RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT # 2

For Decision

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is for the Board to review the overall GPE risk portfolio and endorse the updated Risk Management Matrix.

2. REQUESTED DECISION

2.1 The GERF requests that the Board of Directors approve the following decision:

BOD/2015/12-XX—Risk Management Report: The Board of Directors:

1. Notes the changes to the Risk Matrix and agrees to transfer the ownership of risks 1.1.2 and 1.2.3 from the Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC) to the Board;
2. Endorses the Risk Matrix, including revisions to the overall score of some risks and status of identified mitigations measures, as presented in BOD/2015/12 DOC 12Annex 1;
3. Requests the GERF to conduct an in-depth review of the full Risk Management Matrix at its next meeting, to ensure full alignment with the Strategic Plan and recommendations to strengthen the Operating Model, including the Operational Risk Framework, and report to the Board at its next meeting with any recommended adjustments to the Risk Policy and Matrix.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In December 2014 (BOD/2014/12-03), the Board adopted the Risk Policy and endorsed the "Risk Management Matrix with the understanding that it will be reviewed and revised semi-annually by the Secretariat and submitted for evaluation to the GERF and any material changes will be reported to the Board"

3.2. Per the Policy on Risk Management and related Risk Matrix, the GERF is responsible for overseeing risk management within the Global Partnership for Education ("Global Partnership" or GPE") and ensuring that progress is being made on implementing risk mitigation measures. It is also

responsible for working with the Secretariat to identify new risks as they arise along with associated risk mitigation measures.

3.3 During its meeting on November 5-6, 2015, the GERF reviewed the risk portfolio (GERF/2015/11 DOC 04 and DOC 04 Attachment 1) and additional inputs from the CGPC and the SPC. The GERF specifically noted that:

- ✓ since the adoption of the policy last year, significant progress has been achieved, noting that the whole partnership is working together towards mitigation of risks;
- ✓ the risk dashboard is a very useful tool enabling a quick assessment of the state and trend of risks. However, some GERF members stressed the need to further refine the tool to ensure the status and timing of key mitigation actions is clearer, and that the actions are for the partnership and should not just appears as if they are Secretariat workplan items.
- ✓ based on the fact that 20 out of 29 risks on the register are still assessed as Critical or High, there is a risk that contributing to the Partnership could be perceived as very risky by some donors that may not understand the extent of the mitigation actions planned or underway. Some members noted the need to consider improvements in how the risks are presented and whether an assessment of residual risk should be included in the matrix.
- ✓ There would be a need to spend considerable time reviewing each risk on the register at its next meeting to ensure alignment with the new Strategic Plan and the changes planned to strengthen the operating model.

3.4 Based on Secretariat assessment and recommendations from the SPC and the CGPC, the GERF decided to specifically draw to the attention of the Board for its consideration nine risks:

- 1.1.2 | Partner Commitments | "the risk that GPE Partners fail to deliver on commitments made in achieving GPE strategic plan objectives".

The SPC noted that if this risk is retained in the Risk Matrix after the new strategic plan is adopted, the Board would be best situated to own the risk and be accountable for it as it is fundamental to the Partnership. GERF requests the Board to take a decision whether the ownership of this risk should be reassigned or not.

- 1.1.3 | Monitoring Mechanisms |: "The risk that the Partnership is unable to monitor and demonstrate progress on Strategic Plan Objectives".

Given the extensive work on the strategic plan, consultations, outreach and feedback, the Secretariat considers that a strong foundation has been built to address this strategic risk, subject to the adoption

of the Strategic Plan and Results Framework. The GERF concurred with Secretariat analysis that this risk decreased from critical to medium.

- 1.2.4 | Operational modalities: The risk that GPE processes do not take sufficient account of the level of national capacity and the operating environment, particularly in conflict-affected states

The GERF noted that this risk remains critical but that the probability decreased due to the approved modifications to the Operational Model.

- 2.1.1 | Quality assurance process | The risk that GPEs quality assurance processes do not always detect poorly designed programs at country level (both in terms of substance and oversight) and ensure they are remedied.

With the operational risk framework being developed, a much more nuanced approach related to quality assurance depending on the country context will be implemented. The Secretariat also continue to strengthen up the Quality assurance by having finance staff now work with country leads.

