REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS JUNE 14-15, 2016 OSLO, NORWAY

INTRODUCTION

The agenda for the Board meeting can be found on the Global Partnership for Education's (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.

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016

The Board chair, Julia Gillard, called the meeting to order at 8:40am.

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

1.1 The Board chair welcomed meeting participants and thanked the government of Norway for hosting the meeting, and all its work to advance education. She announced that Ms. Tone Skogen, State Secretary in the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, would offer some opening remarks later that morning. The Board chair thanked Secretariat staff for their hard work in preparing the meeting.

Meeting Objectives and Outcomes

1.2 The Board chair noted the agenda had been revised to remove several items from the consent agenda at the request of Board members. These included the allocation of education sector program implementation grants (ESPIGs) in round 1 of 2016; the proposed revision to the Burundi ESPIG, the minimum standards for local education groups (LEGs), and the conflict-resolution procedures. These items were included on the agenda for discussion and decision on the last day of the meeting.

Approval of Consent Agenda (BOD/2015/12 DOC 02)

1.3 The Board chair reviewed the items on the consent agenda and asked for any final objections. Hearing none, she deemed the consent agenda approved.

1.4 The following decisions were approved:

BOD/2016/06-01—December 9-10, 2015 Board Meeting Report: The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Dakar, Senegal on December 9-10, 2015 (BOD/2016/06 DOC 03).

BOD/2016/06-02—March 9, 2016 Board Meeting Report: The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors via audioconference on March 9, 2016 (BOD/2016/06 DOC 04).

BOD/2016/06-03—Trustee Budget: The Board of Directors approves the estimated administrative expenses of US$399,000 for trustee services for the period of July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2017.

BOD/2016/06-04—<u>Financial Procedures Agreement</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves the proposed modifications to the standard Financial Procedures Agreement (FPA) as set out in Attachment 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 10 and requests that the trustee and all grant agents finalize the updated FPAs as expeditiously as possible.
2. Requests contributors to the GPE Fund that may wish to conduct a review or verification of activities financed with GPE funds to make best available efforts to plan, coordinate and conduct such reviews or verifications in a way that limits the burden on grant agents.
3. Delegates authority to the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee to approve all changes to the standard Financial Procedures Agreement that impact contributors' rights, provided that:
   a) The Board receives two weeks advance notice of the proposed modification.
   b) No requests have been received prior to the GERF meeting from any Board or alternate Board members requesting that the issue be considered formally by the Board.
   c) The trustee has been consulted and is in agreement with the change.
4. Delegates authority to the Secretariat to approve all other changes to the FPA, provided the trustee has been consulted and is in agreement with any changes.

1.5 The Board chair requested to insert in the Board meeting summary the statement by the Board representative from UNICEF on the revised FPA made the previous day during the Board retreat. The statement included that UNICEF did not object to the proposed revision and welcomed the continued commitment and financial contribution to GPE, recognizing the revised FPA had facilitated the receipt of funds from the European Commission (EC) by GPE. However, she expressed concerns about donor access rights in respect of the broader implication for multi-donor trust funds. UNICEF would monitor implementation of the new clause in the FPA and bring any undue burden on grant agents and countries to the attention of the EC and the Secretariat.

2. REPORT FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (BOD/2016/06 DOC 11)

2.1 The CEO, Alice Albright, introduced her presentation and noted that GPE has concluded a period of more than 18 months of strategy work and the focus is now on implementation. The presentation focused on GPE's current position and looked ahead to define priorities.

2.2 The CEO highlighted that GPE has become a strong and thriving partnership which has evolved in size, reach and depth, while steadily making progress on core work. GPE is shifting gear from design to implementation of the reform agenda and the key challenge will be to manage growth and secure resources to match the level of ambition in GPE 2020.

Update on Key Areas: Fragile and Conflict-Affected States and Gender Equality

2.3 The CEO emphasized the importance of addressing the needs of children impacted by conflict and fragility in line with for GPE's goals of equity and inclusion. In addition, GPE has become a significant funder of education in countries affected by fragility and conflict: 28 GPE developing country partners are considered fragile or conflict-affected. These countries account for an increasing proportion of GPE expenditure.

2.4 GPE's operational framework for effective support in fragile and conflict affected states provides a starting point for coordination and allows for repurposing of grants, for example in South Sudan, Yemen, Burundi and Sierra Leone. In addition, GPE has the ability to accelerate financing for countries with announced GPE allocations; Central African Republic, Chad, Somalia and Yemen are examples of countries where accelerated funding was applicable. The CEO also highlighted the role that GPE plays in bridging the humanitarian and development divide. The Secretariat would later

present on the business case and propose an approach to engaging with Education Cannot Wait (ECW) that draws on the strengths of existing GPE support for education in crises and emergencies.

2.5 Gender equality will be at the heart of GPE's work given the multiple barriers to girl's education. GPE 2020 addresses gender equality through three main areas of our work. Firstly, through gender-sensitive sector analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring. Secondly, the results framework disaggregates all data by gender, and lastly, the Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange Strategy and the Gender Equality Policy, Strategy and Action Plan that both target gender equality in education.

Strengthening GPE to Deliver

2.6 Over the last two years, GPE has pursued a comprehensive reform agenda and is now shifting to focus on implementation. Reforms have focused on the operational model, risk management and governance and there has been progress across all three areas with corporate and grant-level risk frameworks being developed. In addition, seven countries have accessed support through the funding model launched in 2015 and 35 countries are in the pipeline in 2016 and 2017. She highlighted three key lessons learned so far from implementing the funding model: (1) engage early, (2) flexibility, and (3) the importance of sufficient domestic financing. Lastly, the monitoring and evaluation framework which includes the results framework forms GPE's first partnership-wide results framework and gives GPE the tools to track, monitor and report progress.

Misuse of Funds

2.7 The deputy manager for the Country Support Team (CST) gave an update on current cases on misuse of funds. These include Benin, Liberia, Madagascar and an ongoing investigation in a country (Country Case A) that cannot yet be named due to the need to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the ongoing investigation. The Secretariat reported that the government of Benin has repaid the funds, Liberia is awaiting formal ruling on eligibility, and Madagascar has made a formal commitment to repay. The Secretariat will continue to monitor these cases on a regular basis and follow-up with grant agents if reasonable progress is not being made to resolve the case. An update will be provided to the GERF and Board at each face-to-face meeting.

2.8 Final investigation reports for these cases produced by grant agents will be examined for lessons learned, and recommendations will be made accordingly to modify policies, or approach to quality assurance and monitoring, or to the operational risk framework.

2.9 The presentation also outlined the framework for protection and good stewardship of GPE funds. The first level is based on the strong fiduciary procedures of grant agents. The second level involves legal agreements in place between grant agents and member governments and other implementers. The third level is the specific measures being taken by the Secretariat. The Secretariat also highlighted the operational risk framework which will allow a significantly more detailed dive into risk identification, assessment, and mitigation, including risks around the stewardship of GPE resources. In particular, the operational risk framework will specifically examine the risk of fraud and misuse on individual GPE grants and will seek to identify the risk factors that drive a particular risk, for example grant agent capacity in the country context

Discussion:

2.10 Board members raised the question of GPE outgrowing its governance and referenced capacity issues and organizational reform in light of the Evans Report in 2016. Several other Board members highlighted the need to reflect fragility and gender in core indicators and welcomed the work on gender equality, others mentioned the need to focus on donors and replenishment, tracking domestic financing and impact of GPE grants.

2.11 The CEO highlighted the M&E strategy will help the partnership to better understand GPE's impact and noted that the planned country case studies will also look at performance. The Secretariat noted that the Results Framework methodology for tracking domestic financing is included in the Board paper.

2.12 Regarding misuse of funds, a number of Board members inquired about the length of time to resolve issues. For example, the Madagascar case took three years to resolve. It was also noted that if Country A is among the three country grants being presented for approval, the Board would not approve the grant application and it would be important for the Secretariat to notify the Board as soon as the misuse is confirmed. The CEO responded that Country Case A is not among the countries applying for a grant. She concurred timely reporting of misuse cases was important, and that the policy required informing the Board via email when alleged misuse was confirmed and a special Board audioconference would be arranged if needed. A discussion followed on how partners collaborated on audit procedures and how UNICEF looked at other funds flowing through the program to strengthen oversight, and there was an elaboration of the World Bank's investigation unit (INT). The Secretariat added risk of misuse of funds is factored into the operational risk framework and would have meetings with all grant agents to discuss key issues including ongoing cases of misuse.

3. REPORTS FROM THE GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, RISK AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

3.1 The chair of the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance committee (GERF) and the Secretariat presented the recommendations from the GERF on the financial forecast and risk management, and GERF items not for decision.

