# REPORT FROM THE COUNTRY GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE: INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN RELATION TO PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ALLOCATIONS, THE 2014 PORTFOLIO REVIEW, AND COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT OF THE GRANT PORTFOLIO

**For Decision and Information**

**Rev. 1 – revisions are marked in red and reflect non-substantively revised decisions recommended to and approved by the Board during the December 15-16 Board meeting.**

## 1. PURPOSE

1.1. The purpose of this paper is to summarize the deliberations of the Country Grants and Performance Committee ("CGPC") during its face-to-face meeting held in Washington, D.C. on November 4–6, 2014.

1.2 This paper contains the following:

**For Decision**

- Program Implementation Grant Allocations (section 2)
- Recommendations regarding the Portfolio Review (Section 5, CGPC/2014/11 DOC 02)
- Committee oversight of the grant portfolio (section 6)

**For Information**

- CGPC observations on general trends, issues, and value-add in relation to Program Implementation Grants (section 3)
- Update on Program Implementation Grants (section 4, CGPC/2014/11 DOC 03)
- Roll-out status of the funding model for the 2015-2018 period, including partial fulfillment of requirements in Round 1 of 2015, and applying funding model principles to the multi-country allocations for the Caribbean and Pacific Small Island Developing States (section 7, CGPC/2014/11 DOC 05)
- Policy updates: revisions to Guidelines for Program Implementation Grants and Policy on Timeframes and Revisions (section 8, CGPC/2014/11 DOC 06 and 07)
- Update on GPE Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix (section 9)

## 2. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ALLOCATIONS

***Recommendation***

2.1 The CGPC recommends the Board approve the following decision:

**BOD/2014/12-XX** - **Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants**: The Board of Directors:

1. approves the allocation from GPE trust funds for the Program Implementation Grants as described in the applications submitted in the second round of 2014, summarized in BOD/2014/12-XX 1 (c), subject to:

   a. availability of funds; and
   b. Board decision BOD/2012/11-04 on commitment of trust funds for Program Implementation Grants in annual installments.
   c. CGPC recommendations for funding include (all amounts in US$):

**Table 1**

| Country | Supervising Entity/ Managing Entity | Allocation Requested | Allocation Recommended | Supervision Allocation[1] | Agency Fee % and Amount | Period | Funding Source |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central African Republic | UNICEF (ME) | 15,510,000 | 15,510,000 | n/a | 8% - 1,240,800 | 3 years | GPE Fund |
| Guinea | World Bank (SE) | 37,800,000 | 37,800,000 | 400,000 | 1.75% - 661,500 | 3 years | GPE Fund |
| Guyana | World Bank (SE) | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | 200,000 | 1.75% - 29,750 | 3 years | GPE Fund |
| Kenya | World Bank (SE) | 88,400,000 | 88,400,000 | 750,000 | 1.75% - 1,547,000 | 4 years | GPE Fund |
| Lao PDR | World Bank (SE) | 16,800,000 | 16,800,000 | 500,000 | 1.75% - 294,000 | 4 years | GPE Fund |
| Nigeria | World Bank (SE) | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 600,000 | 1.75% - 1,750,000 | 3 years | GPE Fund |
| **Totals** | | **260,210,000** | **260,210,000** | **2,450,000** | **5,523,050** | | |

2. requests the Secretariat to:

   a. include in its notification to each of the relevant Governments, LEGs through the Coordinating Agencies, and Supervising Entities/Managing Entities of the approval of the allocations and the expected timeframe for signing of the Grant Agreement, if applicable, the conditions, requests for report-back, and observations on the program as recommended by the CGPC and set out in BOD/2014/12 DOC 08, Table 2; b. provide to the CGPC an

[1] The Supervision Allocation amounts are all in line or less than the standard amounts as outlined in the guidance on Supervision Allocations approved by the Board in November 2013.

update at its next face-to-face meeting on the issues listed as "conditions" and "report back" in BOD/2014/12 DOC 08, Table 2.

