of the national implementation of the post-2015 education agenda in GPE partner developing countries by providing financial resources and a results-based approach; enabling improved accountability to citizens for progress in education; assisting with country-level education sector planning and implementation; and supporting the coordination of inclusive partnerships operating at country level. Support for civil society participation is a part of the value the Global Partnership can add.

Discussion:

6.18 Board members commented that advocacy is critical for keeping momentum on education and expressed appreciation for the Global Partnership's strengthening of in-country processes in line with existing processes within the FTI framework. Board members concurred that the Global Partnership and its next strategic plan should align itself to the new global education goals and the post-2015 agenda generally as the role of the Global Partnership is to facilitate implementation of those goals. The UNESCO constituency expressed appreciation for the involvement of the Global Partnership in the UNESCO/UNICEF process on developing the education goals. The constituency noted the Global Partnership's value add in the process lies in assisting with unpacking global goals into country ownership and context. The constituency in turn can assist the Global Partnership by making available its expertise in data collection at country level.

6.19 The Chair thanked the presenters and the Board for their contributions and announced more time would be dedicated to this topic in future Board meeting agendas.

Civil Society Strategy Update

6.20 The Chair invited the SPC Chair to make some introductory remarks after which the Advocacy Officer continued to provide an update on the GPE Civil Society Engagement. The Advocacy Officer noted that the Global Partnership continues to strengthen staff support for civil society at the national and global level, collaborating with the Global Campaign for Education in engaging national civil society, providing assistance to civil society GPE Board members, and continuing funding for the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) program.

6.21 With regard to the latter, she recalled the Board's request during the November 2013 Board meeting for the development of a civil society support proposal for 2015-2018 in consultation with CSO Board members. The newly created SPC had subsequently been tasked to guide the work. It was decided to delay the proposal from June to December 2014 to allow for a more thorough and meaningful review of GPE supported processes and the nature of civil society engagement at the global and national processes.

6.22 The proposal will look at how GPE funding can be invested to address the gaps in the Global Partnership's engagement with civil society. This comes at a particularly important time, as the CSEF fund will be depleted early 2015 and the post-2015 agenda creates an urgency around ensuring that effective national and global mechanisms are in place to help the Global Partnership track and achieve the post 2015 education goals which are articulated in our partners' national education strategies. The Advocacy Officer invited GPE Board members from the civil society constituencies and their stakeholders to become involved in the process.

Discussion:

6.23 Board members favored continued support for civil society. Feedback included that given the success of the replenishment event with regard to domestic financing, there is a role for civil society to play in supporting governments by monitoring and tracking domestic financial commitments and ensuring allocated funds flow down to the intended level. Civil society could also assist at country level with monitoring systems towards better results and generally in making proposals towards greater effectiveness at country level.

6.24 Several Board members advocated for an annual report card on how the Global Partnership is doing in terms for meeting government commitments to increasing the domestic budget for education at both the donor and developing country partner levels.

6.25 Board members acknowledged the interest expressed during the replenishment event by the youth constituency in playing a greater role in the Global Partnership. The comment was made that the Board should think about how this constituency can best advance issues to the GPE Board and how youth should be included in the GPE decision-making process.

Review of the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan Implementation Plan

6.26 The Chair invited the SPC Chair to provide an update on the Implementation Plan of the current strategic plan. The SPC Chair explained that the Implementation Plan of the current strategic plan is being reviewed to reflect on its purpose and added value and to learn lessons for the next strategic planning process, to identify operational constraints, and to pin point which aspects of the Plan need modifying to make it more fit for purpose for the remaining operating period. The review considers questions related to strengthening partner collaboration, the value of the Global Partnership as a whole, and the force of collective capabilities and advancing efforts to achieve strategic objectives.

6.27 Next steps in the process include a Board and core partner questionnaire on the implementation plan, meetings with Secretariat cluster leads, partner leads and SPC members on strategic objectives, drafting modifications including clarifying roles and better delineation of responsibilities, and finally a Board audio call in September to consider progress on the Plan and proposed revisions.

Discussion:

6.28 A Board member commented that it is important to highlight the issues that have prevented the Global Partnership from acting on the Implementation Plan. Further, the Implementation Plan would benefit from both having an assigned Secretariat focal point for each aspect of the work and the same staff dedication for each component in terms of time spent and efforts made. It was also noted that the process could be made more inclusive.

6.29 The SPC Chair noted that challenges with implementation are related to the Global Partnership consisting of many voices, which at the same time is its strength in that the collective endeavor results in shared responsibility. However, clarification is needed in terms of who leads which efforts in order to harness the strength of the partnership. The SPC Chair further acknowledged that processes for joining the various implementation plan clusters should be clarified and made more transparent to enable individuals to participate in the process.

GRA Program Progress Report and the Work of the Board Reference Group on Results Agreements

6.30 The Board Chair asked the SPC Chair to give an update on the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program and the work of the Board reference group on results agreements. The SPC Chair reported that by July of 2013, two batches of concept notes were approved by the Board, for a total of US$33 million funding 16 different programs.

6.31 Next steps for the Secretariat include supporting implementation and focusing on knowledge dissemination and exchange, supporting the monitoring of implementation and reviewing agency reports, and reporting on the GRA grants incorporated in the 2014 Portfolio Review and subsequent portfolio review.

Discussion:

6.32 A member of the Board reference group noted disappointment in the management of the process and suggested lessons learned should be considered in the future. Another Board member suggested that the regional aspect of the program could be improved; while there is little allocation for small countries in program implementation grants, there are other areas where a regional approach makes sense. Other comments included that with any future innovation fund, while there is no need to reframe the fund itself, the process does need to be revisited and the regional focus should be given more attention. The Board Chair thanked the Chair of the SPC for his leadership, along with the other members of the SPC for all their work over the past few months.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 The CEO offered her apologies for an earlier board paper which mistakenly identified Ethiopia as a fragile country. She confirmed that the document would be corrected.

7.2 The Chair concluded the meeting by paying tribute to Multilateral Organizations and Regional Banks Board Member, Elizabeth King, who would retire from the World Bank in just a few days and thus vacate her seat as Board member. Several other Board members expressed their appreciation and gratitude for Ms. King's many contributions to the Board during her tenure as well as her profound impact on individual Board members' Board experiences.

7.3 Ms. King noted it had been a pleasure serving on the Board. She referenced the ongoing negotiations with the Secretariat on a memorandum of understanding between the Secretariat and the World Bank and acknowledged both the benefits as well as the constraints of the current hosting arrangement. With the restructuring of the World Bank, the Global Partnership would soon have the advantage of being mapped to a division other than Global Practices that is not operational in education, and thus an inherent conflict of interest for the World Bank will have been eliminated.