Financial Forecast and Approval of Maximum Country Allocations (BOD/2016/06/ DOC 12)

3.2 Minister Manigat, GERF Chair introduced the financial forecast which the chief finance and operations officer presented as set out in DOC 12. The forecast provided for sufficient funds for ESPIGs in Round 1 of 2016 and maximum country allocations announced previously, but not enough to announce new indicative allocations. While no further reductions were anticipated, he noted that a further strengthening of the US dollar and the impact of the ongoing refugee crisis in Europe could lead to a further reduction in available resources and trigger additional prioritization measures and even delay the approval of grant allocations in 2017. The outcome of the UK referendum on whether to remain in the European Union could also affect available resources given its potential to weaken the value of sterling.

3.3 The Secretariat added that the revision to the FPA approved by the Board had positively impacted the forecast as it enabled the EC to pay its pledged contribution in a timely manner. Appreciation was also extended to Australia for front-loading their contribution, and to Norway, and Sweden for moving to pay their contributions mid-year, rather than year-end.

3.4 To address the concentration of risk in the donor base, the CEO called for greater diversification of donors and new types of financing and funding mechanisms in order to be able to increase the level of resources to meet the demands on GPE from its 65 developing country partners.

Discussion:

3.5 Comments from Board members included that not only donors should be called to fulfill their pledges, but also developing country partners (DCPs) and other partners.

3.6 There being no further comments or questions, the Board chair concluded there was consensus on the decision with the amendment.

Decision:

3.7 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-05—<u>Financing Options</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Notes that while additional prioritization measures are not currently anticipated, there is no scope to provide additional indicative allocations at this stage.
2. Calls on all partners to intensify their efforts to secure additional financing through the GPE Fund and on donors, developing country partners and other partners to fulfill their pledges in a timely manner.
3. Noting the risk to GPE's liquidity, calls on those donors that are in a position to do so to advance the timing of their contributions to the GPE Fund.
4. Requests that the GERF conduct a review of the forecast of available resources at its next face-to-face meeting in 2016, and, if possible, that it make recommendations for Board decision on potential positive adjustments to the maximum country allocations for eligible countries affected by the prioritization measures, and on the resources available for the general provision.

Risk Management Report (BOD/2016/06 DOC 13)

3.8 The GERF chair presented the risk management report, set out in DOC 13. He called for the need to build trust within the partnership through robust risk management tools at the global level, combined with better governance and financial management tools at the country level.

3.9 The GERF chair highlighted that the revised matrix includes inherent, residual and target risks and was fully aligned with the strategic plan, the operational model, and the Secretariat work plan. He noted that additional mitigation measures were needed to sufficiently address all the risks and that implementation of the mitigation measures would need to be funded at a sufficient level.

3.10 The Chief Finance and Operations Officer presented the GPE Operational Risk Framework (ORF) set out in BOD/2016/06 DOC 13 Annex 3. Whereas the corporate risk framework considers the overall portfolio, the ORF considers each country and sector grant separately with the purpose of having a differentiated risk-based approach for quality assurance and monitoring of grants. The ORF would be used primarily by the Secretariat to determine where to deploy its resources and identify areas to strengthen or where processes are too heavy. Based on the particular risk assessment, the Secretariat would determine the level of risk management. The Secretariat emphasized the importance of a consistent approach in assessing and managing risk. Risk Management Plans for critical and high risk grants would be approved and monitored by the Secretariat Leadership Team, and lower medium-risk grants by the CST Manager. While overall risk scores would be made public, the detailed assessments themselves would not, to ensure the assessment of risk was robust and not hindered by concerns of offending partners through publicizing sensitive information. The information however would of course be made available to reviewers should there be an external examination of the application of the ORF.

3.11 The Secretariat had consulted with the CGPC and GERF on the ORF and both committees strongly supported the approach. The Committees agreed that the overall risk rating by country, sector and grant be made publicly available to inform the LEGs, and to include the ratings in the Secretariat's quality assurance review of ESPIG applications. The Committees further agreed that duplication of existing risk management mechanisms of grant agents in managing risk should be avoided, while the Secretariat would review grant agent mechanisms to ensure they were satisfactory.

3.12 The CEO added that the Secretariat would be careful not to create additional burden for countries, and that it would assess the functionality of the ORF to ensure it is fit for purpose.

Discussion:

3.13 Comments from Board members included an appreciation for the significant progress made in addressing the critical areas of risk, and strong support for the ORF and continued work on mitigation measures and additional actions to reduce the risks, particularly with a view to the upcoming replenishment.

3.14 Two Board members expressed discomfort with the identified risk levels at country level and GPE tolerance of these levels. It was suggested the Board spend significant time on risk appetite and target risk levels at its next face-to-face meeting. It would be important to provide a rationale for each risk and its target, along with the related mitigation measures and transaction cost to lower the risks. Additional suggestions included integrating the ORF in the quality assurance framework with respect to grant applications and grant management, including tracking of domestic financing; in the event of a major risk level, the Board might consider not approving an allocation until the risk level has improved sufficiently and the decision language might reflect this process.

3.15 On the risk ratings, the Board member representing the World Bank noted a discrepancy between WB and GPE risk ratings. While acknowledging GPE operated in fragile contexts, the WB had rated its education portfolio, including approximately two-thirds of GPE grants, as moderately high risk while GPE rated its portfolio as high risk.

3.16 In implementing the ORF, Board members emphasized building on existing mechanisms and avoiding duplication of risk management systems of grant agents, while ensuring they meet GPE standards. An increase in transaction costs at the global and country level should also be avoided. To this end, clear CST operational guidelines for following up on risk assessments is needed, including roles and responsibilities, with carefully sequenced activities. This would also mitigate the risk of undermining capacity in difficult places.

3.17 The Secretariat responded its risk ratings had been reviewed by the committees but acknowledged there was a communication challenge to explain the ratings. In terms of increased transaction cost, the Secretariat noted this is the result of not accepting certain levels of risk. It noted that many risks had been categorized as yellow instead of green because the impact if the risk occurred would be severe. For example, the impact of major cases of fraud. GPE would need to focus on lowering the probability of fraud happening. However, even with additional spending on mitigation actions, fraud may still happen and the context would need to be considered. Mitigation actions would need to be tested in a way that does not impose transaction costs and sufficient time allowed to see how they evolve. With regard to additional ideas for mitigation actions, the Secretariat could develop these but they could increase risks for others. A Board member noted the importance of seeking to take actions that would reduce the impact if a risk was to occur and not only the probability of it occurring.

3.18 With regard to grant agent capacity, a Board member noted that the robustness of grant agent presence at country level varies and asked how the Secretariat cooperated with country-level grant agent staff and relied on their knowledge and information. The Secretariat acknowledged grant agent capacity varies and the ORF would provide a better understanding of that.

3.19 Other suggestions included to involve the LEGs in managing sector-level risk, addressing any mal-functioning of individual LEGs and mitigating LEG-related risks, and to leverage knowledge and lessons learned at country level. The Secretariat concurred the LEGs are important in mitigating sector-level risks and country leads would be assessing and mitigating risks in collaboration with LEGs.

3.20 One Board member recommended that, given the correlation between educational resilience and social cohesion, the Board discuss supporting governments in strengthening education systems through conflict and risk analysis and conflict-sensitive and gender-sensitive programs.

3.21 With regard to the risk of insufficient domestic financing, a Board member suggested requiring countries allocate 4-6 percent of GDP to education, in addition to allocating 20% of the national budget.

3.22 The Board chair requested the Secretariat to work with interested Board members to develop revised language reflecting some of the key issues raised.

Decision:

3.23 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-10—Risk Management Report and Operational Risk Framework: The Board of Directors:

1. Notes that the revised risk matrix is fully aligned with the strategic plan and includes actions to strengthen the operational model.
2. Notes the changes to the risk matrix, including revisions to the overall score of some risks, as well as inclusion of both inherent risk and a target risk, update on current mitigations actions, and addition of mitigation actions, as presented in BOD/2016/06 DOC 13 Annex 2.
3. Requests the Secretariat to review the proposed risk matrix to strengthen it, including reviewing the appropriateness of risk owners, risk levels, and mitigating actions to lower the target risk levels that remain too high in many cases.
4. Endorses the proposed operational risk framework, as presented in BOD/2016/06 DOC 13 Annex 3, and requests the Secretariat finalize the sector and grant assessment templates, including the completion of risk factors, and complete the risk identification, assessment, and development of risk management plans for each critical and high-risk country in time for consideration by the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee (GERF) and the Country Grants and Performance Committee (CGPC) at their next meetings in 2016 and update the Risk Management Policy to include the incorporation of the operational risk framework.
5. Requests the Secretariat to update the CGPC and the GERF on the implementation of the ORF and the risk matrix for report to the Board at its next face-to-face meeting in 2016 for a full discussion and decisions on risk appetite and target risk levels.
6. Taking into account lessons learned from the first year of implementation of the ORF, the Secretariat will recommend to the relevant committee(s) any further revisions to the framework and associated policies for the Board's consideration in June 2017.