**Table 2**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Central African Republic** | |
| Observations | Given the very difficult situation in the country, the Committee appreciates that different scenarios are presented in the proposal to ensure responsiveness based on the evolution of the context. It further recognizes the efforts made to facilitate the transition from the emergency phase to the reconstruction period. The Committee also appreciates the important role that UNICEF is playing in the process.<br><br>The Committee noted that there exists an opportunity to use lessons learned from the GRA-funded study on school-based gender violence.<br><br>To ensure implementation readiness the Committee requests that the Secretariat follows up closely with the Managing Entity on the preparatory activities<br><br>The Committee encourages UNICEF to report on the GPE grant within the scope of the overall transitional plan, including an overview of the implementation of activities funded by other donors for which UNICEF is also the managing entity. |
| Report-Back | The Committee requests report-back on the steps taken to assess gender-based violence and to integrate activities increasing safety for girls.<br><br>The Committee acknowledges the financial commitment of the Ministries of Finance and Education, and it requests to be updated on progress regarding increases in the government's budget for education. |
| Conditions | n/a |
| **Republic of Guinea** | |
| Observations | The Committee appreciates the quality of the proposal and the inclusiveness of the proposal process.<br><br>The ambitious plans to increase in domestic funding are positively acknowledged.<br><br>The committee has taken note of the differentiated strategy regarding teacher training. It nevertheless expresses concern about the adequacy and sufficiency of the time allocated for this and, consequently, encourages the government to ensure the highest quality of each level of training and be as transparent as possible in the selection process for each level.<br><br>While the Committee hopes for a downward trend in the occurrence of Ebola in the country, it notes that, if needed, the country may at a later date request for the program to be adapted in accordance with the GPE Operational Framework for Conflict-Affected and Fragile States. |
| Report-Back | The Committee requests clarification on how the GPE gender analysis tool is informing future analysis and sector planning. |
| Conditions | n/a |
| **Guyana** | |
| Observations | The Committee appreciates the full alignment of the program to the sector strategy and the program's use of government modalities.<br><br>Apart from geographical and poverty targeting, there is need for further improvement of capturing and desegregating data to inform policy and planning and to be able to |

| | |
|---|---|
| | respond to equity issues more broadly, including on disabilities.<br><br>The Committee encourages the government to involve local communities in the implementation of the ECE program, with particular attention to the issue of the appropriate use of local languages.<br><br>The Committee notes the discrepancy between the UIS statistics and government data on UPE and out-of-school children and encourages the different partners to harmonize the data. |
| Report-Back | n/a |
| Conditions | n/a |
| **Kenya** | |
| Observations | The Committee appreciated the Government's practice of engaging broadly with education stakeholders, including communities and civil society. Building on this principle, the proposal seeks to deliver more efficient and responsive services through enhanced stakeholder engagement.<br><br>The Committee was pleased to note the extensive and inclusive process of consultation around the articulation of the sector strategy, the NESP. Furthermore that the Global Partnership for Education process was a trigger for renewed and collaborative dialogue between the Government and development partners.<br><br>The Committee appreciates the efforts that have been taken to strengthen governance and financial management within the sector and emphasizes the need to sustain these efforts.<br><br>The Committee strongly recommends that the government engage in dialogue with the teachers union on the program's proposed teacher appraisal and development system, including the role of the TSC.<br><br>The Committee encourages coordination between the EGMA and the TUSOME program. |
| Report-Back | n/a |
| Conditions | n/a |
| **Lao PDR** | |
| Observations | The Committee acknowledges the strength and appropriateness of the proposal.<br><br>The Committee expects that the initiatives supported in the program, including among others the school block grants and school management program, and the outcomes of the studies and discussions related to ethno-linguistic diversity, are being continued in future education sector plans. |
| Report-Back | The Committee notes with concern the low level of non-salary expenditures, low budget allocation to the primary education sub-sector, and their potential negative impact on household budgets for education and requests an annual update on improvements made in this regard. |
| Conditions | n/a |
| **Nigeria** | |
| Observations | The Committee acknowledges the high quality of the proposal, especially given the complexity of the inclusion of five states in the proposal, and the impact it will have on the percentage of out-of-school children.<br><br>Given the complexity of the program, capacity to monitor the program should be strengthened at all levels, including at the state, LEG, and supervising entity level. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The Committee encourages the LEG to regularly assess the program's outcome indicators to ensure that they are fit for purpose for measuring improvements in learning. |
| Report-Back | n/a |
| Conditions | n/a |