7.4 The Board Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:20pm.

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 2014

The Board Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

8. REPORT OF THE COUNTRY GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

8.1 The Board Chair summarized the recommendations from the Country Grants and Performance Committee (CGPC) on the agenda and invited Mr. Ronald Siebes, Chair of the CGPC, to introduce the report of the Committee. The CGPC Chair provided a brief overview of the CGPC terms of reference, work completed to date and remaining priorities for the year.

Allocations for Program Implementation Grants

8.2 The Chair asked if there were any conflicts of interest with regard to the discussion on allocations for program implementation grants. The following Board members declared a conflict of interest: World Bank with respect to the five program implementation grants for consideration as the supervising entity for all five grants; UNICEF with respect to the

proposed revision to the Afghanistan program implementation grant for consideration as the supervising entity for the grant.

8.3 The CGPC Chair introduced the five grant proposals discussed by the CGPC during its April 29-May 1, 2014 face-to-face meeting in Washington, D.C. The Committee had determined to recommend all five grants for funding to the Board of Directors. The CGPC Chair highlighted the diversity of the grants in terms of objectives and approach as noted in final readiness reviews (FRR) included in the Board meeting materials.

8.4 With respect to the Haiti grant proposal, he pointed out the complex environment due to a largely non-public education sector in Haiti. The CGPC Chair noted that the committee had struggled with the definition of what is non-public. While the large majority of schools in Haiti are non-public, they are not private in the traditional sense but are operated by religious institutions and communities and are all regulated under the government framework. There is a need, however, to pay closer attention to how the regulatory system is applied to non-public providers.

8.5 The CGPC Chair explained that the provincial grant proposals from Pakistan are diverse in focus but both marked by a difficult setting in terms of security issues. Realizing the many security challenges, UNICEF had offered to share the findings of an in-depth conflict analysis it has conducted in Pakistan. Both provincial governments are committing to 1.9 percent increase for education in the provincial budget.

8.6 The CGPC Chair recalled that the Uzbekistan proposal was first submitted in the fall of 2013 but had not been recommended for funding at that time due to reports of state-sponsored forced child labor during the cotton harvest. There had also been concern about the lack of consultation within and restricted membership of the LEG in Uzbekistan. The Uzbek government was requested to address the issues and resubmit the proposal. The CGPC during its April 29-May 1 meeting found the issues had been sufficiently addressed but remained concerned. In addition, the CGPC chair reported that the government of Uzbekistan had recently ratified a decree on additional measures on implementation of conventions of the International Labor Organization (ILO), further affirming the government's intent to address the issues raised. Secretariat staff distributed copies of the decree during the meeting.

8.7 Ms. Gillard thanked the CGPC Chair and invited comments or questions from Board members.

Discussion:

8.8 Board members generally supported the proposals and congratulated the CGPC on its work. One Board member noted that the focus of the CGPC is critical as it wrestles with questions of implementation and the quality of education plans in the new funding model. Several Board members expressed recognition that the CGPC recommendations were based on in-depth review and discussion of the proposals with Committee membership including a balanced mix of Board constituency representatives, and the Board should be cautious to repeat the work done by the CGPC as it would undermine the role of the committees.

8.9 With respect to the grant proposal from Haiti, the Board member from the CSO 3 Teaching Profession constituency in particular expressed significant concern about an apparent imbalance between the proposal and GPE objectives in that most of the grant would fund non-public schools. The Country Support Team Lead, Paul Coustere, also explained that the Secretariat had reviewed the "disequilibrium" between public and non-public schools, as well as what other donors were supporting in the public sector in Haiti. There was also a GPE mission last week to Haiti to further analyze the situation. The Board member also pointed to the CGPC paper which noted the Global Partnership should address issues related to

considering grant proposals from countries where there are allegations of human rights issues which may carry a reputational risk for the Global Partnership and requested the Haiti grant proposal be considered such a reputational risk. The Board member further expressed concern about the lack of criteria used in identifying school grant recipients as selection of schools appeared random, which would not guarantee access to education for the poorest children. The Board member also noted the proposed grant was a continuation of a previous GPE funded program, in which the allocation per student in non-public schools was 50 percent higher than some students received in public schools.

8.10 Other comments included that the Haiti proposal is project-based and deviates from the standard program-based approach. In addition, the parallel non-public education system is not aligned to the national system: more aligned sector programming is needed. Secretariat staff agreed that alignment is insufficient but commented that there are no other options at this point. One Board member noted the lack of sustainability of the tuition waiver program and consideration of the national education fund: the tax base for education should not be tied to one particular program.

8.11 Other Board members commented that the Board cannot change the landscape in Haiti. The Global Partnership needs to help the children now and should work through the LEG to influence more government funded public schools in the future and that the GPE funds should be targeted to support the non-public schools most in need.

8.12 With respect to the Uzbekistan grant proposal, while acknowledging the comments from the CGPC, a Board member suggested some external contradiction in interpretation of the significance of the decree of the Uzbek government.

8.13 The consensus of the Board included support for the five grant proposals with the exception of the remaining concerns about the Haiti proposal. While a majority of Board members was in favor of approving the grant, the CSO 3 Board member remained opposed. Another CSO constituency Board member suggested including language for Haiti that any evidence of inappropriateness might be considered a misuse of funds subject to a return of funds. Since there were serious concerns expressed about the Haiti grant, the Board Chair asked for a show of hands in favor of approving the grant and then those opposed. The majority were in favor of approving the grant.

8.14 While recognizing the concerns raised by the CSO Board members, the Board Chair suggested asking that a report-back item be added to the comments to Haiti requesting that information be provided to the Board on if and how the grant targets the poorest schools. The Board Chair noted that should serious risk issues arise, the LEG should flag these to the Board.

Decision:

8.15 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2014/06-05 –Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants: The Board of Directors:

a. approves the allocation from GPE trust funds for the program implementation grants as described in the applications submitted in the first round of 2014 and that are listed in Table 1 of BOD/2014/06 DOC 11, subject to:

   i. availability of funds; and
   ii. Board decision BOD/2012/11-04 on commitment of trust funds for Program Implementation Grants in annual installments.

b. requests the Secretariat to:

i. include in its notification to each of the relevant Governments of the approval of the allocations, the conditions, requests for report back, and observations on the program set out in Table 2 in BOD/2014/06 DOC 11; and

ii. provide to the CGPC an update at its next face-to-face meeting on the issues listed as "conditions" and "report back" in Table 2 of BOD/2014/06 DOC 11.