GERF Items not for Decision (BOD/2016/06/ DOC 14)

3.24 With regard to constraints/opportunities for GPE to act without grant agents or direct access, the Secretariat noted that the GERF had determined to continue the conversation but not to present a recommendation at this time, and that it would not be possible without the establishment of a legal entity for GPE. The issue of legal entity may be relevant in discussions on strategic financing and ECW, and therefore the GERF recommended the issue be considered as part of the work of the external firm that would be contracted to support this work.

3.25 With regard to GPE grant agents meeting minimum standards, the GERF found that while grant agents had the necessary policies and procedures that met the standards, these may not always

be applied consistently. The Secretariat clarified that the ORF would take this into account when assessing risks for individual grants.

4. REMARKS FROM TONE SKOGEN, STATE SECRETARY AT NORWAY MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

4.1 The Board chair welcomed Tone Skogan, state secretary at the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Board chair thanked Norway for hosting the Board meeting, noting its strong support for GPE and impressive leadership in education and work in driving the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity (Education Commission).

4.2 Ms. Skogen noted education is Norway's first priority in international development, having doubled its support to education and GPE in four years. She thanked the Board and Secretariat for addressing concerns identified in Norway's independent evaluation of GPE in 2015 by strengthening the operational model and creating a results framework. She welcomed in particular efforts in supporting capacity building and national systems, and the gender equality policy and action plan. Ms. Skogen expressed her hope that the report from the Education Commission later in the year would positively impact the GPE replenishment and alleviate the stagnation of international support to education.

5. REPORT FROM THE STRATEGIC FINANCING WORKING GROUP (BOD/2016/06 DOC 15)

5.1 The Secretariat took note of the productive discussion during the previous day's Board retreat regarding strategic financing. In particular, the Secretariat observed the Board's directive to the Strategic Financing Working Group (SFWG) as follows:

- Mandated the SFWG with delivering an ambitious, comprehensive Financing and Funding Framework (FFF).
- Encouraged SFWG to move forward with this important and timely work.
- Cautioned on the need for simplicity and ease of implementation.
- Suggested the SFWG look more at leveraging domestic financing.

5.2 The purpose of the presentation was to request the Board's approval regarding the timing of the next replenishment, revised reporting lines of the SFWG and approval of the SFWG work plan moving forward.

5.3 The Secretariat noted an appetite expressed by the Board for a greater level of ambition for the next replenishment. They also identified lessons learned under the current replenishment period, including a lack of alignment with the GPE strategic planning cycle. The SFWG, GERF and SPC recommended the next replenishment cover the period from 2018-2020, to align with GPE 2020. The timing of the next replenishment event, wherein the partnership would solicit financial and policy pledges from partners, was recommended to occur at the end of 2017 or by no later than quarter 1 of 2018. The reasons for the recommendation included: the necessity of ensuring robust targets, results report and pledge review; establishment and operationalization of the FFF; lead time needed to plan and execute a replenishment campaign; process for developing a robust business case for investing in GPE; and the need to wait on final ECW hosting decisions.

5.4 The Secretariat noted the extensive challenges of the SFWG reporting through the GERF and SPC committees, highlighting in particular the constraints of tight deadlines for producing separate reports to each committee on progress. The Secretariat requested the Board to approve the

SFWG report directly to the Board, while keeping the GERF and SPC informed of progress.

Discussion:

5.5 Board members noted the need for the new FFF to be assessed as a package to ensure an appropriate mix of mechanisms. Decisions on individual mechanisms should not be considered in isolation, with preference for a limited set of mechanisms and an accompanying cost-benefit analysis to further explain the rationale for the framework.

5.6 One board member reiterated that although progress had been made regarding mobilization of domestic resources for education, the partnership will need to ensure this potential is further leveraged for the next replenishment, and that credible pledges are made and monitored. Another DCP board member noted that GPE support could also be used as leverage for domestic resource mobilization. A request for clear reporting framework around all types of pledges was also made.

Decision:

5.7 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-06—<u>Preparing for the Next Replenishment</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Extends its appreciation to the Strategic Financing Working Group (SFWG) for its work to date and notes the indicative forward work plan.
2. Endorses the proposed approach to the design of an ambitious *Financing and Funding Framework* that includes a broader mix of funding mechanisms to help enable a more differentiated approach to GPE funding in order to achieve the goals and ambitions of GPE 2020, while also providing opportunities to mobilize additional financing from a wider range of sources.
3. Notes that the majority of GPE funding will continue to be directed to Education Sector Program Implementation Grants.
4. Agrees to the forthcoming replenishment covering a period of 2018–2020 to align with GPE 2020.
5. Agrees to the GERF recommendation of a replenishment campaign that concludes in Q4 2017 or Q1 2018.
6. In order to maximize the available time to complete its work, requests the SFWG report directly to the Board in November 2016.

6. REPORTS FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

6.1 The chair of the Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC) and the chief technical officer (CTO) presented the recommendations of the SPC on the GPE Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange (KGPE) Strategy and the Gender Equality Policy and Strategy and Action Plan.

Options and Costs for a Proposal to Strengthen Country Capacity in KGPE (BOD/2016/06/ DOC 16)

6.2 The Board chair introduced the presentation by reflecting on the October 2015 Board retreat where the Board asked the SPC to work with the Secretariat on a strategy for KGPE to drive knowledge exchange in the partnership. The Board chair introduced a proposal to do this pre and post replenishment. In order for the work to move forward, she asked that the Board consider accepting targeted financing for two identified areas of work. There would be safeguards for this initial targeted funding, and an indicative level of ambition for this work beyond replenishment.

6.3 The CTO gave an overview of GPE's significant investment in knowledge exchange to date, including the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program, the Sector Monitoring Initiative and DCP pre-Board meetings. The challenge with the GRA program was that it was separate from the core business model. The approach in this proposal is to use KGPE to strengthen sector planning, mutual accountability, sector dialogue, and better leverage GPE financing. A mapping of KGPE by other development organizations found that all make significant investments in knowledge exchange. There is a well-recognized gap between global evidence and capacity for using that evidence in national policy and planning. Furthermore, a recent benchmarking exercise conducted for the Oslo Summit last July showed low levels of ODA investment in knowledge exchange and research in education at three percent compared to over 20 percent in health.

6.4 The CTO outlined the three key domains of KGPE: i) strengthening sector planning, data and monitoring to support stronger systems, ii) improving learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning, and iii) improving equity, gender equality and inclusion. This will be a staged approach with the first stage involving continuing current GRA activities, mapping critical areas of demand, piloting a small number of initiatives and developing a plan for larger scale investments. She noted that foundations expressed a deep desire to contribute.

6.5 In terms of process and safeguards, the Board adopted safeguards in December 2015 and mandated the Secretariat to identify targeted financing for KGPE. The CTO mentioned the proposed additional safeguards. She also conveyed the SPC recommendation that the SFWG consider the indicative amounts for KGPE financing as part of replenishment fundraising, reflecting a broader level of ambition. Finally, the CTO shared the two proposed KGPE pilot initiatives: Assessment for Learning (A4L) and Better Early Learning and Development at Scale (BELDS).

Discussion:

6.6 Several Board members welcomed the paper and noted the important role that GPE could play as a broker of good practice and entry point for other constituencies to contribute to GPE. A number of Board members raised questions about the relevance of the initiatives to DCPs. Other Board members expressed support for funding global public goods in education through the KGPE initiatives.

6.7 Several Board members mentioned that the decision on scaling of funds seems premature and decision point 2 would benefit from the input of the SFWG. Regarding the five percent benchmark, some questioned the rationale for the five percent contributions from traditional bilateral donors and suggested this should be indicative but needs to be understood within the SFWG and overall budget. Other Board members raised concerns with the process for selecting other projects moving forward as well as GPE's niche and how this fits with the work of academia and think tanks etc.

6.8 The Secretariat clarified that there is clear appetite to keep KGPE activities going through 2016 based on the independent evaluation and strategic plan, and that it may make sense to agree to a five percent indicative placeholder amount for the SFWG to consider, with further exploration of appetite from private foundations to fund this work.

6.9 The Board chair asked the Secretariat to revise the decision language based on the discussion.

6.10 Later in the meeting, the Board chair presented the revised decision language. Responding to a question on the timing for the preliminary safeguards for targeted funding, the Secretariat clarified that this would be adopted and apply to any approved project submitted between now and December 2016, when permanent safeguards will be submitted for Board approval. The Secretariat also noted that the responsibility for ensuring that proposals complement rather than duplicate existing

activities implemented by other organizations rests with the Secretariat, in coordination with the SPC. All documentation would be made available to the Board.