- 2.1.4 | Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at country level |The risk that roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the GPE Secretariat, LEGs, CAs, Grant Agents in country are not clearly defined, understood and consistently applied.

Given the Board's adoption of decisions to strengthen GPE's Operational Model which will clarify roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at country level and given the focus on monitoring and evaluation, and the development of matrices on requirements of the New Funding Model, including on data, the Secretariat/CGPC considers that this risk has decreased from critical to high.

- 2.2.1 | Quality data | The risk that the Partnership is unable to capture reliable data to monitor and demonstrate performance of GPE grants, activities and ESP.

Given the focus on monitoring and evaluation, and the development of matrices on requirements of the New Funding Model, including on data, the Secretariat recommends to downgrade the overall risk from critical to medium.

- 3.1.1 | Donor pledges |: "the risk that donors fail to deliver on their current funding pledges"

The increasing trend is due to the fact that with the ongoing refugee crisis in Europe, one donor has recently communicated it will not be in a position to fulfill its original pledge and there is a risk that other donors may also seek to delay or backload their contributions. An additional factor in revising the rating is the ongoing lengthy negotiations in finalizing a contribution agreement between the

European Commission and the World Bank. GERF concurred with Secretariat assessment that this risk increased from medium to critical.

- 4.2.3 | Secretariat capacity: "The risk that the Secretariats technical capacity, organizational structure, financial, and human resources are not sufficient to deliver on the responsibilities assigned to it by the Board".

Following the implementation of Alison Evans' organizational review recommendations and given that the new positions approved by the Board have been substantially filled, the Secretariat capacity to deliver on tasks assigned by the Board has improved. However depending on the outcomes of the Strategic Plan, this risk will need to be closely monitored in 2016. The GERF concurred with Secretariat analysis that this risk decreased from critical to high.

3.5 Taking into account the GERF recommendations, the Secretariat has developed an Extract of the Risk Matrix (Annex 1) which includes short summaries of mitigation actions and explanations of the future direction of travel foreseen for the upcoming months. The future direction of travel indicates whether the risk rating is likely to change by the time of the next assessment based on the implementation of planned mitigation actions and/or other factors that may impact the assessment of risk. Three symbols are provided to indicate the future direction of travel; these are improving (↓) as the risk rating is likely to be lowered (i.e. from High to Medium), deteriorating (↑) as the risk rating is likely to be increased (i.e. from High to Critical), or stable (↔) to indicate no change in rating expected.

4. NEXT STEPS

4.1 At its next meeting, the GERF will review "in depth" the Risk Matrix and the Operational Risk Framework that will be developed by the Secretariat.

5. PLEASE CONTACT: Padraig Power (ppower@globalpartnership.org) or Christine Guetin (cguetin@globalpartnership.org) for further information.

6. ANNEX AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Annex 1: Updated extract of the Risk Matrix as of November 2015

References:

- ✓ Risk Management Report #2 (GERF/2015/11 DOC 04 and DOC 04 Attachment 1)
- ✓ Risk Policy (BOD/2014/12 DOC 04)
- ✓ Risk Management Report #1 (BOD/2015/05 DOC 17)

Annex 1 : Updated extract of the Risk Matrix as of November 2015

Severity Chart

Probability	Impact			
	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
Very Likely	Medium	High	Critical	Critical
Likely	Low	Medium	High	Critical
Possible	Low	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium

Definitions of Probability:

Very Likely – The risk is seen as certain to occur within the next 3 years.
Likely – The risk is seen as likely to occur within the next 3 years
Possible – The risk is seen as possibly occurring within next 3 years
Unlikely – The risk is seen as unlikely to occur within the next 3 years

Definitions of Impact:

Minor – The risk will not substantively impede the achievement of the objective, causing minimal damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work or to its reputation.

Moderate – The risk will cause some elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing potential damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.

Major – The risk will cause major elements of the objective to be delayed or not be achieved, causing likely damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.

Severe – The risk will cause the objective to not be achieved, causing serious damage to the Global Partnership's ability to carry out its work and to its reputation.

Direction of travel: indicates whether the risk rating is likely to change by the time of the next assessment based on the implementation of planned mitigation actions and/or other factors that may impact the assessment of risk. Three symbols are provided to indicate the future direction of travel; these are "**improving**" as the risk rating is likely to be lowered (i.e. from High to Medium), "**deteriorating**" as the risk rating is likely to be increased (i.e. from High to Critical), or "**stable"** to indicate no change in rating expected.