Extension of Indicative Allocations Expiring in 2014

8.16 The Board Chair requested the CGPC Chair to introduce the recommendation concerning 2014 allocations that expire on December 31, 2014. The CGPC Chair reported that the Secretariat has been receiving inquiries from countries with a remaining allocation in 2014 about whether their 2014 allocations are secure should they not apply for the allocation this year. In order to avoid the possibility of rushed applications, the Secretariat has proposed that the CGPC consider a short, one-time extension to smooth the transition from 2014 to the 2015-2018 timeframe.

8.17 The CGPC Chair specified that the recommendation would extend the 2014 allocations for those countries that have commenced the Quality Assurance Review Phase 1 and have thus expressed intent to apply for the allocation. The following countries would meet the criteria: Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Congo Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Nigeria, St. Vincent & Grenadines, and St. Lucia. Per the recommendation, affected countries that submit in 2015 would not be eligible for another allocation in the 2015-2018 funding period. In addition, the new funding model rules are optional if the application is submitted in Round 1 of 2015 and required if they submit an allocation thereafter. Should affected countries be entitled to a higher allocation under the 2015-2018 funding period, they may apply for the higher amount but must then apply the new funding model rules.

8.18 The CGPC Chair reported that the GERF had considered the recommendation during its June 26, 2014 meeting and did not express any concerns with it. The GERF determined that in fact if some of the countries postpone their application to 2015, it may improve the financial position of the Global Partnership since any country that submits in 2015 would not receive an additional allocation in the 2015-2018 period.

8.19 The Board Chair invited comments and questions and received none.

8.20 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2014/06-06 – in reference to decision BOD/2013/11-07, **Indicative Allocations List 2014:** The Board of Directors:

a. extends the expiration date of December 31, 2014 for all countries with an existing indicative allocation that have commenced Phase 1 of the Quality Assurance Review but are not approved for a program implementation grant by December 31, 2014;

b. decides that the extended allocation will represent that country's maximum country allocation for the 2015-2018 period, subject to the provisions of point d;

c. decides that the application for any extended allocation should be guided by the principles of the new funding model but may be submitted under the existing requirements in effect, provided the application is submitted in the first round of 2015. Any application submitted in a subsequent round will be subject to the requirements of the new funding model; and

d. decides that, in the event that the country would have been entitled to a higher allocation under the new funding model, the country may apply for the higher amount only if it formally submits an application subject to the requirements of the new funding model.

Proposed Revision to Afghanistan Program Implementation Grant

8.21 The Board Chair invited the CGPC Chair to introduce the recommendation regarding the proposed revision to the Afghanistan program implementation grant. The CGPC Chair stated that per the timeframes policy, proposed grant revisions that constitute a 'material change' require CGPC review and subsequent Board approval. The policy further defines material change as in excess of 25% of the total grant amount, or more than US$10 million, whichever is lower. The proposed revision to the Afghanistan grant constitutes a 'material change' under these rules.

8.22 The CGPC Chair summarized the four main changes in the grant, including an increased unit cost for school improvement projects under component 1, an increased unit cost for mosque-based education and teacher training under component 2, a major correction on the initial estimate of unit costs for hiring teachers, changes in the originally proposed hiring and placement of TAs, and a six-month extension of the closing date to December of 2015.

8.23 The CGPC Chair reported that the Secretariat had deemed the revision coherent and presented transparently and that it had been reviewed and endorsed by the LEG. While there were concerns around centralization of implementation and associated costs, these were reflective of a difficult security environment. The Secretariat had articulated some doubt that a six-month extension would be sufficient to assure project completion but pointed out that the country believed otherwise.

8.24 The CGPC had discussed the recommendation during its June 16, 2014 audio call and indicated several areas of concern such as the change of modality and cost implications; the absorption capacity in relation to implementation of SIPs and the Teacher Education Department (TED); the future engagement of NGOs; the teacher training programs, community-based education and alternative pathways; and the implementation of component 3 related to increasing the number of qualified female teachers.

8.25 In the interest of not disrupting the Afghanistan program longer than needed, the Committee had decided to recommend the revision to the Board at this time along with the conditions consisting of a number of requested clarifications. The response to these conditions would then need to meet the approval of the CGPC before the approval becomes effective.

Discussion:

8.26 The consensus of the Board included support for the recommendation. However, a Board member requested the conditions in Annex 1 to BOD/2014/06 DOC 13 be restated so it is clear what is requested and what success looks like. Another suggestion included a deadline for determining whether conditions have been met. One Board member, while expressing comfort in delegating authority to the CGPC in determining whether the conditions are met, suggested Board members may be provided with one more opportunity to provide comments.

8.27 The Board Chair concluded that while Board consensus included approval of the direction of the proposed revisions and delegating final approval to the CGPC, there is a need to revisit the language in Annex 1 to clarify the conditions and insert a deadline for approval. She asked a revised decision to be drafted for consideration by the Board in the afternoon.

Decision:

8.28 Following the earlier discussion, the following revised decision was approved:

BOD/2014/06-07—Proposed Revision to Afghanistan Program Implementation Grant: In accordance with the provisions of the Policy on Time Frames for Grant Agreement Signing and Implementation and Procedures for Proposed Revisions to Implementation Grant Programs (Timeframes Policy), the Board of Directors:

a. requests the Secretariat to more clearly present the conditions listed in Annex 1 to BOD/2014/06 DOC 13 and to communicate these conditions to the Local Education Group;
b. requests the information be provided to the CGPC no later than September 30, 2014;and
c. delegates authority to the CGPC to approve a revised Program Budget Revision Notification after considering the response to the conditions as per points 1 and 2.

Financing Window in Education Plan Development Grant for Sector Analysis

8.29 The Board Chair invited the CGPC Chair to introduce the recommendation regarding the establishment of a financing window for education for education sector analysis in the Education Plan Development Grant (EPDG). The CGPC Chair noted that financing for sector analysis had previously been included in the former FTI Education Plan Development Grant (EDPF). However, the EPDF had ended in 2011 with no corresponding GPE Fund financing facility in place. As the result, the Secretariat had witnessed a notable decline in the number of education sector plans (ESP) built on strong sector analysis. With recent sector analysis a critical element in formulating a 'credible' ESP, which is a requirement in the new funding model, providing a financing window for sector analysis is all the more important.