Decision:

6.11 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-13—Proposal for Strengthening Country Capacity through Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange: The Board of Directors:

1. Endorses the broad goals and objectives in the Knowledge and Good Practice (KGPE) strategy set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 16, including the ambition to raise and allocate resources to knowledge and good practice exchange activities during GPE's next replenishment period.
2. Requests that the Strategic Financing Working Group consider the SPC recommendations to allocate a minimum 5% of disbursements to KGPE, and to consider the proportion which should be funded via targeted financing.
3. Approves the procedures and safeguards proposed for accepting targeted funding for KGPE initiatives from foundations and other donors on an interim basis for the period July 2016-December 2017, as set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 16, recognizing that these safeguards will be replaced by a comprehensive safeguards policy in December 2016.
4. Approves the pre-designation of two thematic initiatives for targeted financing for KGPE investments: Assessment for Learning (A4L) and Better Early Learning and Development at Scale (BELDS), as set out in Annex 2 and 3 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 16, assuring that the final proposals complement rather than duplicate other existing initiatives.
5. Approves the principle that all incremental costs, including for staffing, required for the development, management and monitoring of specific KGPE activities will be assessed and included in the costs of initiatives for consideration by the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee and approval by the Board.
6. Requests the Secretariat to develop a full case for Stage 2 (post-replenishment) investment in KGPE in three main areas of learning, equity and systems, drawing on lessons from Stage 1 investments and the Education Commission report. The case should be presented for review by the SPC and inform GPE's strategic financing work.

Gender Policy, Strategy and Action Plan (BOD/2016/06 DOC 17)

6.12 The SPC chair thanked the SPC and in particular the SPC working group on gender for developing the Gender Equality Policy, Strategy and Action Plan. The working group included external experts on gender, including representatives from UNGEI and Plan Canada. He noted a clear linkage between gender and GPE goals and objectives and that the SPC recommended the highest budget option on the grounds that it was needed to fully realize the action plan.

6.13 The gender policy responded in part to the recommendations of the Gender Equality Institutional Assessment (GEIA) that the Canadian government conducts for all its partners, including GPE. However, while the GEIA had framed the initial discussion on gender at the SPC, the SPC chair noted the gender policy was simply the right thing to do.

6.14 The CTO presented the policy, which focused on all forms of gender inequality, including boys as well as girls. She further noted that gender was one of the thematic areas of consideration in the KGPE strategy.

6.15 The Chair noted she had determined to consider the policy first and the budget item as part of the overall Secretariat budget discussion during executive session the next day.

Discussion:

6.16 The Alternate Board member representing the Canadian government congratulated GPE on the new gender policy. She noted that GPE had been unusually committed to the GEIA starting with a management response letter and followed by Board action. She said moving to a fairer and more adequate system did not mean an exclusive focus on girls' education, as the policy made clear. She proposed revised decision language to include progress on the policy and strategy in the annual results report rather than to report to the SPC and to mandate the Secretariat to prepare and present a multi-year work plan to implement the new gender policy.

6.17 Board members strongly supported the revised decision language and indicated a preference for Option 1 [high resource] in the Board paper, which included adding a fulltime gender specialist to the Secretariat staff, to fully support the implementation of the policy with ambitious interventions. Other comments included that the recommendation aligned with the GPE mission and objectives, and also responded to SDG #5 on gender equality. Board members concurred that gender equality issues affected girls as well as boys depending on country context.

6.18 It was suggested GPE further collaborate with partner organizations working on gender in order to harmonize initiatives and make real progress. It was also noted as critical that GPE look beyond the education sector in implementing the strategy and consider such factors as health barriers to gender equality and teacher education in order to raise awareness.

6.19 The Board member representing UNICEF noted GPE had collaborated with UNGEI since 2005, and had developed in collaboration with UNGEI and other partners the gender responsiveness tool, guidelines, and training. She suggested considering whether certain aspects of the work on gender could be involve other partners. The Secretariat noted that the action plan was envisioned to be implemented with a range of partners.

Decision:

6.20 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-07—<u>Gender Equality Policy and Strategy</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Notes the importance of gender equality in achieving GPE's mission.
2. Approves the Gender Equality Policy and Strategy 2016-2020, as set out in Annex 1 of BOD/2016/06 DOC 17.
3. Requests the resource implications of implementation of the Gender Equality Policy and Strategy beyond FY 2017 as part of the analysis of the external firm's report to the Board in December 2016 on resources and capacity required to deliver on GPE 2020.
4. Requests the Secretariat to report on the progress of the Gender Equality Policy and Strategy and related priorities in the annual GPE results report.

7. EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT (BOD/2016/06 DOC 18)

7.1 The Secretariat presented revised decision language based on the discussion on ECW that took place during the Board retreat.

Discussion:

7.2 Minor changes were made to the revised decision language, including explicitly stating that the SFWG and others will work with the Secretariat and the external firm to assess the business

case for ECW, and noting the process and timelines for determining a permanent host rests with the High Level Steering Group of ECW. The SPC chair noted ECW represents a key turning point in terms of increased global recognition and support for the importance of education in emergencies.

Decision:

7.3 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-08—Business Case to Host the Education Cannot Wait Platform: The Board of Directors:

1 Welcomes the launch of Education Cannot Wait (ECW), and mandates the Secretariat to work with UNICEF and partners in the design and development of ECW.

2 Confirms its interest in being considered as host of ECW, recognizing that the process and timeline for deciding a permanent host rests with the High Level Steering Group of ECW.

3 Recognizes that additional analysis and information will be required before the Board can take a final decision on nominating GPE to host ECW.

4 Requests the Strategic Financing Working Group and the Secretariat to work closely with the external firm to be hired to further explore the implication of hosting ECW as part of this work and to report back to the Board at its second face-to-face meeting in 2016.

8. REPORT FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Conflict-Resolution Procedures (BOD/2016/06 DOC 09)

8.1 Based on the Board deliberations the previous day, the Secretariat presented proposed revisions to the Conflict-Resolution Procedures. The revisions clarified that parties to the conflict should agree up front who would be responsible for documenting the progress, and that the Board could determine not to approve an allocation if the dispute involves GPE funding. Finally, the revisions clarified that in the event a grant agent is impacted, the relevant provisions in the FPA apply.

Discussion:

8.2 Suggestions included a minor word change for greater accuracy. There being no further comments, the Board chair deemed the Conflict-Resolution Procedures with revisions approved. The Secretariat would prepare a revised paper reflecting the changes.

Decision:

8.3 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-09—Conflict-resolution Procedures: The Board of Directors adopts the Conflict-resolution Procedures set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 09 Revision 1.

9. TONY BLAIR FAITH FOUNDATION GLOBAL PRINCIPLES AGAINST EXTREMISM

9.1 The Board chair alerted the Board that in her capacity as GPE Board chair she had received a request from Tony Blair for GPE to support the Faith Foundation campaign. The campaign works to provide practical support to counter religious conflict and extremism, including in education, in order to promote open-minded and stable societies. In response, she had sent a letter describing GPE's work in education sector planning and expressed a willingness to stay in touch on these issues and noted Blair's staff would be welcome to visit the Secretariat to learn more. She noted that any

request for formal endorsement by the Board would come through the normal course of Board operations.

The Board chair adjourned the meeting.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2016

The Board Chair called the meeting to order at 8:40am.

10. REPORT FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (BOD/2016/06 DOC 20)

10.1 The SPC Chair presented the M&E strategy set out in DOC 20. He noted that the M&E framework will be updated to reflect any revision to the results framework upon its finalization in October 2016.

10.2 The CTO presentation summarized the history of GPE's approach to evaluation which relied on retrospective country case studies and provided an overview of the proposed strategy. The proposal includes a set of cumulative evaluation products that lead to a summative evaluation. The GPE 2020 evaluation requires less resourcing than the past two evaluations. Regarding the results report and learning strategy, there will be a yearly report on the 37 indicators to the Board followed by a public-facing version. The strategy would be supported by a budget that would be discussed in executive session later in the meeting, as announced by the Board chair earlier.

Discussion:

10.3 Board members welcomed the strategy and noted its importance for GPE. Several Board members raised questions about the capacity at country level to implement the M&E strategy and also whether the 37 indicators will generate data annually considering varying capacity among countries. The CTO responded that the Secretariat will not release country disaggregated data in the first year and noted that the first results report would focus on baseline data. She said the Secretariat will consult with the partnership about how to disseminate and use country specific data over time. The SPC chair reinforced the point that the strategy provide overall accountability and implementation guidance and that the Secretariat is be open to how evaluations would be done in partnership with others at country level; and that decisions on thematic focus areas will be made on an iterative basis.

10.4 There was also a question about how the future evaluations would feed into programming. The CTO responded that prospective evaluations will be used to support learning about ongoing grants and activities – providing an opportunity to improve GPE's business model. All evaluation products will support GPE's investment decisions.