***Background***

2.2 Each Local Education Group ("LEG") applied for the maximum amount available under the current indicative allocations list and the CGPC is recommending that the Board approve all of the applications as presented by the relevant LEG for the maximum amount available. The Board should note the following:

- **Central African Republic** received a total indicative allocation of US$19,200,000. However, following the coup d'état in the country last year, the country received funding under the Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations in the amount of US$3,690,000. Therefore, the current requested and recommended allocation represents the remainder of the indicative allocation, US$15.51 million.
- **Nigeria** originally applied for its indicative allocation in Round 2 of 2013. However, the former Financial Advisory Committee ("FAC") did not recommend the application for funding and encouraged the country to resubmit an application in 2014.

2.3 Committee members disclosed the following conflicts of interest:

- Jordan Naidoo, UNICEF, with respect to the grant application from Central African Republic as Managing Entity for the proposed program;
- Olav Christensen, World Bank, with respect to the grant applications from Guinea, Guyana, Kenya, Lao PDR, and Nigeria as Supervising Entity for the proposed programs
- Khampaseuth Kitignavong, Lao PDR, with respect to the grant application from Lao PDR

***Update on Uzbekistan***

2.4 The CGPC recommended an allocation for Uzbekistan which the Board approved in June of 2014. To ensure due diligence and compliance with international and national labor laws, the country was asked to report-back on issues of forced and child labor. As such, Secretariat staff provided an update on the issue of forced and child labor in Uzbekistan and on the progress made by the Supervising Entity towards establishing mitigation measures under the project.

2.5 The Grant Agreement for the program was signed at the end of October, 2014. Regarding the grievance redress mechanism ("GRM") and third-party monitoring ("TPM"), separate entities will

be contracted to undertake these functions. The ILO will undertake the TPM in 2015 and 2016 and a separate entity will be contracted to implement the GRM, currently referenced as a Feedback Mechanism following negotiations between the Supervising Entity and the Government. The Feedback Mechanism scope of work remains the same as the terms of reference that were reviewed by the CGPC. It is expected that the mechanism will be piloted by the end of the first quarter in 2015. While the scope of work remains the same, continued follow-up is needed to ensure that the triggers of the feedback mechanisms are adequate and that they sufficiently ensure accountability.

2.6 More generally, the Secretariat continues to monitor dialogue and progress on relevant issues. In June of 2014, Uzbekistan passed a Decree on additional measures on the implementation of ILO conventions, further confirming to development partners the intent of the Government to adhere to forced and child labor laws. Since Board approval of the allocation, there has also been strengthened collaboration between development partners in Uzbekistan, including the sharing of knowledge and expertise on these issues, in particular between the World Bank, the Supervising Entity for the program, the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Asian Development Bank and the extended UN community.

2.7 The issues of forced and child labor also continue to be closely monitored by civil society, in particular by the Cotton Campaign and the Open Society Foundation, which released its report on the cotton sector in October 2014. The Cotton Campaign undertook monitoring of this year's cotton harvest and will publish its findings soon. ILO was unable to monitor the 2014 harvest due to a lack of funding, but it will monitor the harvest in 2015 and 2016.

***Further information***

2.8 The Secretariat's Final Readiness Reviews under the Quality Assurance Review process for each of the applications are posted on the Committee eTeam site.

## 3. CGPC OBSERVATIONS ON GENERAL TRENDS, ISSUES AND ADDED VALUE IN RELATION TO PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

CGPC members made the following observations about the set of grant applications considered during the meeting:

### 3.1 Funding Parameters

- There is a broad range of activities in the funding proposals. While the activities are becoming more focused, a trend that will be strengthened by the requirements and incentives components of the new funding model, there is a need to prioritize activities and ensure the best possible funding choices are made within each country context.