8.30 The Board Chair invited comments and questions from Board members.

Discussion:

8.31 Comments from Board members included support for the recommendation. However, one Board member noted that the decision language should include an element of value for money and not suggest the ceiling of US$500,000 is a default amount. It should also clarify why the grant ceiling is doubled. Further, the guidelines should include criteria for receiving the maximum amount for funding sector analysis. Other comments included that funding for sector analysis should consider other existing external programs. Regarding the role of the Secretariat, it should play a facilitating role, not an implementing one. One Board member suggested the recommendation should link to the new funding model and emphasize results and outcomes. Several Board members raised the issue of lack of country-level capacity to undertake the analysis and suggested raising the issue in the guidelines and supporting ministries in in-country capacity building and establishing sustainable sector programs.

8.32 The Board Chair concluded that while Board consensus included approval of the recommendation generally, the decision needed to be modified in accordance with comments made. She asked a revised decision to be drafted for consideration by the Board in the afternoon.

Decision:

8.33 Following the earlier discussion, the following revised decision was approved:

BOD/2014/06-08— Proposal for Creation of a Window for Funding Education Sector Analyses Within the Existing Education Plan Development Grant Mechanism: The Board of Directors:

a. approves the establishment of a window for financing education sector analyses within the existing Education Plan Development Grant (EPDG) mechanism;
b. authorizes an increase of the EPDG ceiling from US$250,000 to US$500,000 to include additional funding of US$250,000 which would be earmarked specifically for better data and system analysis;
c. requests that the Secretariat update the existing Education Plan Development Grant guidelines as well as other GPE guidance documents to reflect this new financing facility, including criteria to ensure value for money, capacity building for sustainability and alignment with the new funding model. The CGPC will approve the guidelines prior to the launching of the new facility and by January 1, 2015; and
d. authorizes an increase of the Secretariat's authority to approve EPDG applications from up to US$250,000 to up to US$500,000.

9. PRESENTATION ON NEW FUNDING MODEL

9.1 The Board Chair invited the CEO to make some introductory remarks on the new funding model. The CEO thanked the Country Support Team for their work on the related Board paper that had been discussed and approved by the Board during a May 28 Board call. During that call, several Board members had requested the Secretariat to organize training sessions for the DCPs to better understand how the model would function in practice. They also called for a briefing on the details of the new funding model during the June Board meeting. The CEO explained that there would be more opportunities after the presentation today and noted there would be written communication pieces as well to facilitate full comprehension of the new model.

9.2 Paul Coustere, Country Support Team Lead, and Margarita Focas Licht, Regional Team Lead, proceeded to explain the new funding model. Staff summarized the steps that had led to the new model and why the Global Partnership needed to revisit its current model. The latter did not sufficiently leverage the Global Partnership's potential and there needed to be a stronger focus on results, and explicit attention to domestic financing and other potential financing sources. The new model aims at increasing the number of children in school, the number of children mastering basic literacy and numeracy skills, reaching the most marginalized, strengthening education systems, and incentivizing domestic investment in education. It will also provide a better case for investment and alignment for external support.

9.3 In practice, the GPE funding model phases run parallel to the in-country development and implementation of the education sector plan, providing partnership and assistance during each phase along the way. Moreover, the new funding model addresses needs and incentivizes performance. It includes expanded eligibility criteria that focus on poverty, education vulnerability and fragility, a needs-based allocation formula, building capacity at sector level, and incentivizing performance.

9.4 Secretariat staff clarified the requirements for accessing the fixed part of the program implementation grant, or 70 percent of the grant amount. These existed of the availability of data or a strategy to obtain data, a credible education sector plan (ESP), and evidence of commitment to the ESP or TESP and its financing. To subsequently access the variable part of the grant, or 30 of the grant amount, countries would need to review their policies or strategies for equity, efficiency and learning outcomes, and choose actions or target indicators which would constitute a "stretch." Payment of the variable component would normally take place on

an ex-post basis with payments made after verification of agreed actions or indicators. On an exception basis, the CGPC can clear an ex-ante arrangement.

9.5 The Secretariat had already started to update guidelines and supporting tools, working in consultation with key partners in implementation. Potentially 8-10 countries will inaugurate the new funding model during the two rounds of applications for 2015 and these grants will inform the understanding of the implementation phase. The first discussions with local education groups in these countries are already taking place and regional meetings on implementation are planned for the latter part of the year. The GPE-sponsored DCP collaboration meetings are being considered as an opportunity to brief partner countries on implementing the funding model.

9.6 The Board Chair opened the floor for comments and questions.

Discussion:

9.7 Board members recognized the stupendous work that the Secretariat had done to develop the new funding model. There was an emphasis on accelerating progress in student learning and an urgency to ensure that indicators are not process or output oriented but really focus on learning outcomes. The selected indicators must be linked to desired outcomes.

9.8 Additional comments included a concern that the complexity of and lack of specificity in the new funding model would result in credibility issues in the short term and an additional burden on countries due to added documentation requirements and processes. There are many things that are still not clear such as what the consequences are if data is simply not available, how the monitoring will work, what indicators for the variable part will be acceptable, what the consequences are when the progress achieved is not sufficient to release the variable part or sufficient progress is made but in an area other than the one agreed on, or how to measure learning outcomes. Discussions at local level with the LEG on such process details and on the clear definition of the respective roles of country-level actors are key to alleviating these concerns. In addition, it would be helpful to have a simple diagram or document that illustrates the model.

9.9 The CEO acknowledged the importance of more specificity in the final guidelines and conversations with all actors on the model. She noted that the Global Partnership needs a communication strategy to more clearly and simply explain the new funding model and how it will be rolled out. There is a need to closely consult and work with the Supervising and Managing Entities. Secretariat staff added that there is a balance in the new funding model between predictability and efficiency. However, the funding model will align to the education sector plan.

9.10 Secretariat staff confirmed that during the transition period between models, those countries that have applied under the old funding model rules will continue as usual, while making as much as possible efforts to implement the principles of the new funding model. Those that apply in 2015 and beyond must meet the requirements of the new funding model, with the exception of those countries with a remaining 2014 allocation that have commenced QAR phase 1 and apply after Round 1 of 2015.

9.11 With respect to choosing indicators or targets, staff noted that while not seeking to impose specific ones, if a country chooses an indicator that is considered "insufficient," then the CGPC may review it for sufficiency. The Global Partnership will need to find a balance between building capacity, country ownership and imposing conditions. Staff also acknowledged it is important that grant assessment is straight forward and interpretation is left with the CGPC.