Decision:

10.5 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-11—<u>Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Strategy as set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 20.
2. Requests the Secretariat provide an annual results report to the Board, along with annual updates on the M&E Strategy at the second meeting of the Board each year.

11. RESULTS FRAMEWORK CORE INDICATORS (BOD/2016/06 DOC 10)

11.1 The Deputy CTO presented on the results framework, including a detailed presentation of the targets for the twelve core indicators which were being recommended for approval by the Board, as set out in DOC 19. Targets for the remaining 25 indicators will be presented to the Board for approval before the end of the year.

11.2 The Secretariat noted the guiding principle for development of the twelve core indicators was to utilize existing data from GPE partners, or data that is already collected at country level, in the interest of not overburdening DCPs. The Secretariat requested input from the Board regarding level of ambition, observing that most indicators will be disaggregated by gender and fragility. The intention is to "bend the curve" to achieve improvement over the historical trend for each indicator.

11.3 With regard to impact indicators, a key concern had been expressed regarding the availability of some data, particularly in the area of learning outcomes. The Secretariat noted that target-setting is unavoidably impacted by the availability of data and observed that indicators could remain flexible as more data becomes available over the next few years.

11.4 With regard to domestic financing for the education sector, the Secretariat noted it now has information for 42 DCPs, based on an innovative methodology, which has effectively expanded the baseline for the target. The target for the indicator takes into account country context and tracks movement toward improvement.

11.5 The Secretariat further noted the proposed adjustments procedures, observing that for some of the indicators historical data is not available and thus the targets may need to be adjusted as the Secretariat begins collected information. Minor adjustments to non-core indicators can be made by the Secretariat. For significant adjustment to non-core, or minor adjustments to core indicators, the Secretariat will submit proposed changes to the SPC for recommendation to the Board.

11.6 The Board chair clarified that the targets have been developed on the basis that GPE continues under the current financing paradigm. The Secretariat may bring the targets back for adjustment after the next replenishment to enable the Board to make calibrations against any new financing and funding arrangements.

Discussion:

11.7 Board members were generally supportive of the recommended targets for the core indicators, understanding the difficulty of finding balance between feasibility and ambition. Nevertheless, a few board members hoped to see higher ambition for a few of the targets, including the trained teacher ratio for example. The Secretariat observed that for some countries, this target is quite ambitious and for others there may be a need to re-examine the target in 2018 after the replenishment. One member cautioned on the need for proper sequencing, noting low ambition for processes but high ambition for what GPE produces. The Board member also raised a concern about the definition of trained teachers used. The Secretariat reinforced that the results framework target uses the internationally agreed UIS definition of trained teachers; and that it will come back to the Board for approval of any changes to these targets when SDG methodologies are adopted, to ensure that the definition raises and does not lower overall ambition.

11.8 A DCP Board member expressed hope that GPE would support governments to collect the relevant data, noting that for some indicators ministries would need to work collaboratively with other line ministries in order to accurately report on progress.

11.9 For future developments and additional non-core indicators, one Board member proposed bringing a range of targets that clearly demonstrate the relationship of each target to risk and feasibility would be useful. The Secretariat felt this request seemed reasonable, but reflected it would require further discussion.

Decision:

11.10 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-12—<u>Results framework Core Indicators</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves the milestones and targets associated with the core indicators set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 19 Revision 1.
2. Approves the procedures to adjust the results framework set out in BOD/2016/06 DOC 19 Revision 1.
3. Requests the revision of the results framework after the replenishment in 2018.
4. Mandates the Secretariat to finalize the milestones and targets for non-core indicators with high ambition by October 2016.

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION

12.1 The Board discussed the performance of the CEO and her reappointment, the Secretariat budget and work plan for 2017, including funding for the M&E strategy (DOC 20), and the Gender Equality Action Plan for 2017 (DOC 17); and continued its discussion of the governance review, including revisions to the charter (DOC 22). Unless otherwise noted, only Board members and alternates, and the Board and Committee Chairs were present.

CEO Performance and Reappointment

12.2 As the CEO's current term would expire in February 2017, the Board discussed the performance of the CEO. Board members expressed their appreciation to the CEO for a job well performed and accordingly recommended that the CEO be reappointed for a new three-year term.

12.3 The Board further agreed that the GERF should develop a performance appraisal process for the CEO to be presented to the Board for approval.

Decision:

12.4 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-14–<u>Appointment and Review of the Chief Executive Officer of the Global Partnership for Education</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Determines to offer Alice Albright a further appointment as CEO of GPE for three years commencing at the conclusion of her current contract in February 2017.
2. Notes that the CEO will continue under her current classification and employment arrangements and that the three-year term is in line with the usual appointment period for GPE staff.
3. Congratulates Alice on this re-appointment and looks forward to continuing the productive working relationship.
4. Requests the GERF to develop a CEO performance appraisal process and make a recommendation to the Board.

Secretariat Budget and Work Plan Fiscal Year 2017 (BOD/2016/06 DOC 23)

12.5 The CEO presented the Secretariat budget and work plan for FY17 set out in DOC 23. The CEO was joined by the other members of the Secretariat Management Team to provide additional details as requested by Board members.

12.6 With regard to the budgets to fund the M&E strategy and the gender equality action plan, the Board strongly favored the highest of the budget options set out in the respective Board papers (DOCs 17 and 20). It was noted that while the Secretariat budget itself is approved on an annual basis, the Board supported the higher cost multi-year M&E strategy set out in Option 1 of DOC 17 and this would be reflected in future Secretariat budget requests. For the gender equality action plan, the highest option approved by the Board included approval of one staff position. Going forward, the Secretariat would present the Board with an annual gender action plan and include in its annual budget request the funds required to implement this plan.

12.7 The Board agreed to increase the Secretariat headcount. Specifically, the Board agreed to four additional headcount to strengthen the Strategy, Policy and Performance team, including one gender specialist arising from the gender equality action plan, and three temporary staff to support the replenishment-related surge activities of the Partnerships and External Relations Team. The Board also noted that contingent on funding being identified for both the A4L and BELDS initiatives, one additional headcount for each initiative would be required and funded from such targeted contributions.

Decision:

12.8 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-15–Secretariat Work Plan and Budget: July 2016–June 2017: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves the core 12-month budget of the Secretariat of up to **US$ 24,223,000** for the period July 1, 2016–June 30, 2017. This amount includes US$805,000 for the Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy, US$480,000 for Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange, and US$372,000 for the Gender Equality Action Plan.
2. Approves a supplemental amount of US$ 594,000 for replenishment surge activities between July 1–December 31, 2016, and for three term-limited positions to support the replenishment in Fiscal Year 17.

Governance Review (BOD/2016/06 DOC 21)

12.9 The Board resumed its discussion on the governance review with the CEO and Secretariat Management Team present. The Board chair shared some perspectives on the topic and a rich and frank discussion with Board members followed.

12.10 There was broad support for the Chair to convene a small advisory group of Board members and Committee Chairs to consider GPE governance needs and to report back to the Board at its next meeting.

12.11 The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the decision language based on the deliberations for consideration by the Board later in the meeting during the open session.

13. REPORTS FROM THE COUNTRY GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE (BOD/2016/06 DOCs 06, 07)

13.1 The chair of the CGPC presented the Committee's recommendations on ESPIG allocations in round 1 of 2016 and the proposed revision to the Burundi ESPIG.

Allocations for ESPIGs Round 1 of 2016 (BOD/2016/06 DOC 06)

Prior to the discussion, the Board member representing the World Bank declared a conflict of interest as grant agent for all three ESPIG proposals.

13.2 The CGPC chair briefed the Board on the deliberations of the CGPC at its face-to-face meeting in April and summarized the grant proposals from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Malawi, and the Caribbean island states of Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and the CGPC observations and report-back items set out in DOC 06.

13.3 The DRC proposal supports ambitious and much-needed reforms in the area of quality and governance and is aligned with the ESP aimed at education quality and free primary education. Considering the difficult context in the country, the CGPC found the application robust and feasible. The Committee provided some observations and requested the DRC provide regular updates on its commitment to allocate 45 percent of the education budget to primary, and on the government's detailed plan to abolish school fees.

13.4 The Malawi proposal aligns interventions with efforts by other development partners for systemic change and aims to improve equity and quality of primary education service delivery in early grade levels with emphasis on improved accountability and functioning at the school level. Taking into consideration the significant challenges in the country, the CGPC had concluded the application was robust and feasible and included measures to mitigate the risks related to sustainability.

13.5 The CGPC chair noted that the Caribbean island states proposal is the first regional application coordinated by an intergovernmental organization and based on a regional education strategic plan. The approach significantly reduces transaction costs and consolidates resources for common issues. The program focuses on education quality and learning outcomes, teacher development, and improving school leadership. While the grant is exempted from the variable part, clearly it addresses the funding model dimensions of equity, efficiency and learning. The CGPC chair flagged that the supervision allocation exceeds the maximum due to the complexity of the grant.

Discussion:

13.6 Board members supported the grant applications and asked a few clarifying questions.

13.7 Clarification was requested on whether the Malawi application was based on recent sector analysis, and whether the indicator on learning outcomes was a true stretch at a 20% increase in pupil-teacher ratio when no baseline numbers were referenced. The Board member suggested the LEG monitor the actual impact on learning outcomes in those areas. The Secretariat noted the program appraisal document included the actual baseline and target numbers. With regard to sector analysis, the funding model allowed applications to be based on an existing or new ESP. Malawi had applied on the basis of the existing plan. While there had been no full sector analysis prior to developing the plan, additional analysis had been conducted and the program implementation plan was developed to strengthen the sector plan.

13.8 On the DRC application, one Board member asked how the funding model requirement of additionality was met. The Secretariat responded that the external financing is targeted to high-risk areas affected by conflict and only a small amount is channeled to the government's plan that builds capacity.

13.9 It was further suggested that countries affected by people movement and displacement, such as the DRC, might reflect this context in the application with GPE possibly considering providing a top-up grant. The Secretariat suggested the Board take the issue of displacement forward in the partnership in the planning stage at country level by addressing the issue in sector plans.

13.10 A discussion ensued on risk assessment. A Board member noted it considered DRC and Malawi as countries with significant risk and requested amending the decision asking the Secretariat to conduct risk assessments and develop risk management plans for the DRC and Malawi grants. Another Board member noted its constituency rated Malawi as medium-risk and suggested Malawi be exempted from the amendment. The Board chair noted that under the ORF, each country would be assessed regardless of individual donor rating and proposed the amendment include that the assessments of the DRC and Malawi under the ORF be prioritized.

13.11 The Board member representing the World Bank noted that each of the grants it supervises is assessed in accordance with the Bank's risk management framework and asked how the ORF assessment would be different.

13.12 The CGPC chair added that the CGPC also considers risk through its grant review methodology. He asked the Board to consider the number of risk assessments and how each of them provides added value. He further noted that the level of detailed technical questions from Board members on grant applications are more appropriately handled by the CGPC as the technical committee vetting the applications. He also advised the Board to finalize the items on the consent agenda before the meeting in order to be well prepared with technical experts present as needed.

13.13 The Board chair proposed revised decision language reflecting that the Secretariat prioritize a risk assessment and develop a risk management plan for the DRC and Malawi grants under the ORF and report back to the CGPC and GERF at their next meetings. Hearing no comments, she deemed the revised decision approved.

Decision:

13.14 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-16–<u>Approval of Allocations for Education Sector Program Implementation Grants</u>: The Board of Directors with respect to the applications submitted in the first round of 2016:

1. Notes compliance with the requirements for accessing the fixed part of the respective maximum country allocations, as described in the applications and summarized in Tables 1 in Annexes 2, 3 and 4 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 06 Revision 1.
2. Notes compliance of the applications of the Democratic Republic of Congo and Malawi with the incentives for accessing the variable part of the respective maximum country applications and approves the indicators on Equity, Efficiency, and Learning and their means of verification, as described in the applications and summarized in Tables 2 in Annexes 2 and 3 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 06 Revision 1.

3. Approves allocations from GPE trust funds for Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (ESPIGs), as described in the applications submitted in the first round of 2016, and summarized in Table 1 in BOD/2016/06-16 3 (c), subject to:
   a. Availability of funds.
   b. Board decision BOD/2012/11-04 on commitment of trust funds for ESPIGs in annual installments.
   c. CGPC recommendations for funding include (all amounts in US$):

Table 1: Application Summaries and CGPC Allocation Recommendations of ESPIGs in US$:

	Country	**Democratic Republic of Congo**	**Malawi**	**Caribbean Island states**	**Totals**
a.	Maximum Country Allocation	100,000,000	44,900,000	2,000,000	146,900,000
b.	Allocation Requested (100%)	100,000,000	44,900,000	2,000,000	146,900,000
c.	Fixed Part (70% of a.)	70,000,000	31,430,000	2,000,000	103,430,000
d.	Variable Part (30% of a.)	30,000,000	13,470,000	N/A	43,470,000
e.	**Allocations Recommended by CGPC**	**100,000,000** (fixed + variable)	**44,900,000** (fixed + variable)	**2,000,000** (fixed)	**146,900,000**
f.	Grant agent	World Bank	World Bank	World Bank	
g.	Grant agent Allocation	1,125,000	625,000	300,000	2,050,000
h.	Agency Fee % - Amount	1.75% - 1,750,000	1.75% - 785,750	1.75% - 35,000	2,570,750
i.	Period	4 years	4 years	3 years	
j.	Variable Part Disbursement Modality	Ex-post	Ex-post	N/A	
k.	Funding Source	GPE Fund	GPE Fund	GPE Fund	

4. Requests the Secretariat to:
   a. Include in its notification to each of the relevant developing country partner, grant agent, and coordinating agency, for distribution to the local education group, of the approval of the allocations and the expected timeframe for signing of the Grant Agreement and grant effectiveness and, as applicable, the conditions, requests for report-back, and observations on the program as recommended by the CGPC and set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 06 Revision 1.

b. Include an annual update on the issues listed as "conditions" and "report back" in the Portfolio Review.
c. Prioritize risk assessment and development of risk management plans for the DRC and Malawi grants in accordance with the Operational Risk Framework, and report back to the CGPC and GERF at their next meetings.

Revision to Burundi Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (BOD/2016/06 DOC 07)

Prior to the discussion, the Board member representing UNICEF declared a conflict of interest as grant agent for the proposed grant.

13.15 The CGPC chair noted that the revision had been triggered by the sustained political and security situation in Burundi which had forced the grant agent, Belgian Technical Cooperation, to end its mandate. He recalled that CGPC was authorized to approve material revisions to ESPIGs. However, the request of the new grant agent, UNICEF, for an agency fee that accompanied the proposal could only be approved by the Board. As such, the proposal required Board approval as implementation was contingent on the Board approving the agency fees.

13.16 The proposal addressed the crisis in Burundi, and aimed at consolidating reforms, ensured continuity, and protected schools from security risks. The program would improve access to and equity in basic education, improve quality of education by supporting curriculum reforms, and build capacity to produce and effectively use critical data. The CGPC chair highlighted that the grant agent's appraisal of the program had included an assessment of the strategic, programmatic, as well as the fiduciary risks. The CGPC had recommended the proposal for approval.

Discussion:

13.17 Some Board members representing European donor countries noted they were not permitted to fund the Burundi government directly and requested clarification as to whether funds would be channeled through the government. The Secretariat clarified that the vast majority of the grant funds would be channeled through UNICEF. A small portion would be provided for teacher training and while these funds would not go through the government, teachers and instructors in the program who are government employees would be beneficiaries. UNICEF in turn confirmed that for Burundi, funds for teacher training would be channeled through a third-party provider.

13.18 The Board member representing the Belgian government and the former grant agent for the grant, the Belgian Technical Cooperation, noted that Belgium is not suspending aid to Burundi and continued to be present in the LEG, but could not have a direct funding relationship with authorities at this time.

13.19 There being no further comments, the Board chair declared the decision approved.

Decision:

BOD/2016/06-17—<u>Proposed Revision to Burundi Education Sector Program Implementation Grant</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Refers to its approval of an allocation for an Education Sector Program Implementation Grant for Burundi in the amount of US$52,900,000 with Belgium Technical Cooperation as Grant agent (Supervising Entity) in decision BOD/2012/11-06.

2. Approves the proposed revisions to the Burundi ESPIG as recommended by the Country Grants and Performance Committee and requested in the Program Revision Notification in Annex 1 of BOD/2016/06 DOC 07, including a change in Grant agent from Belgium Technical Cooperation to UNICEF.
3. Reduces the allocation to Belgium Technical Cooperation by US$20,100,000 representing the remaining uncommitted funds on the initial allocation, and approves a corresponding amount of US$20,100,000 with UNICEF as Grant agent, plus an additional US$1,608,000 in Agency Fees.
4. Requests the Secretariat to include in its notification to Burundi, the grant agent, and coordinating agency, for distribution to the local education group, the approval of the revision and the observations on the revision as recommended by the CGPC as set out in BOD/2016/06 DOC 07, Table 1.

14. REPORT FROM THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Local Education Group Minimum Standards (BOD/2016/06 DOC 08)

14.1 The CST manager briefly presented revisions to the proposed minimum standards for LEGs based on the deliberations of the Board during the Board retreat two days earlier. She noted that the revisions included a compromise between the various views among Board members in order to move forward with the minimum standards.

Discussion:

14.2 Comments from Board members included an appreciation of the progress made and incorporation of the changes requested during the Board retreat. However, additional changes were recommended, notably from some Board members who wanted clarity on how to address non-compliance through sanctions. Other Board comments included adding timely and transparent sharing of information, clarifying accountability in meeting the standards, how LEGs would be assessed against the minimum standards, and broadly, reconsidering the purpose of the standards beyond merely guiding dialogue to identify gaps and assist countries in improving towards the standards. One Board member commented on the need to include a focus on other stakeholder issues, such as insufficient donor capacity at the country level, which impacts the LEG.

14.3 On accountability, one Board member reminded the Board that GPE does not own or control LEGs but that LEGs could be held accountable for their role in the partnership. In this regard, the sector and grant process is important for LEG compliance with specific guidelines.

14.4 With regard to what happens if standards are not met, the Secretariat noted that the standards aim at making progress on inclusive policy dialogue in line with the objectives of GPE 2020. The risk of enforcing compliance is the potential for distortion, such as a separate group established for GPE purposes in parallel to the forum where sector policy dialogue takes place. In addition, countries are at different stages in their development/governance. If GPE is to assist them in moving forward, careful thought needs to be given to these issues and possible unintended consequences.

14.5 The SPC chair added that there are different interests and perspectives on the standards and different approaches. The Board had focused primarily on conformance, and not as much on performance or supporting LEGs. He recommended clarifying that standards can be perceived very differently qualitatively, and that the Board should invest in tools and guidelines for supporting LEGs in meeting the standards.

14.6 A Board member noted that the Board needed to decide whether the purpose of the standards is to strengthen governments, or compliance. If the former, it should let governments decide how to lead the LEG. The Board might then consider how it can best assist countries in moving towards the standards rather than sanctioning them for not meeting the standards.

14.7 The Board chair determined there was no consensus and adjourned the item. The Secretariat would continue to collect information and best practices and bring the item back to the SPC.

15. REPORTS FROM THE GOVERNANCE, ETHICS, RISK AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

15.1 On behalf of the GERF chair who was unavoidably required to depart early due to travel arrangements, the Chief Finance and Operations Officer presented revised decision language for the governance review and related revisions to the charter arising from deliberations during the Board executive session earlier in the day.

Governance Review (BOD/2016/06 Doc 13)

15.2 Revisions to the decision language on the governance review included the establishment of a governance working group of the Board to consider how to further strengthen the governance arrangements, and to request the GERF in consultation with the CGPC and SPC chairs to consider strengthening the committees with a report to the Board at its next meeting and in time for the Committee call for nominations in December. Proposed references in the decision language, Board and Committee Operating procedures, and Charter regarding greater delegation to the Coordinating Committee with respect to Board and Committee nominations had been removed based on the Board's deliberations.

Discussion:

15.3 Board members supported the revised decision language. A Board member suggested to amend the decision language to have the GERF develop clear selection procedures based on commonly agreed criteria. Another Board member suggested feedback from constituencies be requested on the criteria prior to the call for nominations.

15.4 The Board chair concluded there was consensus on the decision with the amendment.

Decision:

15.5 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-18—<u>Governance Review</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Requests the Secretariat to update the Board and Committee Operating Procedures to clarify that Board and committee members make decisions and recommendations in the best interests of GPE, and to clearly differentiate this principle from the role performed when representing the views of constituencies during discussions and deliberation.
2. Mandates the Board Chair to convene a working group of the Board to examine options for strengthening governance arrangements and to report to the Board in time for its next face-to-face meeting on progress made.
3. In view of the call for committee nominations to be launched in December 2016, requests the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee (GERF) in consultation with the Chairs of the Country Grants and Performance Committee (CGPC) and Strategy and Policy Committee (SPC), and taking into account the working group's initial deliberations:

a. to examine and clearly define skills/competency-based service requirements for committee members.
b. to examine and propose options on the size and composition of the committees in light of the mix of skills/competencies required, the workload of the committees, and their representativeness.
c. requests the GERF to develop clear selection procedures based on commonly agreed criteria to report to the Board at its next meeting in November 2016.

Revisions to the GPE Charter (BOD/2016/06 DOC 22)

15.6 The Chief Finance and Operations Officer presented proposed revisions to the charter set out in DOC 22. He recalled that the GERF Committee recommends adopting four categories of revisions: enhancement of the mutual accountability framework at country level; improvements to the global governance arrangements; clarification of the partnership meeting; and alignment of the Charter with GPE 2020 and other recent Board decisions, such as the revision to the two Board seats for UN agencies (BOD/2016/05-01), support to the DCP pre-Board meetings, advocacy for global education, and oversight of the implementation of the risk management policy.

15.7 He noted that the revisions presented takes into consideration the Board discussion on the governance review during the executive session earlier in the day, resulting in the removal of proposed delegation of authority to the Coordinating Committee to approve Board and Committee appointments. Further, language was added to reflect that GPE Committees are accountable for serving in accordance with their terms of reference.

15.8 The Secretariat would prepare the revised paper following the meeting and based on the decision.

Discussion:

15.9 A Board member recommended that "Quality Education for All Children" references in the charter be changed to "Quality Education for All," in accordance with the new strategic plan, and to revise GPE taglines similarly. The Board chair suggested to consider the suggestion another time.

Decision:

15.10 The following decision was approved:

BOD/2016/06-19—<u>Revisions to the Global Partnership for Education Charter</u>: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves revisions to the Global Partnership for Education Charter as set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 22 Revision 1.
2. Requests the Secretariat to update the Board and Committee Operating Procedures and related policies in accordance with all modifications to the Charter.

16. GLOBAL BOOK ALLIANCE

16.1. Board member Charles North of USAID provided an overview of the Global Book Alliance supported by several development partners, which aims to establish an efficient distribution of appropriate books in developing countries and make them easily accessible. A study had just been completed on a possible business case for the alliance and partners were considering options on how to best move forward.

16.2. The Board congratulated the US and partners on the progress on this initiative thus far. It noted that the initiative showed much potential for improving learning outcomes and that GPE should consider how it can further support the initiative.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

17.1. The Board Chair invited Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly to present a proposed decision on protecting education from attack and schools and universities from military use to recognize the immense threat to education by these attacks and to pay tribute to initiatives taken to counter them. Board members expressed support for the decision. Suggestions for improvement of the language included to reflect GPE's ongoing work in fragile and conflict-affected states, and to not only focus on protecting education from attack, but also threats of attack.

17.2. A Board member noted that reference to the Safe Schools Declaration in the decision language does not constitute an endorsement by the respective GPE partner governments.

Decision:

17.3 The Board approved the following decision:

BOD/2016/06-20—Protecting Education from Attack and Schools and Universities from Military Use: The Board of Directors:

1. Reiterates its commitment in decision BOD/2014/02-09 to support global efforts, and the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA), in preventing violent attacks on schools, universities, their students and staff.
2. Highlights the fact that the since that Board Decision, attacks on education have continued to occur in dozens of countries across the world. Incidents involving the highest number of victims include: the abduction of some 234 girls from a school in Chibok, Nigeria, in April 2014; the abduction of about 150 Kurdish students on their way to their final exams in Aleppo, Syria, in June 2014; the killing of some 145 during an attack on the Army Public School in Peshawar, Pakistan, in December 2014; the killing of at least 147 at Garissa University in Kenya in April 2015; and a raid on Bacha Khan University that left approximately 30 dead in Charsadda, Pakistan, in January 2016. Schools and universities have also been used for military purposes by state armed forces and non-state armed groups in some 26 countries from 2005 to 2015, the majority in situations of armed conflict, putting the educational institutions at increased risk of attack by opposing forces.
3. Recognizes the initiatives that have been taken by many states to better protect education from attack and schools and universities from military use, including the Safe Schools Declaration, which was opened for endorsement by Norway on May 29, 2015, and to date has been endorsed by 53 states.
4. Asks the Strategy and Policy Committee to explore ways in which the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), as a partner of GCPEA, can assist states in further protecting education from attack and threats of attack within the context of GPE's ongoing work in fragile and conflict-affected states.

Next Meetings

17.4 The Board chair announced the next Board meeting would take place Siem Reap, Cambodia, November 30-December 2, 2016. The Secretariat would circulate detailed information in due course.