- There is a noticeable correlation between the quality of grant applications and the time taken to prepare them, most clearly illustrated by the proposal from Nigeria. Similarly, the Committee acknowledged that the length of the grant period can affect the quality of program implementation: a three-year implementation period may be challenging.

### 3.2 Country Systems

- In recognition of the value of a more holistic approach to systems building and building institutions for sustainability of systems, the CGPC was pleased to see an increased focus on governance and systems building in the proposals at both central and community/school levels.
- There is a need for further harmonization and alignment of financing modalities as was also recommended in the 2014 Portfolio Review.

### 3.3 Dimensions of the Funding Model for the 2015-2018 Period: Equity, Efficiency and Learning

- While there is an increased focus on learning, insufficient use of mother tongue/local language instruction needs further attention
- Equity is being addressed in grant proposals, but more focus is needed on girls and the most marginalized children.
- The role of teachers is acknowledged, but there is no systematic approach to addressing issues related to training for teachers. Further, the impact of teacher training on student results should be measured more closely.
- The Committee noticed increased use of school grants modalities. More attention should be paid to how these modalities impact learning outcomes and equity.

### 3.4 Roles and Responsibilities at Country Level

- More clarity is needed on the roles and responsibilities of the LEGs and the Coordinating Agency. Should their roles be limited to GPE grants? How are LEGs to prepare for their role, especially given their increased role in the new funding model?
- There is increased participation of civil society organizations in local education groups.

### 3.5 GPE Added Value

- The Global Partnership provides continuity in fragile contexts, providing a bridge from a state of emergency to development.

- The Global Partnership has been instrumental in opening or renewing dialogue between government, civil society, teacher unions and development partners.

## 4. UPDATE ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

4.1 The Secretariat provided an update on grant agreement signing for allocations approved in the past two funding rounds. Grant agreements for allocations approved in November of 2013 had all been signed within the agreed timeframe. For the five allocations approved in June of 2014, the initial deadline for grant agreement signing is December 28, 2014. As of the meeting, two agreements had been signed (Pakistan-Sindh and Uzbekistan), two were on track to be signed by the deadline (Pakistan-Bolochistan and Haiti), and one would likely need an extension to January, 2015 (Togo).

4.2 Regarding the next funding round, staff noted five countries are expected to apply: Bangladesh, Congo, Mozambique, Nepal and Rwanda.

4.3 The Secretariat also provided an overview of proposed non-minor, non-material revisions to program implementation grants it received in 2014. All revisions involved no-cost extensions of the grant end date of twelve months or less and were approved by the Secretariat via no-objection.

## 5. 2014 PORTFOLIO REVIEW

5.1 The Secretariat provided an overview of its 2014 Portfolio Review and requested the Committee to consider the proposed recommendations in the review. The Committee agreed with the proposed recommendations overall but requested a few modifications and added three additional recommendations.

***Recommendation***

5.2 The CGPC recommends that the Board approve the following decision:

**BOD/2014/12-07 – 2014 Portfolio Review**: The Board of Directors determines that the 2014 Portfolio Review and the recommendations of the Secretariat and the CGPC as set out in BOD/2014/12 DOC 09 be a key input into the strategic planning process, especially in work stream 1, as per BOD/2014/12-02.

## 6. COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT OF GRANT PORTFOLIO

***Recommendation***

6.1. The CGPC recommends that the Board approve the following decision:

BOD/2014/12-XX – **Committee Oversight of Grant Portfolio**: The Board of Directors:

1. agrees that the Country Grants and Performance Committee's current responsibilities with regard to country-level grants be expanded to include all other types of grants, except for those delegated to the Secretariat;

2. notes that when the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee carries out its full governance review at the end of the committees' initial two-year term, the terms of reference of all committees will be reviewed and revised as needed.