ID	1.0 STRATEGIC RISKS	Risk Owner	03-2015	11-2015	Future direction of travel
	1.1 Implementation of GPE strategic plan				
1.1.1	**Implementation Plan | The risk that the Board and Management have not developed a realistic and achievable implementation plan to support the achievement of Strategic Plan goals and objectives.** • The Board will take a decision regarding the new strategic plan and its implementation plan in December 2015. • Secretariat and SPC recommends to change the probability from likely to unlikely. The overall risk score would remain medium.	Board			Stable
1.1.2	**Partner Commitments | The risk that GPE Partners fail to deliver on commitments made in achieving GPEs Strategic Plan Objectives.** • Current strategic plan: difficult to monitor due to the lack of results framework in place. • New strategic plan: Partnership will be able to monitor under the Results Framework which will be presented to the Board in December 2015. SPC recommends that the Board owns this risk.	SPC/ BOARD			Stable
1.1.3	**Monitoring mechanisms | The risk that the Partnership is unable to monitor and demonstrate progress on Strategic Plan Objectives.** • The new strategic plan will include a theory of change, a results framework with indicators, targets and timelines to allow for improved monitoring and demonstration of progress during implementation. If the Board regularly monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan, the risk is less certain to occur in the next 3 years. • Secretariat and SPC recommends to change the probability trend from very likely to unlikely. This change would impact the overall risk score from critical to medium.	Board			Improving

1.1.4	**Mandate of GPE Secretariat/Board** | **The risk that Board members do not share a common agreement on the mandate of the Board and the Secretariat.** • Given extensive work on the strategic plan, consultations/outreach and feedback, the Secretariat recommends to change the probability from likely to possible. The overall risk will change from critical to high. • The Secretariat will continue to develop and monitor Board and Committee annual workplan	Board/ Secretariat		Improving
	1.2 Support to the education sector in developing countries			
1.2.1	**Support to Education Sector Plans** | **The risk that the partnership does not address the sustainability of education systems in Education Sector Plans** • FY 2015: The **monitoring and report on the implementation of the new Funding Model** has been included in the Portfolio Review. Ongoing monitoring of implementation progress will continue FY 2016. • FY 2015 **DCP constituency meetings** have served as a platform for collection discussion, decision making and information sharing. FY 2016: Proposal submitted to the Board to continue this work. • Secretariat is developing **technical assistance services and processes to develop credible Education Sector Plans** (piloting a cross-country knowledge/experience sharing approach, participation in the design of Capacity Development workshops together with UNICEF and Pole de Dakar). • GPE Secretariat Country Leads are working with countries planning to apply in 2016. • Secretariat will present to the Board options for **independent assessment of Education Sector Plans**. • A **Quality Assurance Review process** for ESPs is under development. • **Guidelines for transitional plan appraisal** are currently being developed.	CGPC		Stable
1.2.2	**Engagement strategy** | **The risk that GPE is unable to positively influence education budgets at country level** • Secretariat is working on detailing the **technical specifications of the Funding Model requirement on domestic** financing that will be the common ground for assessing and monitoring countries' commitments in the area. This will constitute the basis for elaborating methodological guidelines for domestic resource mobilization to be developed later in FY 2016.	DCPs		Stable
1.2.3	**GPE role in emergency/humanitarian crises** | **The risk that the partnership is unable to define its mandate in Education and Emergencies and Protracted Crisis (EEPC) in both GPE and non GPE member countries.**	SPC		Stable

	• Despite the relatively slow progress on defining the operational model for a Platform and Fund for EEPC, it's expected to be clearer towards end 2015 beginning of 2016. This would provide for GPE a better opportunity to define the Partnership's role within the Global context related to EEPC. Secretariat/SPC recommends to change the probability from possible to unlikely. • GPE is currently updating all operational guidelines on GPE support to Conflict Affected and Fragile States.				
1.2.4	**Operational modalities** | **The risk that GPE processes do not take sufficient account of the level of national capacity and the operating environment, particularly in conflict-affected states.** • Following up on October Board decision on strengthening the Operational Model (including developing an Operational Risk Framework for GERF review in 2016 to allow a more differentiated approach to quality assurance and monitoring in these contexts), significant work is planned to be completed by June, 2016. • 2015 Portfolio Review includes a section on how the GPE mechanisms have been applied in countries in crisis over the past year, highlighting strengths and weaknesses. Further work is planned in 2015/16. • Guidelines for transitional plan preparation plan guidelines are currently being developed. They would provide guidance on how to develop credible TEPs and what are the key criteria that speak for the credibility of transitional plans.	Board			Improving