9.12 Responding to a question on how the financing requirement will be framed, the CEO noted that the financing requirement should be imbedded in the pledges made during the Replenishment Conference by Developing Country Partners. She further added that the pledges made by the DCPs demonstrated a correlation between domestic financing and education financing. She stressed that in all its divisions, the Funding Model should be reflective of the Global Partnership concept of "country ownership". Other comments included that capacity building activities should be extended to Supervising and Managing Entities as these agencies will need to know how to implement the new model. The Board member for UNICEF noted that communications around the new GPE funding model have already taken place within the organization and further trainings will occur. Additional information and clarity from the Secretariat will help to better prepare UNICEF staff in country. UNICEF also emphasized that there needs to be subjective context criteria to judge progress versus objective standards.

9.13 One Board member emphasized the need for the Board to be patient before it would be in a position to evaluate the success of the new funding model. As the Global Partnership gains experience in implementing it, there will have to be minor tweaks to adjust or improve it. It is important that the Board resist the temptation to judge the new funding model too early. It takes time to see results. Other Board members acknowledged that it will take patience to see the full benefits of the new funding model but commented that it would be helpful to get on estimate on how long it would take before the funding model has been fully developed and up and running well.

9.14 The Regional Country Lead noted that the CST team has grown, is very competent, and has close relationships with all countries, which will be instrumental in rolling out the new funding model. There is strong and regular dialogue across the Global Partnership. The CST is also working on better understanding the dynamics of the local education groups in partner developing countries.

10. OUTCOME OF REPLENISHMENT CONFERENCE AND FINANCIAL FORECAST AND GERF INDICATIVE COUNRY ALLOCATIONS 2015-2018

Outcome of the Replenishment Conference

10.1 Charles Tapp, Manager of the External Relations and Partnership Team ("PERT"), presented the Global Partnership's Replenishment Outcomes. He announced that donor countries committed US$2.1 billion to the GPE Fund. He noted that particularly strong leadership was shown by the European Union, Norway, Denmark, Sweden and the UK. A number of other donors maintained or increased their commitments to the GPE Fund. Further pledges of support came from civil society and the private sector, with two private foundations (CIFF and Dubai Cares) pledging financial support to the GPE fund for the first time. These donor contributions are a critical first step toward reversing the decline in global aid for education, with further commitments expected from donors in the coming months. He also noted that GPE's developing country partners in particular have showed their strong commitment to ensuring that more resources are dedicated to education by pledging $US 26 billion in additional resources between 2015 and 2018, far exceeding the US$16 billion target on the first day of the replenishment campaign.

10.2 The Manager of PERT informed the Board that outcome documents of the Replenishment Conference will be finalized and updated with the final pledges. He noted that within the past 2 days the US pledge has already been increased from US$40,000,000 to US$90,000,000 million. He finally recalled that the replenishment period is open for 4 years (2015 to 2018) and that more commitments are to be made.

Financial Forecast and Indicative Country Allocations 2015-2018

10.3 The Senior Financial Officer recalled the key decisions taken by the Board based on the GERF's recommendations (including the cap in March/ available resources in June). He noted that thanks to these meetings, the Board is in a good position to make decisions with regard to the allocation of funds. He then summarized the deliberations of the Governance, Ethics, Risks and Finance Committee held during its third face to face meeting on June 26th (BOD/2014/06 DOC 08 Addendum).

10.4 He announced that the total of new pledges received is US$2,150 billion. He explained that the resources for forecasting purpose should also take into account existing pledges to be paid in 2015 (US$35 million), projections of additional contribution that can be made between 2015 and 2018 (US$329 million), projected carryover from 2015-2018 approvals (US$393 million with a US$100 million cap and to US$450 million with a US$140 million cap).The total resources for forecasting are US$2,907 billion (with a US$100 million cap) and US$2, 964 billion (with a US$140 million cap). The Senior Financial Officer noted for projections of additional contributions, that this is a very conservative approach and only donors who have a track record contributing to the GPE Fund have been considered. The forecast does not include new donors who have never pledged. He noted that the carryover is close to but does not exceed the maximum of 20 per cent of allocations approved by the Board. The level has increased since the previous GERF report as some grants approved in 2013 commenced later than anticipated which impacts the timing of their next allocation and allows for a higher carryover in the forecast. The Senior Financial Officer explained that this amount is not available for allocation, because of the amount to be set aside for other liabilities (less projected carryover from 2013, Round 1 2014 allocations, expected Round 2 2014 allocations, Secretariat and Trustee budgets, supervision fees, agency fees, other small grants, a provision for a continuation of the civil society education fund, and provisions for future programming and unexpected events for the 2015-2018 period). He also explained that there is no provision for a continuation of successor to GRA at present. The total amount to be set aside is US$-1,165 million (with a US$100 million cap) and US$-1,172 million (with a US$140 million cap). He concluded that the total amount of available resources for implementation grants is US$1,742 million (with US$100 million cap) against a minimum required amount of US$2 billion to fund all eligible countries without resorting to prioritization. There is an anticipated shortfall of US$258 million which would increase to US$458 million in order to funds with a US$140 million cap.

10.5 He explained that some issues will affect the total amount of resources, including new pledges, clarity on pledges subject to conditions (such as the UK that have committed up to £300 million, with the condition that the contribution increase is contingent on reform, support from other donors and that the UK contribution will not exceed 15 per cent of the total amount pledged) and the impact of any slippage from round 2 2014.

10.6 The GERF noted all countries scheduled to apply in Round 1 2015 are either low income countries or small island and small landlocked developing states and none are affected by the cap on allocations. Based on this analysis, he explained that the GERF recommends that the Board announce indicative allocations for Round 1, 2015 for countries as presented in Annex 1 of BOD/2014/06 DOC 08 Addendum. A total amount of US$199.2 million may be allocated among five countries (Liberia: US$11.9 million, Malawi US$44.9 million, Mozambique US$57.9 million, Nepal US$59.3 million, Rwanda US$25.2 million) and an additional amount of US$11.2 million may be allocated among Small Island and Landlocked Developing States.

10.7 The GERF also recommends that it review the financial forecast at its next face to face meeting in October. This approach will allow the Secretariat to clarify outstanding issues and seek to raise extra resources during the July through September period. Based on its review in

October 2014, the GERF would recommend to the Board for consideration at its December meeting the allocations for Round 2, 2015 and preferably 2016.

10.8 The Manager of PERT informed the Board that discussions with Qatar are ongoing and that because of specific circumstances, Canada was not able to pledge at that time but may in the autumn or fall. He also mentioned dialogue with other countries, including France and Germany. He thanked the UK for the incentive attached to their contribution which will be key to challenging other donors and leverage additional funds.