17.5 There being no other business, the Board chair closed the meeting at 5:00 pm.

ANNEX 1
PARTICIPANTS LIST

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Adlide, Geoff	Director, Advocacy and Communications	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Adricula, Sylvia	Events Assistant	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Ahmat, Khazali acyl	Minister	Minister of Education	Chad	**Alternate Board Member**- Constituent of Africa 2
Ahmat, Youssouf	Director-General of administration and planning	Ministry of National Education	Chad	Constituent of Africa 2
Albright, Alice	Chief Executive Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Alffram, Rebecka	Senior Program Specialist	SIDA, Sweden	Sweden	**Alternate Board Member**- Constituent of Donor 2
Arakawa Yamaguchi, Naoko	Education Specialist	The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Japan	Observer
Archer, David	Head of Program	ActionAid	United Kingdom	**Board Member** Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Atchoarena, David	Director Policies and Lifelong Learning Systems	UNESCO	France	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Bachiller, Ana	Procurement Coordinator	Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI)	Spain	Observer

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Baker, Tony	Education for All Campaign Manager	RESULTS Educational Fund	United States	**Alternate Board Member-** Constituent of CSO 1 (International / Northern)
Barnett, Andrea	Project manager	Chang-Castillo and Associates	United States	Interpretation Coordinator
Baysah, David	Project Coordinator and Technical Advisor	Ministry of Education	Liberia	Constituent of Africa 3
Beardmore, Sarah	Sr. Strategy and Policy Specialist	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Belew, Negussie	Head minister's Bureau	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Constituent of Africa 2
Benveniste, Luis	Practice Manager	The World Bank Group	United States	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent Multilateral & Regional Banks (M Agency 3)
Bernard, Jean-Marc	Deputy Chief Technical Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Bouapao, H.E. Lytou	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	**Board Member** Constituent of Asia & The Pacific

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Bourne, Josephine	Associate Director	UNICEF	United States	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
Brown, Donal	Director, Global Funds Department	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	**Board Member-** Constituent of Donor 3
Brüning, Marie	Education program Officer	Swiss Agency for Development and Corporation - SDC	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Brynildsen, Øygunn	Senior Advocacy Advisor	GCE Norway / Save the Children Norway	Norway	Observer
Cherevatova, Natalia	Operations Officer	The World Bank	United States	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Cheru, Eshetu	Director	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Constituent of Africa 3
Coustère, Paul	Deputy Director	International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)	France	Constituent of Donor 5
Dansie, Grant	Education Advisor	The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Constituent of Donor 4
Diop, Sabine	Advisor	German BACKUP Initiative for Education	Germany	Observer
Dorsonne, Jean Beauvois	Minister of Education	Ministry of National Education and Vocational Training	Haiti	Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Empey, Patrick	Human Development - Policy Team Leader	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade / Irish Aid	Ireland	**Alternate Board Member-** Constituent of Donor 4
Feinberg, Nathalia	Head of Department/Ambassador/Development Policy and Global Cooperation	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 2
Focas Licht, Margarita	Country Support Team Manager	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Gardiner, Amanda	VP, Sustainability and Social Innovation	Pearson	United States	**Alternate Board Member-** Constituent Private Sector/Private Foundations
Gillard, Julia	Board Chair	GPE Secretariat	United States	Chair
Golden, April	Donor Relations Officer: Asia Pacific	GPE Secretariat	Belgium	GPE Secretariat
Goudiaby, Gisele	Events Coordinator	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Graves, Sue	Director, Health and Education Funds	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	**Alternate Board Member -** Constituent of Donor 6

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Hanif Balkhi, Assadullah	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	**Board Member** Constituent Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Henfry, Sally-Anne	Special Assistant to the Board Chair	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Henke, Kerstin	Desk Officer for Education	German Federal Ministry for economic cooperation and development	Germany	Constituent of Donor 5
Herbert, Alicia	Head of DFID Mozambique	The Department for International Development (DFID)	Mozambique	Constituent of Donor 3
Hjarrand, Jessica	Advocacy Coordinator	Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies -INEE	Norway	Observer
Horton, Claire	Special Assistant	GPE Secretariat	United Kingdom	GPE Secretariat
Ismoilov, Bobohon	Coordinator GPE-4 Grant	Ministry of Education	Tajikistan	Constituent Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
Iwase, Keita	Chief for Education Aid Policy and Gender Issues	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Observer
Karjalainen, Marja	Deputy Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 5

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Leumer, Wolfgang	Program Manager CSEF	Global Campaign for Education (GCE)	South Africa	Observer
Liechti, Valérie	Education Political Advisor	The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Constituent of Donor 1
Liha Matejicek, Aida	Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 5
Manigat, Nesmy	Advisor	Ministry of Education	Haiti	**Alternate Board Member**- GERF Committee Chair
Mbow, Cheikh	National Coordinator	COSYDEP	Senegal	**Board Member** Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Mesen, Michelle	Developing Country Partnerships Lead	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Mettille, Jeff	Adviser	USAID	United States	Constituent of Donor 6
Mornet Cariou, Odile	Advisor	German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ) Initiative for Education	Germany	Observer
Mowe, Kjersti	Global Networks and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	Norway	Observer
Mundy, Karen	Chief Technical Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Mutale, Lancelot	Chief Planning Officer	Ministry of General Education	Zambia	Constituent of Africa 1
Naidoo, Jordan	Director of the EFA and Global Agenda Coordination Team	UNESCO	France	**Alternate Board Member-** Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Nankabirwa, Grace	Economist	Ministry of Education	Uganda	Constituent of Africa 1
Nestel, Yona	Senior Education Advisor	Plan International	Canada	Observer
Nicod, Chantal	Head of West African Division and Education	The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	**Board Member-** Constituent of Donor 1
Nielander, Tim	Counselor	GPE Secretariat	United States	Presenter
Nielsen, Nicolai	Senior Advisor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Constituent of Donor 2
Nkaada, Daniel	Commissioner Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Uganda	**Board Member-** Constituent of Africa 1
North, Charles	Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)	United States	**Board Member-** Constituent of Donor 6
Paladines, Cindy	Trustee/Economist	World Bank Group	United States	Trustee

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Paradis, Anne-Françoise	Education Advisor	Ministry Foreign Affairs - Belgium	Belgium	**Alternate Board Member-** Constituent of Donor 1
Pascual, Jay	Senior Counsel	World Bank	United States	Trustee
Pentimalli, Maria	officer	Ministry of foreign affairs and Italian cooperation	Italy	Constituent of Donor 5
Phonthachit, Dockeo	Head of Human Resource Development Office	Ministry of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Constituent of Asia & The Pacific
Pompilus, Antoine Guy	Director of Training and Development	Ministry of Education	Haiti	Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Power, Padraig	Chief Finance and Operations Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Rafique, Atif	Education Specialist	The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	United States	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Rodriguez-Perez, Evelyn	Director, Office of Education	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)	United States	Constituent of Donor 6
Roxburgh, Rose	Assistant Director, Health and Education Funds	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Australia	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Rudischhauser, Klaus	Acting Director General	Euopean Commission - DG DEVCO	Belgium	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 5

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Sakho, Marieme	Union Representative	Sypros	Senegal	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
Sanchez, HE Sandra	Vice Minister of Education	Vice Minister of Education	Honduras	**Board Member** Constituent of Latin America & The Caribbean
Sarch, Terri	Deputy Head of Global Funds Department	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Schroh, Karen	Senior Donor Relations Specialist	GPE Secretariat	Belgium	GPE Secretariat
Seim, Olav	Policy Director Education	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway	**Board Member** Constituent of Donor 4
Sheehy, Ita	Senior Education Advisor	The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Denmark	Constituent of UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
Shouldice, Julie	Director	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development	Canada	**Alternate Board Member** - Constituent of Donor 3
Siebes, Ronald	Head Education and Research Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	CGP Committee Chair

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Skeie, Silje	Senior advisor education	Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)	Norway	Observer
Smith, Matthew	Deputy Manager, Country Support Team	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Steckhan, Uwe	Public Partnerships Specialist	The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	United States	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Sumerfield, Douglas	Sr. Operations Officer	World Bank	United States	Technical Advisor to the BoD Member
Tapp, Charles	Manager	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Usmonzoda, Fathiddin	Deputy Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Tajikistan	Ministry of Education and Science of RT	Tajikistan	Constit Eastern Europe Midle East & Central Asia
Van Dyke, Johanna	Board Operations Officer	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Wagshal, Julie	Program Assistant	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Wane, Michaelle	Senior Board Operations Assistant	GPE Secretariat	United States	GPE Secretariat
Waruku, Boaz	Program Manager	ANCEFA	Kenya	Observer
Waterkeyn, Marie Sophie	Expert Education	Belgian Development Agency	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 1
Waterschoot, Wieke	Program Manager	European Commission	Belgium	Constituent of Donor 5

Full Name (Last, First)	Job Title	Institution/Organization	Country/Pays	Constituency
Werner, HE George	Minister	Ministry of Education	Liberia	**Board Member** Constituent of Africa 2
Wood, Grace	Program Manager, Global Funds Department	Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Constituent of Donor 3
Yoshida, Kazuhiro	Professor	Hiroshima University	Japan	Observer
Zehra, Kaneez	National Coordinator	Society for Access to Quality Education	Pakistan	**Alternate Board Member** Constituent of CSO 2 (Developing Country)
Zubaidulloev, Mukhibullo	Principal	International Presidential School	Tajikistan	Interpretation Coordinator