ID	2.0 PROGRAMMATIC RISKS	Risk Owner	03-2015	11-2015	Future direction of travel
	2.1 Program Implementation and oversight				
2.1.1	**Quality Assurance Process - The risk that GPEs quality assurance processes do not always detect poorly designed programs at country level (both in terms of substance and oversight) and ensure they are remedied.** • The probability of the risk will decrease with the full implementation of the **new** (for ESPs) and **strengthened** (programs) **quality assurance processes**. • The quality assurance process for programs (QAR 1 and 2) has been revised to comply with the new funding model. The process to strengthen the quality assurance process for programs (QAR 1, 2 and 3) is ongoing and will be finalized in December 2015. • The revision of the methodology to assess the quality of ESPs has been finalized.	CGPC			Stable
2.1.2	**Grant Agents Oversight - The risk that Grant Agents are not always providing effective oversight.** • A process has been adopted for review of Grant Agents progress reports on grant implementation Current strategic plan: difficult to monitor due to the lack of results framework in place. • A mechanism is being rolled out for **quarterly joint** Secretariat/agency management **review of grant portfolio by regions** for the World Bank, at the global level for UNICEF and on a biannual basis for SEs managing 1-2 grants • Board decided in Oct. 2015 that the Secretariat work with the Grant Agents to complete the **review against the minimum standards** to all Grant Agents and report to GERF at its first meeting in 2016.	Grant Agents			Stable
2.1.3	**Program Implementation Timeline - The risk that grant objectives are not achieved within the expected implementation period.** • Secretariat is analyzing root causes for delays in program implementation. The disbursement and implementation status of all grants active during FY15 was analyzed and follow-up actions proposed for the FY 15 Portfolio Review. A process has been adopted for review of Grant Agents progress reports on grant implementation to provide feedback and propose follow-up actions, and rollout has started.	DCPs			Stable

	• A mechanism is being rolled out for **quarterly joint** Secretariat/agency management **review of grant portfolio by regions** for the World Bank, at the global level for UNICEF and on a biannual basis for SEs managing 1-2 grants. • New ESPIG policy has strict rules on grants start date. • GPE is currently monitoring at risk grants and other priority grants to focus on implementation progress and to identify from Grant Agents progress reports issues requiring follow-up grants.				
2.1.4	**Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at country level - The risk that roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the GPE Secretariat, LEGs, CAs, Grant Agents in country are not clearly defined, understood and consistently applied.** • Secretariat/CGPC considers that this risk has decreased from critical to high Board agreed to increase emphasis on monitoring through a new GPE M&E Strategy. An interim approach will be ready by December with a more comprehensive approach agreed in June 2016. • Successful Implementation of the Operational Model recommendations designed to specifically address this issue is likely to allow a further reduction in this risk.	Board			Improving
2.1.5	**New Funding Model- support to countries - The risk of disruption in GPE activities due to problems in the implementation of the new funding model.** • Country Level Process Guide updated to reflect the new funding model. • The country support team is at full capacity in terms of country leads and operations officers, enabling closer work with countries through fewer countries per person. • Paper on application of variable part for grants under 5 million USD approved by the CGPC. • The Board approved in October that the Secretariat develop a **standardized grant reporting format**, to include agreed indicators, strengthen country-level development partners' **understanding of the implementation of the funding model**, further clarify funding model requirements, enhance GPE **emergency response mechanisms** and cover key elements of the strengthened operational model in future portfolio reviews.	Secretariat			Stable
2.1.6	**Implementation Modalities - The risk that a country cannot** identify a Grant Agent • The work on the circumstances in which GPE could operate without a Grant Agents is scheduled for completion by June 2016.	Board			Stable

	2.2	**Data and Results**			
2.2.1	**Quality Data - The risk that the Partnership is unable to capture reliable data to monitor and demonstrate performance of GPE grants, activities and ESP.** • Secretariat recommends to downgrade the overall risk from critical to medium because new systems and safeguards are being established. • Internal capacities have been strengthened at the Secretariat. Cross-team efforts to secure, strengthen, monitor, and define indicators and framework. • Quality assurance of Education Sector Plans have been strengthen. • M&E will be strengthen to include the development of a menu of input level measurements to better capture the use of GPE grant resources.	DCPs | Grant Agents			Improving
2.2.2	**Program Implementation Modality - The risk to GPE that by not using government systems, GPE will not realize sufficient progress in the sector.** • Current work to develop Quality Assurance in ESP development which will include focus on aid effectiveness and modalities. • Secretariat is working on lessons learned of choices of modalities and Grant Agent to improve GPE guidelines and support services to country partners. • The FY15 Portfolio Review includes an overview of use of government systems by grant, and this information is now including in the grant application format to ensure discussions on implementation modalities are held and reported on. • A updated desk review of program modalities was conducted for the FY 15 Portfolio Review building on the method developed and assessment provided in the FY 14 Portfolio Review. • The work to explore the circumstances in which GPE may operate without a Grant Agent is currently scheduled to be completed by June 2016.	Board			Stable

2.2.3	**Grant Management - The risk to GPE that poor performing grants are not all detected and remedied in a timely manner.** • Secretariat notes that the risk is still likely to occur within the next 3 years because of the nature and complexity of the grant portfolio and the fact that a large portion of these grants are executed under very difficult circumstances. The Secretariat is making efforts to better detect poor performing grants and to work with partners to restructure these grants. However the risk remains that these actions may not significantly improve overall grant performance. • Review of **Grant Agents progress reports** underway throughout the year on **grant implementation** to provide feedback and propose follow-up actions. Quarterly management review meetings with agencies managing multiple grants and biannual meetings with those managing 2 or less being established. • GPE Strategic Plan Results Framework will help establish **minimum standards for sector plan and grant program performance**, on which basis CST and SPP will monitor performance and propose corrective actions as needed. • Operational Model includes **minimum standards for LEGs, ESPs and Programs** and **conflict resolution mechanism.** • ESPIG Policy approved by the Board in May 2015 includes reporting **requirements and sanctions in cases of non-performance** and tightened deadlines for signing and implementation of grants.	CGPC			Stable

ID	3.0 FINANCIAL & FIDUCIARY RISKS	Risk Owner	03-2015	11-2015	Future direction of travel
	3.1 Available Resources				
3.1.1	**Donor Pledges - The risk that donors fail to deliver on their current funding pledges.** • GERF concurred with Secretariat assessment that this risk increased from medium to critical. • Some of the traditional donors will **not be giving expected top ups** to their pledges due to the ongoing refugee crisis in Europe. For ex. one donor has cut its pledge by 1/3. • Pledge Monitoring performed monthly within the Secretariat and incorporated within the Financial Forecast. • Contribution Agreements have been signed with 16 out of 20 Donors that	Donors			Stable
3.1.2	**DCPs Pledges - The risk that some DCPs fail to deliver on their current pledges.** • Secretariat is working on a way to capture domestic funding commitments. Ongoing Secretariat effort to define a methodology to track country pledges based on regular dialogue with countries. Secretariat will develop a Methodological Guidelines for Domestic Resource Mobilization. • Ongoing Development of the methodology of a Corporate indicator on domestic financing	DCPs			Stable
3.1.3	**Alternative Funding - The risk that GPE fails to attract alternative sources of funding or additional funding.** • Strategic Finance Paper, theory of Change and Results Framework will be presented for a Board decision in December 2015. • Options for **new funding modalities** have been included in the strategic planning process, if those are accepted, this could be an alternative source of funding. • Continuous engagement with non-traditional donors as a mid to long term strategy and possibly not for this replenishment period. • Corporate Alliance Guidelines have been developed and will be presented at	Board			Stable