Discussion:

10.9 The GERF's recommendations were unanimously supported by Board Members. Some Board Members noted that there is a political momentum coming out of this week, and welcomed the commitment of DCPs.

10.10 Some Board Members especially welcomed the first contribution from the Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF), a private sector foundation. One Board member expressed concern that the CIFF contribution was earmarked and this would not be in line with the way the Global Partnership has been operating. The Manager of PERT explained that the same rules apply to all contributions and that a contribution agreement will be signed between the Trustee and CIFF. The Board member representing private foundations/private sector explained that the CIFF grant would not be held in a separate account and that there were no special reporting arrangements. The Chair thanked all partners for their support and noted that additional pledges are expected.

Decision:

10.11 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2014/06 - 09 — Maximum Country Allocations for Program Implementation Grants

The Board of Directors:

a. approves the list of Maximum Country Allocations for the first round of 2015 as set out in Annex 1 of the addendum to BOD/2014/06/DOC 08. The allocation for these countries will remain valid for the 2015-2018 period unless otherwise adjusted by the Board, and will be subject to the requirements of the new funding model.

b. requests the GERF to conduct a review of the forecast of available resources at its next face-to-face meeting in October 2014 and to make recommendations for decision by the Board on the level of available resources for approval of the Maximum Country Allocations of Round 2 2015, and if possible, the Maximum Country Allocations for 2016.

11. GPE Risk Management Framework

11.1 Chris Tinning, on behalf of the Chair of the GERF, presented a brief update on the GERF and Secretariat's work on the Risk Management Framework. He informed the Board that the GERF had reviewed the initial risks identified in the draft Risk Management Matrix during its February 2014 meeting. At that time the GERF found that many risks could be mitigated by the new funding model and a better definition of roles and responsibilities of all partners. The

GERF requested the Secretariat to develop two frameworks on roles and responsibilities at global and country level for GERF review at its October meeting.

11.2 The presentation focused on the GERF's next steps post replenishment, including identification of risk mitigation measures and the parties responsible for implementation. The GERF acknowledged that the absence of a shared risk management matrix is a gap. There will be consultations with all of the Board committees as the GERF progresses in its work with the goal of presenting a final risk management framework for approval to the Board at its December Board meeting.

Discussion:

11.3 Board members supported the methodology and noted that the development of this tool is critical. One Board member asked whether there should be a specific category for reputational risk. The World Bank Board member specifically noted that the Board should consider how it will manage risks associated with the functioning of the Secretariat as the World Bank allows more autonomy to the CEO for managing the Secretariat through the finalization of the Hosting Memorandum of Understanding.

11.4 Responding to these remarks, Chris Tinning noted that reputational risk runs across all of the categories of risk (strategic, implementation, financial and governance). It is a key Board issue that will need to be addressed at the next December Board retreat.

12. SECRETARIAT BUDGET UPDATE

12.1 The Board Chair called for an Executive Session to discuss the Secretariat Budget update. She asked that all observers and members of the Secretariat leave the room and that only Board and Alternate Board members, the CEO, the COO and one Board Operations Officer remain.

Decision:

12.2 Following the discussions at the Executive session the following revised decision had been approved by the Board of Directors during the session:

BOD/2014/06-10- Secretariat Budget Update: The Board of Directors:

a. approves a supplemental amount of US$425,000 to cover current CY2014 budget needs as outlined in 3.1.;
b. approves a supplemental amount of US$175,000 for a Special Advisor to the Board Chair;
c. approves a supplemental amount of $100,000 for innovative financing;
d. concurs with the GERF's recommendation to approve that the Secretariat budget revert to a July 1–June 30 fiscal year (GERF/2014/05 DOC 07), to align with the Hosting Agency's (World Bank) fiscal year accounting and reporting requirements, policies, procedures and systems, effective July 1, 2015;
e. requests the Secretariat to prepare a six-month budget for consideration at the December 2014 Board meeting to cover the period January–June 2015 and thereafter prepare a fiscal year budget (July–June) starting in May/June 2015; and
f. approves a supplemental amount of US$350,000 (50 percent of US$700,000) to provide financial support to strengthening communications and coordination among GPE developing country partner constituencies for a six-month period July–December 2014 as per BOD/2014/06-07.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Calls to Action

13.1 Responding to a question on what the next steps are for the Call to Actions solicited from participants in the Replenishment Pledging Conference, the Manager of PERT responded that all Calls for Action and signatures have been collected and staff will build on the momentum by encouraging GPE partners to formally sign up to the Calls to Action at the institutional level. This has been done already by some partners for some of the Calls to Action, either in writing or through declarations at the side events. Staff will look into designing a systematic process to secure and formalize additional support. The Chair asked the Secretariat to circulate the Youth Recommendations and she asked the GERF to review the recommendations and come back to the Board with advice as to how to carry them out.

Strategic Planning

13.2 The Chair explained the initial steps for developing the critical next GPE Strategic Plan. She had started the conversation with the Coordinating Committee during an audio call on April 28, 2014 during which she emphasized the importance of aligning the plan seamlessly with the post-2015 development agenda. The development of the global consensus about that agenda and GPE internal consensus about the strategic plan are twinned processes. Thus the critical decision-making points in the global process matter to the GPE processes. She also noted the importance of the work of the Independent Evaluation to the development of the strategic plan.

13.3 Next steps included the Board Chair in collaboration with the CEO and SPC Chair drafting a paper on how the strategic planning process is to be carried out over the next 18 months. The paper would outline the processes and timelines for putting the strategic plan together and would look at how the Board and the partnership as a whole would manage it, including the roles of the technical committees, in particular the SPC. The draft paper would then be reviewed by the Coordinating Committee prior to presentation to the Board.

Next Board Meeting

13.4 Ms. Gillard announced that the next face-to-face Board meeting would take place December 15-16, 2014 in Washington, DC. The meeting would be preceded by a two-day retreat (December 13-14) for Board and Alternate Board members only to reflect on the future of the Global Partnership and the next strategic plan.

Board Composition

13.5 The Board Chair announced that in addition to Elizabeth King, Board Member for the Multilateral Organizations and Regional Banks constituency, Hansjurg Ambuhl, Alternate Board Member for the Donor 1 constituency, would also rotate off the Board prior to the December Board meeting. The Board Chair expressed gratitude to both for their service to the Global Partnership Board of Directors.