***Background***

6.2 During its meeting on November 4-6, it was noted that while the CGPC is tasked with reviewing and recommending program implementation grants and monitoring their performance, grants under other types of funding frameworks, including at present the Global and Regional Activities ("GRA") program, and the Civil Society Education Fund ("CSEF"), are currently not covered by the Committee. This appears to be an oversight that should be corrected, as any grant benefits from vetting by a committee prior to consideration by the Board.

6.3 Centralizing oversight of all grants under the various funding frameworks in one committee would reduce the risk of grants residing in silos and allow the Global Partnership to view its grants portfolio in a more holistic manner, thereby facilitating linkages between the grants where possible and desirable, and maximizing the Global Partnership's grantmaking impact.

***Reasons for recommendation***

6.4 Designating the CGPC to manage all grant proposals, and revisions is a natural choice as grants are the core business of the Committee. Moreover, CGPC members have appropriate skills to oversee grants; having extensive knowledge of and experience in analyzing funding proposals and making recommendations, managing or overseeing education programs in developing countries, and knowledge of country-level processes are prerequisites for serving on the committee.

6.5 The Committee notes that, at present, tracking progress on the GRA and CSEF is included in the TOR of the Strategy and Policy Committee ("SPC"). However, the purpose of the SPC is to oversee the development of strategies and policies and recommending those to the Board. Once those strategies, including funding frameworks, are in place, the operationalization of the funding frameworks, including reviewing grant proposals as well as tracking implementation and performance, might best reside with the Country Grants and Performance Committee, as part of the name of the Committee suggests.

6.6 The Committee recognizes that the outcomes and knowledge gained from grant programs are of interest to the SPC. To ensure sharing of information between the CGPC and SPC in this area and other areas of common interest, the Secretariat's Chief Technical Officer who serves as the focal point for the SPC will closely collaborate with the Country Support Team to follow the work of the CGPC.

6.7 The Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee during its October 27-29 meeting noted the gap in committee mandate with respect to oversight of grants other than program implementation grants and raised no objections to the Secretariat's suggested approach of having the CGPC review these types of grants in the future.

***Annexes and further information***

6.8 The current terms of reference for the Strategy and Policy Committee and the Country Grants and Performance Committee are posted on the Committee eTeam site.

## 7. ROLL-OUT OF THE FUNDING MODEL FOR THE 2015-2018 PERIOD

**Roll-Out Status**

7.1 The Secretariat provided an overview of the roll-out of the new funding model, which included preparations underway to update various grant-related guidelines, including the Plan Preparation and Appraisal Guidelines. The Secretariat also shared a newly-developed 'readiness matrix' which indicates if a country preparing to apply for a program implementation grant is expected to meet the requirements. In addition, the Secretariat shared a preliminary overview of a 'screening' tool intended to assist countries in addressing the funding model dimensions of equity, efficiency and learning to access the variable part of the grant. The Committee requested to be updated on the development of the tool and suggested integrating other GPE tools.

**Role of the CGPC**

7.2 The Secretariat noted that the Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the GPE Funding Model for the 2015-2018 Period (BOD/2014/06 – DOC 03) included two explicit roles for the CGPC. In addition to being consulted on the revision of the Guidelines for Program Implementation Grants, the Committee would also be responsible for pre-approving an ex-ante approach for the variable part of a grant on a case-by-case basis. The Operational Framework does not provide details on other aspects of the fixed and variable parts of the funding model, including decision-making with respect to the fulfillment of requirements, clearing strategies and indicators for the variable part of the grant and disbursement thereof, and releasing the variable part upon

evidence of results. The Committee considered the various questions and determined more discussion was needed to provide answers and to determine the right level of CGPC involvement in the grant process. It was agreed that the CGPC would continue to review the 'readiness matrix' prior to application, at least for the second round of 2015.

**Partial Fulfillment of Requirements Round 1 of 2015**

7.3 The Secretariat asked the Committee to consider the fulfillment of requirements for the fixed part of the grant for the three countries that are preparing to apply in Round 1 of 2015 – Mozambique, Nepal, and Rwanda–and suggested adjustments for further alignment to the requirements (CGPC/2014/11 – DOC 05).