3.1.4	**Liquidity - The risk that the GPE Fund has insufficient funds and liquidity to meet its current and planned funding obligations.** • Financial Forecast for consideration at Board December 2015 meeting with recommendations on prioritization of resources. • Limited scope for substantial change with donors, however GPE actively discussing with World Bank possibilities for hedging including the potential development of a new World Bank policy in 2016.	Board			Stable
3.2	**Fiduciary**				
3.2.1	**Fraud and Misuse - The risk that significant GPE funds are diverted from their intended purpose through fraud or other forms of misuse.** • M**inimum standards for Grant Agents** will include ability to deal with fraud and misuse, including investigations, and protection of whistleblowers. • GPE Secretariat has strengthened its capacity in this area through recruitment of two financial management specialists to support this aspect of the work in quality assurance reviews and monitoring of GPE grants. • All new grant applications reviewed by the Secretariat will ensure that the implementing agencies have **strong quality assurance and fiduciary control systems** in place, including on anti-corruption and fraud prevention. • All Staff trained on World Bank **procurement policies**	DCPs | Grant Agents			Stable

ID	4.0 GOVERNANCE & MANAGEMENT	Risk Owner	03-2015	11-2015	Future direction of travel
	4.1 Decision making process				
4.1.1	**GPE Decision Making Process - The risk that GPE decision making is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.** • Board approved in May 2015 to delegate authority to the Country Grants and Performance Committee to approve material changes to grants, as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, and to approve accelerated funding for emergency and early recovery activities (in accordance with the Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations); • Governance decision making process will be reviewed as part of the overall governance	GERF			Stable
4.1.2	**Grant Decision Making Process - The risk that GPE decision making with regard to grants is not made in an efficient and timely manner, therefore having a potentially negative impact on GPE operations.** • Board approved in May 2015 to delegate authority to the CGPC to **approve material changes to grants** and **to approve accelerated funding for emergency and early recovery activities**; • The GERF, in consultation with the CGPC, will review the implementation of this delegation of authority and report to the Board at its next governance review. • Secretariat will start to explore with Grant Agents business processed and incentives that can be adjusted in order to expedite commencement of newly approved grants. It is expected that the strengthened Operational Model will determine how this can be done.	CGPC			Stable
4.1.3	**Risk Management - The risk that Board and Management do not systematically take risk into consideration while taking decisions.** • Secretariat is monitoring information related to each risk and updating the status of mitigation actions through the **Risk Dashboard.** This information is reviewed and analyzed by the Leadership Team in terms of overall risk score, effectiveness of actual mitigation actions and direction of travel. • Secretariat present **semi-annual reports** to Standing Committees and to the Board for recommendation.	Board/Secretariat			Stable

	• A "**culture of risk**" has been continuously developed within the Secretariat and the Leadership Team pay an increasing attention **to the quality of the risk analysis** in all Board/Committee documents. • The Board requested the **development of an Operational Risk Framework to be embedded within the GPE's Risk Policy** to guide how GPE adopts a differentiated risk based approach to quality assurance and monitoring of its country programs, to be delivered by June 2016				
4.1.4	**Board Governance responsibilities - The risk that some Board members do not understand their governance responsibilities.** • All new Board and Committee members received an induction package with all core governance documents • Board Support Team provides support and offer individual training/support to Board and Committee members. • The quality of the service currently provided by the Secretariat will be evaluated through	GERF			Stable
	4.2 Functioning and mandate of Secretariat				
4.2.1	**Media Exposure - The risk that GPE does not have sufficient capabilities to deal with a serious media crisis.** • Draft protocol to handle a media crisis under preparation • Review by communications strategy implementation task team	Secretariat			Stable
4.2.2	**World Bank- Secretariat hosting arrangement - The risk that the Secretariat may become less effective and efficient due to operational challenges of the hosting arrangement and the current restructuring within the World Bank.** • The relationship with the current VP is very collaborative and solutions have been found to any issues arising with relative ease.	Secretariat/The World Bank			Stable
4.2.3	**Secretariat capacity - The risk that the Secretariat's technical capacity, organizational structure, financial, and human resources are not sufficient to deliver on the responsibilities assigned to it by the Board.** • Work plan is fully functional, including monthly updates from over 30 different secretariat staff covering each of the more than 100 activities. GPE Leadership Team each month reviews a summary report highlighting outcomes and trends from the work plan updates • Organizational Review completed. Secretariat capacity issues is currently addressed by all the hiring done. • Secretariat conducted a staff progress survey in March/April which included some questions about prioritization and work-life balance.	Board/ Secretariat			Improving