13.6 There being no further business, the Board Chair adjourned the meeting.

ANNEX 1

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Gillard, Julia	Chair	Global Partnership for Education	Australia	**Chair**
Wolpe, Bruce	Chief of Staff	Office of Hon Julia Gillard	Australia	**Chief of Staff to the Chair**
Aheto-Tsegah, Charles	Ag. Director-General	Ghana Education Service	Ghana	**Board Member** Constituent of Africa 3
Archer, David	International Head of Education	ActionAid International	United Kingdom	**Board Member** Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Brown, Donal	Head of Global Funds Department	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 3
Gardiner, Amanda	Director of Partnerships	Pearson Plc	United States	**Board Member** Constituent Private Sector/Private Foundations
Gupta, Geeta Rao	Deputy Executive Director	UNICEF	United States	**Board Member** Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
King, Elizabeth	Education Director	The World Bank	United States	**Board Member** Constituent Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Mbow, Cheikh	National Coordinator	COSYDEP	Senegal	**Board Member** Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Sakho, Marième	General Secretary	SYPROS	Senegal	**Board Member** Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Seim, Olav	Policy Director Education	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 4
Stassen, Yvonne	Deputy Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The Netherlands	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 1

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Tang, Qian	Assistant Director General, Education	UNESCO	France	**Board Member** Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Thabana, Keratile	Principal Secretary	Ministry of Education and Training	Lesotho	**Board Member** Constituent of Africa 1
Thiam, HE Serigne Mbaye	Minister	Minister of Education	Senegal	**Board Member** Constituent of Africa 2
Tinning, Chris	Minister Counsellor (Development)	Embassy of Australia	Australia	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 2
Ambühl, Hansjürg	Head of West Africa Division	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Switzerland	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Donor 1
Atchoarena, David	Director, Teacher Development and Higher Education	UNESCO	France	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Bouapao, Lytou	Vice minister	Ministry of Education and Sports	Lao People's Democratic Republic	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Bourne, Josephine	Associate Director	UNICEF	United States	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Camara, Kandia	Minister	Ministry of Education	Ivory Coast	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Africa 2
Colenso, Peter	Executive Director, Education	The Children's Investment Fund Foundation	United Kingdom	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent Private Sector/Private Foundations
De Marcken, Natasha	Director, Office of Education	USAID	United States	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Donor 6
Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Feinberg, Nathalia	Ambassador, Head of Department, Development Policy and Global Cooperation	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Donor 4
Gutiérrez, Francisco	Head of the Education Area	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Spain	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Donor 2

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Nhan-O'Reilly, Joseph	Senior Adviser	Save the Children	United Kingdom	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Nkaada, Daniel	Commissioner Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Uganda	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Africa 1
Saidov, HE Nuriddin	Minister	Minister of Education	Tajikistan	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Samba, Madiana	Advisor	Education for all Sierra Leone Coalition	Sierra Leone	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Sanchez, Sandra	Vice Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Honduras	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Shouldice, Julie	Director	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development	Canada	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Donor 3
Wolassa, HE Shiferaw	Minister	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of Africa 3
Lefebvre, Francois	Senior Financial Officer	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
Pascual, Jay	Senior Counsel	The World Bank	United States	Trustee
Ahmed, Samiuddin	Program Officer	ActionAid Bangladesh	Bangladesh	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Anderson, Michael	CEO	Children Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)	United Kingdom	Constituent Private Sector/Private Foundations
Baldeh, Matarr	National Coordinator	EFA Campaign Network	Gambia	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Bobohon, Ismoilov	Coordinator of Project Global Partnership for Education-4	Ministry of Education and Science	Tajikistan	Constituent Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Bogale, Solomon	Director and LEG Co Chair	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Constituent of Africa 3
Brinkhaus, Michaela	Officer for Primary Education	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Cabral, Zaida	Interin Executive Secretary	MEPT - Mozambique	Mozambique	Constituent of Africa 3
Christensen, Olav Rex	Sr. Public Finance Specialist	The World Bank	United States	Constituent Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Christiansen, Thea	Chief Advisor, Team Leader	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Constituent of Donor 4
Cristofoli, Vigdis	Head, education section	The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Dansie, Grant	Education Advisor	The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Diop, Alioune Badara	Project manager	Elementary School Department	Senegal	Constituent of Africa 1
Doroba, Hendrina	Executive Director	Forum for African Women Educationalists	Kenya	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Ebebe, Munsya	Coordinator of Technical Support Unit and GPE Focal Point	Ministry of primary, secondary and vocational Education	The Democratic Republic of Congo,	Constituent of Africa 2
Emog, Paul	Human Resources Director	Ministry of basic Education	Cameroon	Constituent of Africa 2
Fordham, Elizabeth	Education Program Specialist	UNESCO	France	Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Francis, Biney	Coordinator	Ministry of Education	Ivory Coast	Constituent of Africa 2
Gantenbein, Nicole	Program Officer Education	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Guezewane, Jonas	Coordinator of STPCSE and GPE Focal Point	Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Scientific Research	Central African Republic	Constituent of Africa 2
Hamilton, Evelyn	Chief Planning Officer	Ministry of Education	Guyana	Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Hertel, Ulrika	Senior Program Specialist	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)	Sweden	Constituent of Donor 4
Hyving, Stellan	Senior Policy Specialist	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)	Sweden	Constituent of Donor 4

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Ihsan, Mohammad	Planning and Evaluation Coordinator	Ministry of Education (Afghanistan Global Partnership for Education Program)	Afghanistan	Constituent Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Iwase, Keita	Chief for Education Aid Policy and Gender Issues	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Jovin, Mukadi	International Cooperation Adviser	Minister of Primary, Secondary and Vocational Education	The Democratic Republic of Congo	Constituent of Africa 2
Karakoski, Jussi	Senior Education Adviser	Ministry for Foreign Affairs	Finland	Constituent of Donor 4
Kennedy, Raymond	Policy and Program Manager	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Khatun, Anoyara	Student	Save the Children	India	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Leumer, Wolfgang	Program Manager CSEF	GCE	South Africa	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Lloveras, Ferran	Program Assistant	European Commission, DEVCO B4 (Education)	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 1
Manyonga, Grace	Executive Director	Zambia National Education Coalition	Zambia	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Matthews, Alison	Senior Policy Advisor	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Mc Farlane, Esther	GEFI YAG Member	University of Cape Town	South Africa	Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Miachi, Ojonwa	Policy/Advocacy Advisor	Connected Development	Nigeria	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Mowe, Kjersti	Networks and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	South Africa	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Naidoo, Jordan	Senior Education Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Nsapato, Limbani	Regional Coordinator	Africa Network Campaign for All-ANCEFA	Zambia	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Osuji, Chioma	Policy Advisor	Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA)	Nigeria	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Ottosson, Marie	Assistant Director General	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)	Sweden	Constituent of Donor 4