7.4 The Committee recognized that some flexibility is needed in the first funding rounds under the new funding model and agreed that the fulfillment of requirements as presented along with the proposed adjustments is acceptable to the CGPC. The acceptance should not be construed as a precedent for other grant applications: any future requests for partial fulfillment of requirements will be individually assessed by the Committee. Nor should CGPC acceptance of partial fulfillment be considered assurance that the Board will subsequently approve the recommendation of the CGPC.

7.5 With respect to the proposed indicators for the variable part of the grant, the Secretariat will share with the CGPC in January or February which indicators are proposed by the three countries along with the justification for those indicators.

**Application of Funding Model principles to the Multi-Country Allocations for the Caribbean and Pacific Small Island Developing States**

7.6 The Secretariat provided the Committee with an overview of the challenges faced by small island developing states in applying for their Maximum Country Allocations ("MCAs"). Their limited capacity combined with the small size of the indicative allocations and the relatively high transaction cost presents an obstacle to applying for GPE funding. These issues prevented the states from accessing funding under the former funding model. However, with the multi-country allocation, an opportunity exists to lower transaction costs.

7.7 While there are some common challenges between the small islands states, the Secretariat highlighted the significant differences in the contexts of the Caribbean and the Pacific and the importance of proposing solutions that are responsive to these differences. A one size fits all model will not be applied. Given the vast geographical scale of the Pacific island states, and the structural

limits of regionalism (due to *diseconomies of isolation*), a national implementation approach is proposed under a grouped multi-country application with a single Supervising Entity. The application process will make full use of both co-financing and regional frameworks for effective development cooperation (*The Pacific Forum* Compact) to reduce transaction costs. For the Caribbean, given the existence of a strong regional framework for education, a regional approach under a single Supervising Entity is proposed.

7.8 While multi-country allocations make sense for the island groups, there are a number of issues with a regional application (such as that proposed for the Caribbean), including limitations to adapting LEG principles to a regional context. For both the Pacific and Caribbean, general principles on the requirements of the funding model can be applied, but there is a need to be sensitive to the particular contexts of the island states.

7.9 The Secretariat will continue to work with the island groups and update the CGPC at its next regular face-to-face meeting.

## 8. POLICY UPDATES

**Revisions to Guidelines for Program implementation grants**

8.1 In accordance with the Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model for the 2015-2018 Period (BOD/2014/06 – DOC 03), the Secretariat consulted the CGPC on its draft revised Guidelines for Program implementation grants. Revisions included incorporation of provisions from the Operational Framework, general updates and improvements, references to pooled funds and project support, and elaboration of Secretariat support to countries during the different phases of the Quality Assurance Review process.

8.2 CGPC members suggested further revisions, particularly with respect to provisions related to the ESP preparation stage. In addition to the detailed guidelines, it was suggested that a flowchart of the process would be helpful to countries. The Committee also noted it is important to communicate clearly that the Guidelines are intended to provide guidance only, not instructions, to emphasize country ownership of the process.

8.3 The Secretariat will share a revised draft in line with suggestions provided by the Committee before publicizing them. The Secretariat noted that the Guidelines might need to be further revised in the future as the roll-out of the funding model will continue to inform the Guidelines.

**Revisions to Policy on Timeframes and Revisions**

8.4 The CGPC briefly discussed revisions to the Policy on Timeframes and Revisions proposed by the Secretariat that were aimed at incorporating elements of BOD/2014/06 –DOC 03, and provide general updates and improvements. The Committee discussed possible changes related to implementation readiness, performance issues, and mechanisms for considering revisions based on programmatic considerations, not only financial considerations. In light of related ongoing work on the Global Partnership's risk policy and matrix and the roles and responsibilities of GPE actors at country level, both of which would be discussed by the Board during the December Board retreat, the CGPC deemed it premature to recommend revisions to the policy at this time. Depending on the outcomes of the Board retreat, the Committee will present a revised policy for Board consideration in May that will be aligned with the consensus of the Board on the various issues.

## 9. UPDATE ON GPE RISK POLICY AND RISK MANAGEMENT MATRIX

9.1 Lisa Gomer, Chief Operating Officer ("COO"), provided the Committee with an update on the development of the GPE Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix ("RMM") and the recent deliberations of the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee which would be presented at the Board meeting in December. The COO explained the process for developing the Risk Policy and the RMM which entailed an internal staff survey, interviews with Board and Alternate Board members and a Secretariat wide Risk Task Force as well as the input from an outside consultant with an expertise on risk management. The COO revealed that Secretariat staff tend to have a more moderate to high risk appetite. Board and committee members express a low to moderate risk appetite but expressed the desire to work overall with a moderate risk appetite.

9.2 With regard to the role of the CGPC as a Risk Owner, it was noted that there are no specific guidelines yet on how to fulfill that role. The COO explained, however, that as a Risk Owner, the CGPC would have overall responsibility to review and monitor the risk mitigation measures identified in the RMM as they were being implemented and to make suggestions for other risk mitigation measures as deemed necessary. In addition, in reviewing grants and their performance, the CGPC would have a clear role in risk mitigation with a special focus on programmatic risks. The Secretariat would provide the CGPC support in fulfilling its role as Risk Owner.

## 10. NEXT MEETINGS

10.1 The CGPC decided to have a special two-day face-to-face session to discuss the responsibilities of the Committee regarding the performance of GPE grants. This session will take

place early 2015, possibly in Paris, and will take into account cost efficiency. The Committee will hold its regular spring face-to-face meeting on April 14-16 in Washington, D.C.

**11. PLEASE CONTACT** Sven Baeten at: sbaeten@globalpartnership.org for further information.

**12. ANNEXES**

Annex 1 – Participant list of CGPC face-to-face meeting November 4–6, 2014

## ANNEX 1 - Participant list of CGPC face-to-face meeting November 4–6, 2014

| Committee Members | Title and Organization | Representing |
|---|---|---|
| Ronald Siebes, Chair | Deputy Head, Education Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands | n/a |
| Daniel Nkaada | Commissioner, Basic Education, Uganda | Developing Country Partners |
| H. E. Alim Hadidja Youssouf | Minister of Education, Cameroon | Developing Country Partners |
| Khampaseuth Kitignavong | Project Director, Deputy Director General of Pre-and Primary Education Department, Ministry of Education and Sports, Lao PDR, *Alternate for* Bounpanh Xaymountry, Acting Director, General Department of Planning, Lao PDR | Developing Country Partners |
| Sally Gear (November 5-6) | Education Advisor, Department for International Development, U.K. | Donor Partners |
| Vigdis Cristofoli | Senior Advisor, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, Norway | Donor Partners |
| Fanny Gazagne | Officer Education and Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France | Donor Partners |
| Imad Sabi | Program Officer, Oxfam Novib | CSOs |
| Lara Patil | Global Education Research/Policy Manager, Intel | Private Sector/ Foundations |
| Jordan Naidoo | Senior Advisor, Education, UNICEF | Multilateral Agencies |
| Olav Christensen | Senior Public Finance Specialist, World Bank | Multilateral Agencies |
| **Secretariat Staff** | | |
| Margarita Focas Licht | Acting Country Support Team Lead | |
| Sven Baeten | Country Lead and CGPC Focal Point | |
| Johanna Van Dyke | Board Operations Officer | |
| Jean-Marc Bernard | Monitoring and Evaluation Team Lead (portion) | |
| Karen Mundy | Chief Technical Officer (portion) | |
| Charles Tapp | Manager, Partnerships and External Relations Team (portion) | |
| Douglas Lehman | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Hugues Moussy | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Aya Kibesaki | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Raphaelle Martinez | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Josephine Kiyenje | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Blandine Ledoux | Country Lead (portion) | |
| Edouard Lamot | Country Lead (portion) | |
| **Advisors and Observers** | | |
| Appolinaire Tchameni | Ministry of Education, Cameroon (advisor) | |
| Paul Valentin | Ministry of Education, Cameroon (advisor) | |
| Natalia Cherevatova | World Bank (observer) | |
| Atif Rafique | UNICEF (observer) | |