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Owotsogo, Ambroise	Director of Planning	Ministry of Basic Education	Cameroon	Constituent of Africa 2
Pearce, Caroline	Global Coordinator	Global Campaign for Education	South Africa	Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Pessi, Jefferson	Coordinator	Education International	Belgium	Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Rafomoyo, Maxwell	Director	Education Coalition of Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Rao, Kwatolu	Student	Save the Children	India	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Roxburgh, Rose	Policy Officer	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Constituent of Donor 2
Ryberg, Camilla	Online Communications and Education Campaign Manager	RESULTS International	Australia	Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Sahar, Muhammad	Education Advocate	Grace Association Pakistan	Pakistan	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Sahin, Gazala	Consultant	Save the Children, BR	India	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Siebes, Ronald	Head Education and Research Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The Netherlands	Constituent of Donor 1
Tanaka, Shinichiro	Senior Advisor	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Japan	Constituent of Donor 6
Tissafi, Maya	Ambassador	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Vilsack, Christie	Senior Advisor for International Education	USAID	United States	Constituent of Donor 6
Yadav, Chitralekha	Minister	Ministry of Education	Nepal	Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Yeshey, Karma	Director	Department of School Education, Ministry of Education	Bhutan	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Adams, Ray	Special Advisor	Australian Council for Educational Research	Australia	Observer
Alolofi, Ibrahim	Coordinator	Yemeni Coalition for Education for All	Yemen	Observer

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Al-olofi, Esam	Secretary General	Yemeni Coalition for Education for All	Yemen	Observer
Baker, Tony	Education for All Campaign Manager	RESULTS Educational Fund	United States	Observer
Bender, Penelope	Senior Education Advisor	USAID	United States	Observer
Bojanic, Dejan	Educational Advocate	Youth Advocacy Group for the UN SG's Global Education First Initiative	Serbia	Observer
Burley, Jamira	US Representative	GEFI, Youth Advocacy Group	United States	Observer
Callahan, Brian	Advocacy & Outreach Manager	Global Campaign for Education, US	United States	Observer
Cauldwell, Jonathan	Senior Advisor	UNICEF	United States	Observer
Cherevatova, Natalia	Operations Officer	The World Bank	United States	Observer
Cross, Jess	Junior Professional	The World Bank	United States	Observer
Da Camara, Patricia	Communications Officer	The World Bank	United States	Observer
Dabu, Maria Helen	Capacity Development and Advocacy Adviser (CDAA)	Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE)	Philippines	Observer
Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Educational Planning and Reform	Ministry of National Education	Senegal	Observer
Gautam, Kul	Former Deputy Executive Director	UNICEF	Nepal	Observer
Grossman, Allison	Senior Legislative Associate	RESULTS Educational Fund	United States	Observer
Johnny, Thomas	Project Coordinator	Africa Network Campaign for All-ANCEFA	Sierra Leone	Observer
Jones, Dan	Campaigns Manager	Results UK	United Kingdom	Observer
Kenny, Kate	Education Policy Officer	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Observer

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Khembo, Dafter	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Africa Network Campaign on Education for All	Kenya	Observer
Kitignavong, Khampaseuth	Deputy Director General	Department of Pre-primary and Primary Education Ministry of Education and Sports	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Observer
Kuppens, Line	Doctoral researcher	KU Leuven	Belgium	Observer
Laura, Giannecchini	LAC SCEF Regional Coordinator	Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education	Brazil	Observer
Lo, Aissatou	Program Officer	Africa Network Campaign for All-ANCEFA	Togo	Observer
McQuire, Hayley	Australian Representative	Youth Advocacy Group for UN Global Education First Initiative	Australia	Observer
Miyazaki, Takeshi	Expert in Education	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Senegal	Observer
Mohamed, Said	President	FADE DJIBOUTI	Djibouti	Observer
Mornet-Cariou, Odile	Education Advisor	BACKUP Education (GIZ)	Germany	Observer
Mwamba, Matildah	Program Officer	Africa Network Campaign for All-ANCEFA	Zambia	Observer
Perez Sandoval, Virginia	Executive Director	Bolivian Campaign for the Right Education	Bolivia	Observer
Sagna, Marise	Lusophone Program Officer	ANCEFA	Senegal	Observer
Sarch, Terri	Deputy Head of Department	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Observer
Savard-Shaw, Julie	Campaigns Officer	RESULTS Canada	Canada	Observer
Schmidt, Caroline	Education Advisor	BACKUP Education (GIZ)	Germany	Observer
Simon, Kobia	Program Officer	Africa Network Campaign for All (ANCEFA)	Kenya	Observer

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Spink, Jeaniene	Principal Research Fellow	Australian Council for Educational Research	Australia	Observer
Steer, Liesbet	Fellow	The Brookings Institution	United States	Observer
Tahirou, Traore	National Coordinator	Coalition Nationale pour l'Education Pour Tous	Burkina Faso	Observer
Tebbe, Kerstin	Deputy Director	Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)	United States	Observer
Waruku, Boaz	Program Manager	Africa Network Campaign for All (ANCEFA)	Kenya	Observer
Wilson, Ashley	Communications Manager	Global Campaign for Education-US Chapter	United States	Observer
Winthrop, Rebecca	Senior Fellow and Director	The Brookings Institution	United States	Observer
Albright, Alice	CEO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Beardmore, Sarah	Advocacy Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Beeching, Sarah	Strategic policy consultant	Global Partnership for Education	United Kingdom	GPE Secretariat
Bernard, Jean-Marc	M&E Team Lead	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Coustere, Paul	Country Support Team Lead	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Egbetayo, Victoria	Partnership Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Focas Licht, Margarita	Sr Education specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Gomer, Lisa	COO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Goudiaby, Gisele	Events Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Guétin, Christine	Board Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country	Constituency
Henfry, Sally-Anne	Special Assistant to the Board Chair	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Humme, Alexandra	Senior Communications Lead	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Leitner, Marian	Special Assistant to the CEO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Mesen, Michelle	Developing Country Partnerships Officer	Global Partnership for Education	France	GPE Secretariat
Murimi, Lydia	Senior Private Sector Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Oulebsir, Naima	Program Assistant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Palacios, Alejandro	Director, Special Projects	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Power, Padraig	Sr. Financial Officer	Global Partnership for Education Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Schroh, Karen	Senior Donor Relations Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	Belgium	GPE Secretariat
Tapp, Charles	Manager-Partnership & External Relations	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Van Bommel, Joris	Senior Country Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Van Dyke, Johanna	Board Operations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
Wane, Michaelle	Senior Board Operations Assistant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat