.Application Form *for* Education Sector Program Implementation Grant - ESPIG

August 2017

OVERVIEW	
Country:	Somalia
Grant agent(s):	Save The Children International
Coordinating agency(ies):	EU
Date of submission of the endorsed ESP/TEP:	10/18/2017
Period of the ESP/TEP:	5 Years
Date of submission of the full ESPIG package:	2/13/2018
Program name (optional):	Global Partnership for Education: Education Sector Program Implementation Grant
ESPIG amount requested - Fixed Part:	$7,680,000
ESPIG amount requested - Variable Part:	Click here to enter amount.
Agency fees (additional to the country allocation):	$537,600
Estimated ESPIG starting date:	7/1/2018
Estimated ESPIG closing date:	6/30/2021
Expected submission date of completion report:	12/31/2021

Grant modality - (please enter 'X')		Sector Pooled
		Project Pooled/ Co-financed
	X	Project/ Stand-alone

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION

Note to the user

Notification to the Secretariat:

➔ Prior to any ESPIG application development process, the coordinating agency should always notify the Secretariat of the country's intent to apply. The Secretariat will engage with the government and coordinating agency to agree on a timeline for the preparation and submission of the application, based on the country's own education sector planning and GPE semi-annual submission dates.

ESPIG Guidelines:

➔ Applicants should read the *ESPIG Guidelines*, which explain the application development process, including timeline, necessary steps and intermediary submissions for the quality assurance process of the application. In case additional information is needed, the applicant can contact the country lead at the Secretariat.

Application package:

➔ The full ESPIG application package is considered an integral part of the Board's approval. Any changes to any of these documents from submission to the GPE should follow the *ESPIG Policy*. This includes any changes to program documents during the internal approval process of the grant agent.

Data Sources

➔ The financial, education sector, and any country information data included in the application should be accompanied by the relevant sources in the corresponding sections of the form.

CONTENTS

I. Key players 5

I.1 Partner Ministry
I.2 Coordinating agency
I.3 Grant agent

II. Fulfilment of the requirements - Fixed Part 6

II.1 A credible, endorsed ESP/TEP
II.2 Evidence of commitment to finance the endorsed ESP/TEP
II.3 Availability of critical data

III. Country information 9

IV. Program 9

IV.1 Program description – summary
IV.2 Expected outcomes
IV.3 Results framework
IV.4 Financial overview
IV.5 Supplemental program cost
IV.6 Monitoring and evaluation
IV.7 Risks and implementation readiness
IV.8 Past and current performance
IV.9 Aid effectiveness

V. Variable Part 20

V.1 Summary of Variable Part indicators and targets
V.2 Dimensions: equity – efficiency – learning outcomes
V.3 Means of verification

VI. Inclusive Approach 24

VI.1 Consultation
VI.2 Sign-off

Annex I: Definitions of terms 26

LIST OF TABLES

The application contains the following tables to help provide the necessary information, in addition to the narrative sections.

TABLE 1:	Evidence of external resource mobilization	√
TABLE 2:	Level of education covered by the program	√
TABLE 3:	Outcome indicators	√
TABLE 4:	Output indicators	√
TABLE 5:	Program costs and expected disbursement by year	√
TABLE 6:	Program costs and expected disbursement by component	√
TABLE 7:	Other grant agent costs and grant agent fees	√
TABLE 8:	Evolvement of grant financing modalities	√
TABLE 9:	Variable Part indicators	x
TABLE 10:	Means of Verification	√

II. FULFILLMENT OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS – FIXED PART

II.1 Requirement 1: An endorsed quality ESP/TEP[2]

Please explain why the endorsed ESP/TEP can be considered a quality plan by summarizing the main conclusions and recommendations of the Appraisal Report and how these were addressed in the Appraisal Memo, including any adjustments made to the ESP/TEP and/or any medium-long term follow-up actions decided upon, as a result of the independent assessment, as well as any other outstanding issues related to the ESP/TEP.

The series of consultations and discussions held at different level of the MOES structures as well as with the education stakeholders in particular the ESC members is a good indication of the high attention given to the quality of the document in addressing all issues in a comprehensive way. More so, the ESSP document was appraised by an independent consultant with good back ground and experience in appraising GPE proposals. The consultant produced a two round quality appraisal report on the first draft and that of the final draft. The appraisal report includes recommendations and conclusions based on his review, as summarized below. Towards addressing those feedbacks, the ESSP document was reviewed by the task force and ESC members and comments addressed and the final version shared with GPE. A summary of the major responses considered in reviewing the document in response to the recommendation and conclusion given by the consultant is indicated below:

The main conclusions and recommendations agreed upon from the appraisal report include:

Conclusions

Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017-2021 had some the strong elements; it was well linked to strategic documents at the national level, such as the Vision 2030, the National Development Plan 2017-2021 and the National Education Strategy 2015. Equally, the ESSP has a logical structure, with well-organized policy objectives, strategies, and activities with a good roadmap to orient the MOES through an effective capacity development process and it has strengthened some internal planning weaknesses. This qualifies the analysis of risks which is very comprehensive, and realistic & mitigation measures are proposed. However, some of the challenges identified with the plan were: costing of the ESSP which can be a serious obstacle to its implementation, inconsistent of the Results Framework with relevant information missing & confusing, inconsistencies in the terminology and headings and many of the risks were of high likelihood to happen, and could have a very negative impact.

Summary of the recommendations made and action on how they were addressed

Key recommendation	Status/how addressed

1. Regarding the structure of the core elements of the Plan: a. The document ought to be internally consistent. I. Key Policy Objectives: all the strategies must be developed (as done in Policy Objective 2), not only some of them.	Addressed via revision/edits adhering to appraisal recommendations. Now key policy objectives for all strategies are developed for each sub sector. Kindly refer to all strategies under each sub sector. Completed
i. The 7 pillars are not consistent. For example, teacher education appears on the list on page xvi, but then it disappears and is not included in the sub-sectors.	Addressed through revision and further consultation with ministry's Director General (DG) and Technical Working Group (TWG) to ensure alignment across all the pillars. Completed and done.
ii. Cross-cutting issues: this chapter ought to be reviewed, as the issues included in the situation analysis (10.1) are not the same as the issues in section 10.3 on priority objectives, strategies, and activities.	Addressed via revision/edits. Now consistent across the document. Completed and done.
iii. Costing/Budget: the strategies and activities on the budget must be exactly the same as in the matrices at the ESSP	The strategies and activities are now well Addressed via revision/edits. Now consistent across the document. Recommendation applied.
a. Objectives and Strategies must be distinguished clearly. As mentioned above, in the box on page 20 there are some strategies (#2, #6, #7, and #8) that are actually objectives.	Addressed by TWG via revision/edits. Completed and done.
b. A more detailed description of the strategies and actions would help the MOEHS and partners to implement the ESSP.	Detailed description and actions now well explained and revised and easy for implementation by all actors. Completed and done.
c. The Action Plan ought to include the same strategies, activities, and targets as the matrices for each sub-sector on the ESSP document.	This has been updated and based on the detailed implementation result matrix for each of the subsectors and cross-cutting issues. Budget included in Action Plan in finalized version. Completed and done.
2. The Action Plan should include a more detailed timeline for each activity	Addressed via revision/edits.
3. The Results Framework must be completely revised: a. adding a column with the strategies; b. linking indicators to the strategies, not to the activities; c. making sure each target corresponds to its indicator; d. linking each target with one indicator; e. making sure all targets are quantified;	Addressed very well by TWG via revision/edits. Corrected in the integrated result framework for the ESSP implementation framework. Completed and done.

[2] Evidence of a credible ESP will primarily be drawn from the ESP documents submitted prior to the application itself. This section should therefore be limited to a brief summary of key issues highlighted in the appraisal process.

f. Adding a column with how often data will be collected and who is responsible.	
4. Regarding data and indicators in the ESSP: a. The quality assurance process for data collection must be improved. Some figures (e.g. the graph on page 42) are not credible, with the number of female teachers increasing by 95% from one year to the next, and then a reduction of 68% the year after.	Inconsistencies addressed via revision/edit by TWG. Completed and done.
b. The EMIS only covers primary education, secondary education, and alternative basic education. The ESSP proposes improvements to EMIS but NFE and TVET are still not included. It is recommended that the MoEHS elaborate a roadmap to incorporate all the sub-sectors.	All sub sector road map now incorporated. Addressed via revision/edits. Each subsector now has a consistent structure and approach. Completed and done.
5. Financial aspects: a. We strongly recommend that the MOEHS review again the education budget with the Ministry of Finance so that the share allocated to education may grow. A reduction in the share of the national budget allocated to education could have serious implications in terms of funding by the GPE. We recommend the elaboration of an intermediate scenario between model 1 (insufficient) and model 2 (unrealistic).	Addressed via revision/edits with ministry leadership and ministry of finance provided several opportunities to provide feedback on the ESSP.
b. We recommend including a note explaining the rationale for having two models that are so different.	Model 1 was taken in this last version and corrected and updated.
c. The figures ought to be checked for inconsistencies, e.g., figures on donor support on page xvi and page 126.	Addressed through revision and well addressed now in the latest version of ESSP.
6. Risks: There are many risks whose expected likelihood and impact are high. This means that the chances are high that the objectives of this ESSP will not be achieved. Thus, some targets, such as the increase in enrolment or the improvement in textbooks per child (all funded mostly by donors) should be revised and reduced.	Addressed through revision and further consultation with ministry to ensure revisions on target across strategies, activities to make achieve its intended ESSP objectives. Completed and done.

II.2 Requirement 2: Commitment to finance the endorsed ESP/TEP

Please use the table below to provide information on external resource mobilization. For evidence of domestic resource mobilization, complete the Excel template in ***this link***[3] only if there are changes to the education financing data submitted in the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process. Indicate if you are using fiscal or calendar year, and if the former please state when (the month) the fiscal year begins and ends. Also include, where applicable, the sources of all data.

TABLE 1 |

Evidence of external resource mobilization

Actual value for three years			**Target values for the period of the Program**					
Data for the past three years (indicate years as relevant)			**Data for the relevant duration of the program** (indicate years as relevant)					
2014	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Total**
Education sector plan								
Education sector plan cost (local currency)								
$12,418,867	$12,793,592	$14,618,336	$31,319,482	$57,116,635	$60,349,206	$61,066,468	$66,031,705	**$315,714,291**
External funding – excluding GPE funds (local currency)								
N/A	$18,475,000	N/A	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	$13,000,000	**$109,475,000**
Funding gap as recorded in the ESP (local currency)								

[3] This Excel template is the same as the domestic financing spreadsheet initially submitted during the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process. It is also available on the GPE website at: http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/funding-model-requirement-matrix-domestic-financing-annex. Should you have any question about this section of the application form, please send an email to the GPE Secretariat at gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org.

N/A	N/A	N/A	$3,466,064	-$12,787,102	-$3,219,634	$12,789,560	$18,068,295	$18,317,184

GPE support (local currency)

US Dollars $7,680,000 + Agency fees of $537,600

II.3. Requirement 3: Availability of critical data, or a strategy to use and produce data

This requirement concerning the availability of data or alternatively a strategy to produce and use data is divided into three sub-components as indicated below.

II.3.1 A recent education sector analysis

- Provide information and dates on the most recent education sector analysis, including a list of which analytic elements are included (e.g. demographic analysis, analysis of existing policies, costs and financing, system performance and system capacity).
- Indicate how vulnerability and equity, particularly the situation of education for marginalized groups, including girls and children with disabilities, have been addressed.[4]

The most recent Education Sector Analysis (ESA) for Somaliland was done in December 2016, reviewing the performance of the 2012-2016 five year ESSP which was a reference point in developing the new five years ESSP (2017-2021). This was a request made by the government of Somaliland with support from its sector partners; the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), and the Managing Entity UNICEF, for an evidence-based analysis of the Education. Key objective of the analysis was to identify education trends and priorities that would shape the new Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). The ESA was based on a wide spectrum of dialogues with government duty-bearers, local partners and community stakeholders. It analyzed the whole education subsectors from Early Childhood to Higher Education including Education Management and Financing as well as the overall context in which the education programs were implemented. The analysis included factors such as policy context, education financing, education management system, curriculum, examination, enrolment analysis, internal efficiency, gender equity, student outcome etc.

Some of the key observations for the Somaliland Education Sector between 2012 and 2016 include the fact that the allocation of

[4] Reference can be made to the assessment made in the GPE Funding Model Requirements Readiness Matrix (Quality Assurance Review Phase I Matrix), with this paragraph limited to an update on progress vis-à-vis identified gaps; alternatively, if the analysis exists in another document, this section can simply reference that document, which should then be attached.

national funding to the education sector has improved with increase in the national budget. In the past five years, the budget allocation to education has almost doubled from USD 7.8 million in 2012 to USD 14.6 million in 2016. Up to 72% of this was absorbed by teachers' salaries, which, despite reported as being low, has left little for capital expenditure and running costs, especially for free primary education that was introduced in 2011. For the primary sub-sector there is a 9.9 % increase in primary schools from the baseline number of 987 schools in 2012, which is a growth rate of approximately 2% annually. At the same time, the number of ABE centres has declined. The average annual growth rate of classrooms is 15.9% in the formal primary sector for the last five years, which is below the 612 classrooms annually promised in the ESSP 2012/16 but sufficient to keep up with the growing enrolment at this level

Key assumptions indications by local stakeholders showed that specific groups are most vulnerable to different types and are severely impacted by 'shocks' or emergencies. Not surprisingly, those who are perceived as being most impacted are those who experience the greatest inequities in education (e.g. GER for nomadic communities sits at 3.1% and for IDPs is 16.8% compared to 56.8% for children in urban areas). A survey conducted with 120 education stakeholders during early October 2016 in Hargeisa specifically explored which children were most impacted by emergencies. Those identified as being most vulnerable include pastoralist/nomadic communities, children in rural schools, as well as IDP communities. While 'girls' are seen as 'most impacted' by only 36.7%, they in fact tend to be among the most affected overall considering that they make up roughly half of all children in rural and nomadic/pastoral communities. Other groups cited as being impacted include orphans, those with disabilities, and returnees from Ethiopia who sometimes migrate back and forth between Somaliland and the Somali Region of Ethiopia. Those who are least impacted are children from urban schools and, to a lesser extent, children from urban poor families. Common to those groups who experience the greatest impacts is that they are either from rural areas or nomadic/pastoralist communities and thus have limited access to social services, or experience high levels of inequity with how social services (including education resources) are allocated between urban and rural areas. Others who are most impacted also tend to be those who are most marginalized and 'disempowered', including girls and IDPs. Commonly underpinning these patterns are high levels of inequity or social and political marginalization experienced in different forms by the most vulnerable groups. The strategies designed to address some of the vulnerability in the education sector include: provision of feeding programs, establishment of flexible education programs, provision of take home ration for girls, construction of girl friendly spaces in schools and recruitment and training of more teachers for specials needs education.

II.3.2 Basic financial and education data

- Provide date of last submission of data to UIS and highlight any areas where data was not provided;
- Highlight any gaps in national data (such as data quality issues, disaggregation by gender, availability of data on marginalized groups, financial data, etc.); and
- Provide summary of strategies to address these, including how the implementation of a data strategies will be financed and whether they are part of the endorsed ESP.[5]

[5] If these strategies are included in the endorsed ESP, this paragraph should be limited to a list of the strategies and their financing source and a reference to the relevant section in the ESP.

The last date that the Somaliland Ministry of Education and Science submitted SDG 4 education indicators' data for UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) is March 2016. Currently the latest data available in the Ministry of Education Information Management System is the data for the 2015/2016 school year. The data submitted to UIS included data from 2014/2015 school year as well as the 2015/2016 year. The EMIS Data for the 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 was not collected because of the Ministry decision to migrate from an old EMIS Software to a new UNESCO Educt2Stat Software. The Ministry is currently working on the establishment of the new EMIS, which is expected to be functional in the coming 2018/2019 school year.

The data available and submitted to UIS is mainly primary and secondary school data, school facilities and infrastructure and teachers. The data related to TVET, NFE, Higher Education, Culture, Diversity etc. is not reported because are not in the EMIS Data software. In addition to this, data is not segregated and analysed by age, disability and wealth as per the demand of the entry sheet. Generally, although SL MOES submitted data for UIS, it is not fully collected and analysed in all the SDG4 Specific Indicators.

To overcome the challenges of the data deficit, the MoES strategy is to establish Relevant EMIS using the UNESCO Software by replacing the old Australian owned software that was not user friendly and expensive. Once the software is installed, all the data collection format will be changed and adjusted with the requirement of both the MOE and UNESCO for better and meaningful decision making.

II.3.3 A system or mechanisms to monitor learning outcomes

- Indicate whether there is a system for measuring learning outcomes and if so, describe briefly;
- Highlight any gaps and provide summary of strategies to address these, including how the implementation of the strategies will be financed.[6]

The Education system is used to measure learning outcome is the grade level and terminal exams administered at grade 8 (primary completion grade) and form 4 (secondary completion grade). The national exams are developed by the expertise in the examination department and administered nationally. Apart from this, there is no system to measure learning outcomes. However; as indicated in the Somaliland ESA (Page 116)" Measuring learning achievements in Grade Four (MLA4) in Somaliland was a requirement in ICDSEA1 under Result 4, which aimed to strengthen the capacity of departments within Ministries of Education to measure and deliver quality in education". Hence, MLA test was conducted in 2012 on grade 4 and grade 7 and agreed that these assessments of learning achievements should be a regular part of the monitoring of quality in the education system. But there is no document indicating the use of MLA regularly to assess learning out comes then after.

[6] If the system or strategy to develop one are included in the endorsed ESP, this section should be limited to a brief statement and a reference to the relevant section in the ESP.

This gap in the education system has been discussed with the MoES and the ESC members of Somaliland while developing the ESIPG document and it is agreed to have a strategy of measuring learning outcomes inbuilt into the education system. Accordingly, it is indicated in the document to use Early Reading Assessment (EGRA) tools (a widely used tool in east Africa) to regular measure children's learning outcome. Towards this, a strategy of conducting annual assessments of learning outcomes using EGRA is established in the document. This assessment will be financed by the development partners as well as by GPE to start with and gradually the Ministry of education will take over the activity.

III. COUNTRY INFORMATION

NOTE: 1. Federal State applicants should duplicate this section as needed for States applying.
2. Please include the sources of population and GDP data in footnotes.

Total population:	3.508 million
GDP Per Capita (USD):	434.21 USD (2016)
School year runs from (month to month):	August-May
Budget cycle runs from (month to month):	January-December

IV. PROGRAM

IV.1 Program description - summary

In 1,500 words or less (maximum 3 pages), please:

- Provide a narrative of the Program in summary form, describing overall program objectives and related expected outcomes, and the components and sub-components with financing amounts (further details are to be provided in table form under IV.2 and IV.3).

- Indicate as relevant GPE's anticipated share by components and sub-components if this is a co-financed project.

Save the Children International (SCI) through The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) grant support focuses on the implementation of Somaliland validated Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2017-2021. The support given to the Ministry of Education & Science (MOES) concentrates on 3 overarching goals of Education: Access and Equity, Quality and Learning Outcomes and Efficient and Effective Education System. SCI will equally work closely with European Union (EU) as a Coordination Agent in line with MOES. SCI is requesting from GPE $ 8,217,600 for a period of 3 years from July, 2018-June, 2021.

With this particular funding from GPE, MOES will invest in the expansion of access to learning both in rural and urban areas through; the improvement of the quality of education offered through a review of policy, planning and curriculum needs, the training and certification of teachers at the ECE & primary school levels; and strengthening of institutional management and administrative systems both at the central and devolved (REO/DEO/school) levels. The overall Objective of this project is to ensure that by 2021, girls are boys of primary school age, in Somaliland, have acquired the skills and competencies, through safe, protective learning environments.

The aim of the proposal is to secure funding that will allow MOES to:
1. Increase Enrolment in 80 primary schools supported under the GPE increase by 20% over their baselines, with 50% girls.
2. Improve Pedagogical skills of primary school and ECE teachers (25% women) improved through professional training and certification.
3. Establish efficient, effective and functional monitoring system at MOES central and devolved levels (REO/DEO/school)

MOES will realize these objectives by implementing a range of interrelated activities including;
On the 1st outcome of access and equity, the project will focus on: construction/rehabilitation of 70 classrooms and Alternative Basic Education (ABE) learning spaces where a total of 15,200 (50% girls) will benefit from the support to the 80 existing. In line with that, the program will support running community awareness and sensitization sessions to reach parents and the wider communities about the need to enroll children and retain them in school marginalized children, including girls, children with a focus on children with disabilities, pastoralists, and minority groups, through a national Back to School campaign efforts and the joint efforts of the REOs/DEOs and the schools. MOES will construct and furnish girl friendly spaces, which function as special common rooms just for girls, will play an important role in ensuring retention of girls; including reading space, toilets and ablution facilities, and resting areas for girls during breaks. 2800vVulnerable children especially girls will be provide with scholarships.

On the 2nd outcome, GPE project will focus on: distribution of educational materials in order to ensure the quality of teaching and learning at the primary school level, Save the Children will support the ministry to conduct quarterly monitoring visits to selected sample schools including supported schools, conducting a national assessment to establish benchmarks on children's reading and comprehension skills at Grade 2, and will be used in this program as a marker of quality of learning, provision of in-service teacher

training, operationalization of Somaliland National College of Education, establishment, research into integrated Early Childhood Education approaches, development of Early Childhood Education policy and curriculum documents and provision of training for ECE teachers (In-Service)

On the 3rd outcome, GPE project will focus on: building a functional and decentralization of the Quality Assurance and Standards System (QASS) in all department services & its devolution (REO/DEO) levels through establishing a standardized school monitoring system, which feeds into EMIS, training for quality assurance and standards systems officers, Education Management Information Systems, disaster and emergency response, Integration of Peace Education and Conflict Resolution in the classroom, operationalization of Education Management Information Systems , development of a disaster and emergency response strategic plan, promote safe, inclusive, gender sensitive basic education in the school and community structures and strengthen community education committees.

The program will reach directly to 16,682 beneficiaries (15,200 girls and boys, 1482 men & women) with a focus of 50% girls with an indirect reach of 22,705 (composing 85% girls & boys).

Please define the event that will mark the start of the program and which will take place by the expected start date:

At the start of the program, Save The Children International will develop support for the project; MOES, REO/DEO/school levels. SCI will support in organizing an inception/kickoff face to face meeting with MOES stakeholders & with all staff related to the award in the first quarter (one month after the award start date) of the project in order to orient them to the actions. This will include understanding of program goals and the project plan, processes & procedures of managing & implementing the grant and to advocate for ownership of the project. The inception/kickoff meeting will also ensure that SCI staff and partners are aware of training and support they can get on safety and security, child safeguarding (CS), fraud, and financing terrorism. In the preparations of the kick-off/inception meeting, the SCI will ensure that all the necessary plans are finalized in line with the signed agreements shared appropriately. This might include for example, procurement plan, the recruitment plan, the implementation plan, MEAL plan (relevant tools and templates) and partner agreements.

Equally, the program will establish baseline values and targets for the action: SCI & MOES will conduct a baseline survey to determine the baseline measurements of indicators prior to the start of implementation in Quarter 1. The indicators to be determined through this baseline survey will be the high level result indicators at the objective level, covering the major Education outcomes including efficiency and effectiveness management structures of the decentralized REO/DEO and schools.

Complementary information for overview purposes:

Please specify whether the Program covers the following:

• Development and use of Education Monitoring and Information System – EMIS (Please refer to definition in Annex I: **Definitions**)	Yes
• Development and use of learning assessment system? (See refer to definition in Annex I: **Definitions**)	Yes

Please complete the table below, specifying the levels of education and age (from age to age) covered by the program:

➔ *Extend an/or adapt the table to the number of levels covered by the program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 2

Levels of education covered by the program

Levels	**Age**
Early Childhood Education	3-5 years
Primary Education	6-13 years
Non-Formal Education (NFE)	9-17 years
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*

IV.2 Expected outcomes

Please complete the table below, extracting relevant information from the detailed Program document. The Program will be monitored and progress will be reported against these **outcome indicators and targets** in the ESPIG annual implementation status reporting template to be submitted each year of the grant to the Secretariat.

➔ *Indicate the years starting with the baseline year. Extend and adapt the table to the number of components, subcomponents and outputs that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 3 |

Outcome indicators (as extracted from the program document)

Baseline	**Targets**				
year 0	**year 1**	**year 2**	**year 3**	**year 4**	**year 5**
Outcome 1 Indicator 1:	**% increase in enrolment of girls and boys in support schools**				
Source of data:	EMIS System				
0	5%	10%	20%		
Outcome 1 Indicator 2:	**% increase in Gross Enrolment Rate (F/M)**				
Source of data:	EMIS System				
44%	50%	54%	64%		
Outcome 2 Indicator 1:	**% teachers (F/M) demonstrating improved teaching practices in the classroom.**				
Source of data:	Lesson Observation forms, training attendance records, pre-post test results, final assessment scores.				

0	0	70%	75%		
Outcome 2 Indicator 2:	**% teachers certified (qualified)**				
Source of data:	Lesson Observation forms, training attendance records, pre-post test results, final assessment scores.				
TBC	0	95%	95%		
Outcome 3 Indicator 1:	**Functional EMIS system informing the decisions at the MOEHS is implemented.**				
Source of data:	EMIS book, EMIS data is used for the education sector review, number of quality monitoring reported produced and actions plans implemented.				
No functional EMIS system since 2016/17 school year					
Outcome 3 Indicator 2:	**Educational minimum standards are fully functional/ operational at all levels(central/regional and district)**				
Source of data:	Data source: MOEHS annual reports, EMIS report and ESC report				
Minimum standards exist but not used consistently					
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					

IV.3 Results framework[7]

[7] For sector-wide financing (through budget support or pooled funds), a reference could be made to the ESP results framework.

Please complete the table below, extracting relevant information from the detailed program document. There is NO need to reproduce the full results framework here, as long as the program document provides a full results framework with a results chain. The Program will be monitored and progress will be reported against these **output indicators and targets** in the ESPIG annual implementation status reporting template to be submitted each year of the grant to the Secretariat.

If the program plans to purchase and distribute textbooks, train teachers, or build or rehabilitate classrooms, please use the following indicators (GPE Strategic Plan 2016-2020)[8]:

- Number of textbooks purchased and distributed
- Number of teachers trained
- Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated

NOTE: These indicators are NOT compulsory indicators. They are therefore applicable only when the program plans to implement these activities. In case of sector-pooled funds, please indicate numbers planned at sector level.

➔ *Indicate the years starting with the baseline year. Extend and adapt the table to the number of components, subcomponents and outputs that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 4

Output indicators (extracted from the program document)					
Baseline	**Targets**				
year 0	**year 1**	**year 2**	**year 3**	**year 4**	**year 5**
Component 1:	**Outcome 1**				
Objective(s):	Enrolment in primary schools supported under the GPE increase by 20% over their baselines, with 50% girls.				

[8] For definition of indicators, see attached **Annex1**.

Sub-component 1.1:	Output 1.1: Increased enrolment of girls and boys in primary school, particularly girls, children with disabilities, and minority groups.				
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.1.1: # classrooms/ABE centers constructed/rehabilitated, including WASH and accessibility for children with disabilities				
Source of data:	Needs assessment, Bill of Quantities, construction reports, photographs, Completion Certificate, donation certificate				
0	70	0	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.1.2: # girls and boys enrolled in GPE supported primary schools and ABE Centers, including children with disabilities, and minority groups				
Source of data:	School/ABE enrolment records				
8000	10,400	12,800	15,200		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.1.3 # parents/caregivers/community members who participate in national Back to School Campaign				
Source of data:	Attendance records, photographs				
0	4,000	4,000	4,000		
Sub-component 1.2:	Output 1.2: Girls attending GPE supported schools benefit from affirmative action				
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.2.1 # Girl Friendly Spaces constructed/rehabilitated, including WASH and accessibility for girls with disabilities				
Source of data:	Needs assessment, Bill of Quantities, construction reports, photographs, Completion Certificate, donation certificate				
0	14	0	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.2.2 # girls who attend Girl Friendly Spaces				

Source of data:	Girl Friendly Space enrolment records				
TBC	700	1050	1050		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.2.3 % girls who report satisfaction with Girl Friendly Space facilities				
Source of data:	KAP survey results				
0	70%	80%	90%		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.2.4 # vulnerable girls and boys who receive educational scholarship(50% girls)				
Source of data:	Distribution/cash transfer records, vulnerability assessment data, Post Distribution Records,				
0	930	930	940		
Output indicator:	Indicator 1.2.5 % vulnerable girls and boys who received the education scholarship who transition to the next grade				
Source of data:	Distribution/cash transfer records, vulnerability assessment data, enrolment records, attendance records, Post Distribution Records,				
0	65%	70%	85%		
Component 2:	**Outcome 2**				
Objective(s):	Pedagogical skills of primary school and ECE teachers (25% women) improved through professional training and certification.				
Sub-component 2.1:	Output 2.1: Girls and boys attend GPE supported school which meet minimum standards				

Output indicator:	Indicator 2.1.1 # girls and boys who complete their respective year 85% attendance) and transition to the next year grade				
Source of data:	School enrolment records, school attendance records, grade transition records, end of year grades, EGR Assessment data				
0	85%	85%	85%		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.1.2 % schools which meet minimum quality standards				
Source of data:	Quality Learning Environment assessment data (baseline, midline, endline), monitoring and observation visit reports, lesson observation forms.				
0	60%	75%	80%		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.1.3: 3 National learning Assessments conducted and report shared widely to inform learning and programming				
Source of data:	3 National Assessments				
0	1	1	1		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.1.4: Number of textbooks procured and distributed to grade 1-4 in classroom sets and reused every year				
Source of data:	Procurement tracker reports and Distribution list for schools				
0	128,000	0	0		
Sub-component 2.2:	Output 2.2: Teachers provided with pedagogical skills in literacy, gender sensitive teaching, and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)				
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.2.1 # teachers trained (male and female) and certified on pedagogical skills				
Source of data:	Needs assessment, Bill of Quantities, construction reports, photographs, Completion Certificate, donation certificate				

0	0	0	800		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.2.2 Somaliland National College of Education operationalized				
Source of data:	Needs assessment, Procurement documentation construction reports, photographs, donation certificate,				
0	1	0	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.2.3 system established in the operational school and teachers start using it				
Source of data:	School monitoring reports				
0	1	0	0		
Sub-component 2.3:	Output 2.3: Institutional framework of ECE sub-sector is developed				
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.3.1 Somaliland ECE Policy Framework and Minimum Standards, developed and validated, including Health and Safety				
Source of data:	Finalized Somaliland ECE Policy Framework and Minimum Standards, including Health and Safety				
0	1	0	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.3.2 Somaliland ECE Curriculum developed and implemented				
Source of data:	Finalized Somaliland ECE Curriculum				
0	0	1	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.3.3 Somaliland ECE Teacher Training Curriculum developed and implemented				

Source of data:	Finalized Somaliland ECE Teacher Training Curriculum				
0	0	1	0		
Sub-component 2.4:	Output 2.4: Girls and boys attend GPE supported ECE classes which meet minimum standards				
Output indicator:	Indicator 2.4.1 % ECE teachers who pass the Somaliland ECE Teacher Training Program				
Source of data:	Training attendance records, pre-post test results, final assessment scores.				
0	0	0	100%		
Component 3:	**Outcome 3**				
Objective(s):	Established efficient, effective and functional monitoring system at MOEHS central and devolved levels (REO/DEO/school)				
Sub-component 3.1:	Output 3.1:Quality Assurance and Standards System (QASS) Department services are functional and decentralized to devolved (REO/DEO) levels.				
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.1.1 # monitoring and supervision visits conducted by QASSO using agreed minimum standards				
Source of data:	Monitoring and supervision plan, monitoring and supervision reports, lesson observation reports, photographs				
0	10	10	10		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.1.2 # monitoring and supervision visit reports submitted to EMIS Unit				
Source of data:	Monitoring and supervision reports				
0	10	10	10		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.1.3 # QASSOs trained on results based monitoring and supervision				

Source of data:	Training attendance records, pre-post test results.				
0	0	32	0		
Sub-component 3.2:	Output 3.2: EMIS Unit is operationalized, functional and decentralized to devolved levels (REO/DEO/school).				
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.2.1 EMIS software operationalized				
Source of data:	EMIS reports, Scholastic Year Book				
0	0	1	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.2.2 MIS Operational Guidelines developed and adopted				
Source of data:	EMIS Operational Guidelines				
0	1	0	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.2.3 # EMIS Unit Staff, REOs, head teachers, and EFPTs trained EMIS data collection and analysis				
Source of data:	Training attendance records, pre-post test results.				
0	0	32	0		
Sub-component 3.3:	Output 3.3: An effective disaster and emergency strategic plan developed and is operational.				
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.3.1 # Disaster and Emergency Response Strategic Plans developed				
Source of data:	Disaster and Emergency Response Strategic Plans				

0	0	1	0		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.3.2 # Disaster and Emergency Response training modules developed				
Source of data:	Disaster and Emergency Response training modules				
0	TBC	TBC	TBC		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.3.3 # MOEHS officials trained in Disaster and Emergency Response				
Source of data:	Training attendance records, pre-post test results.				
0	0	100	0		
Sub-component 3.4:	Output 3.4 School and community structures promote safe, inclusive, gender sensitive basic education.				
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.4.1 % Schools implementing School Improvement Plans				
Source of data:	School Improvement Plan, action plan				
TBC	50%	70%	80%		
Output indicator:	Indicator 3.4.2 # CEC members trained in specified topics				
Source of data:	Training attendance records, pre-post test results, focus group discussions with CEC members.				
0	0	560	0		

Output indicator:	Indicator 3.4.3 # Schools receiving School Improvement Grants				
Source of data:	School Improvement Plan, action plan, financial receipts, photographs				
0	0	15	15		
➔ *For more rows, please copy and adapt a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					

IV.4 Financial overview

Please complete the table below, indicating program cost and disbursement by year as applicable, based on information extracted from the program document. If it is a co-financed project, indicate estimates for the expected disbursements of GPE funds by year.

TABLE 5 |

Program costs and expected disbursements by year – in USD

Indicate years:	Year 1 July'18 to June '19	Year 2 July'18 to June '20	Year 3 July'18 to June '21	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Total program costs per implementation year[9]	$2,560,000	$2,560,000	$2,560,000			$7,680,000
Indicate years:	[Year 1] July'18 to Dec'18	[Year 2] Jan'19 to Dec'19	[Year 3] Jan'20 to Dec'20	[Year 4] Jan'21 to June'21	Year 5	Total

[9] Implementation year runs by 12-month cycle beginning with signing of grant agreement. For example, if the signing is expected to start in July 2016 then the implementation year is July 2016 to June 2017, and July 2016 should be entered as Year 1. The program costs per calendar year for 2016 should reflect the estimated costs for the July – December 2016 period.

Total program costs per calendar year	**$1,280,000**	**$2,560,000**	**$2,560,000**	**$1,280,000**		**$7,680,000**

Please complete the table below, listing the proposed interventions/components, and indicating the expected disbursement by year and total cost for each component, as well as their respective percentage of the total grant.

If it is a co-financed project, indicate estimates for the expected disbursements of GPE funds by year.

➔ *Extend and adapt the table to the number of components that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 6

Program costs and expected disbursement by component[10] – in USD

Components	[Year 1] July'18 to June '19	[Year 2] July'18 to June '20	[Year 3] July'18 to June '21		Total costs	Program %	Other %
Project Personnel Costs	$394,329	$394,329	$394,329		$1,182,986		15.40%
Project Personnel Fringe Benefits	$35,407	$35,407	$35,407		$106,220		1.38%
Per diems for missions/travel [Project]	$51,452	$51,452	$51,452		$154,356	2.01%	
Per diems for missions/travel [Operations]	$40,152	$40,152	$40,152		$120,455		1.57%
Equipment for NCTE	$28,333	$28,333	$28,333		$85,000	1.11%	
Supplies for Project use	$1,800	$1,800	$1,800		$5,400		0.07%
Contractual [Audit Costs]	$16,000	$16,000	$16,000		$48,000	0.63%	

[10] If not using budget support as grant modality.

Office Operational Costs	$30,170	$30,170	$30,170		$90,511		1.18%
Program Activities	$1,962,357	$1,962,357	$1,962,357		$5,887,072	76.65%	
Total Direct Costs	2,560,000	2,560,000	2,560,000		**7,680,000**	**80.40%**	**19.60%**

➔ *For more rows, please copy the above rows and paste them here.*

IV.5 Supplemental program cost

TABLE 7 |

Other grant agent costs and general agency fees – in USD[11]

Indicate years:	**Year 1 July'18 to June '19**	**Year 2 July'18 to June '20**	**Year 3 July'18 to June '21**	**year 4**	**year 5**	**Total**
General agency fees (in addition to MCA):	$197,570	$189,131	$150,899			$537,600
Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc. (part of MCA)						

IV.5.1 Use of Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc.

In 300 words, please indicate how Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc. will be utilized.

Project Personnel Costs and it includes:-

[11] See *ESPIG Guidelines* for explanation of respectively other grant agent costs and general agency fees.

• Basic Education Technical Specialist who will provide technical advice to the project at all levels.
• Head of Education who maintain the required leadership and management of this project including maintaining the relationship with the donor in terms of reporting and communication.
• Education Program Manager who will lead, Coordinate the project and leads in the relationship with the MOE&S.
• Education Project Manager who will run the project.
• Education Project Coordinator who will support the Project Manager to run the programme.
• Three Education Project Officers who will be responsible for the day-to-day activities of the project.
• Contribution to a Construction and WASH Engineer who support on the project construction activities
• Contribution to the Research, Evaluation, Accountability, Learning and Monitoring Team Contribution who will assess the short-term impacts of the programme regular
• The project will also provide a fair Contribution that is based on their Effort on this project the following support teams in Operations, Admin HR, Finance & Awards, internal Audit and Compliance, Management, Supply Chain and logistics, Communication and Media and IT Departments

The Project will provide two laptops, sets office equipment and printers for the additional project staff

For office running costs:
Save the Children has a cost allocation methodology (CAM) to objectively allocate shared direct costs to awards based on the share of resources used by the award. Shared direct costs are costs that are incurred for multiple objectives to provide support to all awards in the implementing offices. These costs are necessary for program and project delivery. Shared direct costs are not indirect costs, which are defined and accounted for in compliance with appropriate donor regulations. CAM ensures consistent classification and strict segregation of allowable expenses and establishes a standardized, worldwide methodology to allocate shared direct costs to awards in each program implementation location on a basis which is transparent and compliant. Shared direct costs are proportionately and directly allocable to awards on a monthly basis, through an automated process within our financial management and effort reporting systems.

To estimate a project's anticipated fair share of shared direct costs to include in proposal budgets, we calculate the anticipated project's amount of total direct expenditure to be incurred at the country level as a percentage of the total country program's direct expenditure (all projects). "Direct expenditure" is considered as only costs incurred directly by Save the Children to implement the project (labor, consultants, travel, equipment, supplies, office operations and program activities. It does not include costs partner costs, gift-in-kind, cash transfer programming, indirect costs and home office costs. The allocation amount is based on proportionate direct expenditure excluding specified distorting costs. The amount allocated to any single award will therefore vary each month based on the actual level of support required to deliver the project. The cost allocation methodology is applied across all projects in a specific country to all types of shared direct costs (e.g. staff, vehicle, property, travel and other).

To reflect this anticipated fair share in the proposal budget, the calculated percentage is applied to the total shared direct cost base of the Country Program's annual operating budget and this amount is included across seven different line items in the proposal budget. The seven line items are as follows:
• Shared direct costs-International salaries
• Shared direct costs-National salaries
• Shared direct costs-Non-salary benefits
• Shared direct costs-Travel and lodging
• Shared direct costs-Vehicles and transport
• Shared direct costs-Premises
• Shared direct costs-Other

IV.6 Monitoring and evaluation

In 300 words, please:

- Explain how the Program will be monitored and evaluated.
- Include how the monitoring and evaluation of the Program is aligned with the national reporting systems and to the monitoring and evaluation of the Education Sector Plan through the Joint Sector Reviews or other processes.

Implementation of project activities will be regularly monitored to generate information on availability of required inputs, timeliness of implementing activities and achievement of targeted outputs. To happen this, in line with the MOES education sector strategic plan M&E framework, a detailed project level M&E framework will be developed. The purpose of this monitoring and evaluation framework is to provide a common understanding of the project M&E approach across the different departments of the MOES (such as EMIS, QASS & M&E unit). The M&E framework will also facilitate learning and enable timely access to information for decision-making, sharing of information with education stakeholders and quality donor reporting. To monitor project implementation progress, a joint monitoring will be carried out on quarterly basis. The joint monitoring will be participated by MOES team, SC project team and members from other education partners who attend ESC. The findings of the monitoring including progress made, quality gabs and other issues will be discussed and agreed action point in the education sector meeting and education program steering meetings which MOES organizes at Hargeisa level.

Apart from the ongoing and routing monitoring, a participatory Mid-Term Review will be conducted midway through the term of the action to assess the implementation progress/achievement against set targets for the indicators as per the Logical Framework, and the findings will be used to review the implementation process as necessary. This will also involve the key stakeholders and actors as identified above, and guided by either an external evaluator or done in-house by program staff. A participatory End-Term Evaluation of the action will be undertaken by an external evaluator, involving the key actors and stakeholders. Achievement of the expected results vis-à-vis the indicators

of achievement as reflected in the Logical Framework, challenges and constraints, and lessons learnt will be documented and recommendations made for the way forward for the GPE support in educational development in Somaliland.

IV.7 Risks, implementation readiness, and sustainability

In 300 words, please:

- Outline the principal risks and assumptions associated with the Program and what is planned to mitigate these risks.
- Demonstrate readiness for implementing the Program.
- Explain what is being done to ensure sustainability of the Program.

Below are key potential risks that may face the education sector & mitigation strategies to ensure sustainability based on the ESSP (2017-2021). The MOES will ensure the sustainability of the program risks are well articulated in three specific areas: institutional, technical & financial sustainability.

1. Outbreak of severe natural disaster (flood, wind, prolonged drought): The MOES will continue to give attention to institutional strengthening for disaster management and emergency preparedness through the development of disaster and emergency response strategies planning, training of MOES personnel from the central to devolved levels on disaster management and emergency preparedness. This will help mitigate the impact of shocks and minimize disruption of learning. See also Annex 1I for planning different scenarios to mitigate the risk.

2. Outbreak of clan conflict and preventing access to project sites, and interrupting learning: Somaliland Government and the communities in general are committed to peaceful resolution of conflicts despite sporadic clashed between clans in some parts of the country. The deployment of an expert on disaster management and emergency response and establishing community based early warning systems in order to minimize negative impact on schools and learners. MOES will adhere to the principle of ‘do no harm’ and promote peaceful approaches to conflict resolution. MOES will promote peace education in the teacher training & curricular as a long-term strategy for peaceful co-existence between communities.

3. The Release of Planned budget for MOES by the National Government could be insufficient to cover salaries of teachers: The development partners and MOES will lobby for increased budget allocation to the sector to enable it meet its salary obligation to teachers. The new government has campaigned for improving education services as their key priority.

4. Limited capacity within MOES to oversee and monitor the implementation of the program: The MOES will appoint a Focal Point to manage and oversee the implementation of the GPE/ESPIG Program. He/she will work in close cooperation with the Program Manager

appointed by Save the Children, who will provide technical support as necessary. The Program Steering Committee (PSC) will be established by the MOES and will provide the necessary technical back up in terms of guidance and direction to the implementing team.

IV.8 Past and current performance

In 250 words or less, please:

- Describe the implementation status of any past or current GPE grants.
- Explain how the proposed Program builds on lessons learned through the implementation of previous grants.

For countries that are not past or current GPE grant recipients, answer "Not applicable" in the box below.

Somaliland was a participant in the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) program for the period 2012-2016, under the overall Application for the Federal Government of Somalia, with UNICEF as the Grant Agent. The total amount awarded to Somaliland under the Application was $4.2 million. The Program achievements are highlighted below:

• 1a. Payment of salaries of 295 primary school teachers
• 1b. Payment of incentives to 840 head teachers
• 1c. Payment of incentives to 14 Regional Education Officers (REOs)
• 3b. The Teacher Training Policy and Minimum Standards was not developed because the National Education Policy Review, a fundamental pre-requisite, did not take place.
• 4a. 53 female teachers received two-year diploma training on school management and administration

The proposed GPE Program for the period 2018-2021 builds on lessons learned from the previous phase one of GPE program and concentrates around 3 components, following the structure of the validated ESSP 2017-2021:
1. Access and Equity
2. Quality and Learning Outcomes
3. Efficient and Effective Education System

IV.9 Aid effectiveness

Please complete the table below to illustrate how the proposed grant financing modality is evolving in comparison to the previous grant (where applicable) vis-à-vis alignment with national systems.

TABLE 8 |

Evolvement of grant financing modality

	Previous GPE grant	Current application
In relation to the ESP/TEP		
Is the GPE-funded Program aligned with the Education Sector Plan?	Yes	Yes
Are the projected expenditures of the Program included in the multi-year forecast of the Minister of Finance (Medium Term Expenditure Framework)?	Yes	Yes
In relation to the national budget and parliament		
Is the project included in the national budget?	Yes	Yes
Does the national annual budget show specific appropriations for the different planned expenditures (economic and/or functional classification)?	Yes it does	Yes, this is shown in the ministerial level budget
In relation to treasury		

Is the majority of the financing disbursed into: (a) the main revenue account of government, (b) a specific account at treasury or (c) a specific account at a commercial bank?	N/A	N/A
Is the expenditure process (documents and signatures on commitment, payment orders, etc.) for the national budget used for the program expenditures? Are there any specific derogations or safeguards on the national execution procedures for the program expenditures (other documents and/or signatures)?	N/A	N/A
In relation to procurement		
Are government procurement rules used? If so are there any derogations/safeguards on the use of these rules introduced?	No	No
In relation to accounting		
Is the financial accounting directly on government's accounting systems used for the national budget? If not, are the accounting results afterwards integrated in government's accounting systems?	Yes	Yes
In relation to audit		

Will the financial accounts be audited by the government's external auditor?	Yes	Yes
In relation to reporting		
Will the information on project execution be included in the Education Sector Plan Annual Implementation Report prepared by the Ministry of Education?	Yes as part of the Joint Review of the Education Sector and MoES Annual Reports	Yes as part of the Joint Review of the Education Sector and MoES Annual Reports
Will separate / additional reports be required for the Program?	No	No

IV.5.1 Evolution of aligned assistance

In 375 words or less, please:

- Describe how the proposed grant financing modality is evolving in comparison with the previous grant (if applicable) based on the table above.
- Explain what mechanisms are in place to mitigate fiduciary risks and why they seem appropriate.
- Detail how the proposed Program lays the foundation for more aligned assistance in the future.

N/A

V. VARIABLE PART INFORMATION

V.1 Summary of Variable Part indicators and targets

Please complete the table below, by providing and defining the selected indicators and providing recent data for the indicators, where applicable, to reflect past trends, and the specific targets for the Program.

➔ *Extend the table as necessary to fit the Program and number of indicators in each dimension, by copying/pasting rows as relevant.*

TABLE 9

Variable Part Indicators

	Past trends data		Baseline	Program targets	
Indicate years for data entries:	year	year	year	year	year
1. Equity					
Indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Definition of indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Data/targets:	N/A				
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					
2. Efficiency					
Indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Definition of indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Data/targets:	N/A				
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					

3. Learning outcomes					
Indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Definition of indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Data/targets:	N/A				

➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*

V.2 Strategies and actions in equity, efficiency, learning outcomes

For each specific dimension, please:

- Describe the selected strategies/actions in the Education Sector Plan to address the issue of each specific dimension.
- Explain how the proposed strategies/actions are included in a results' chain and can be considered transformational.
- Demonstrate that the proposed implementation strategies are robust and evidence-based.
- Demonstrate that the selected indicators have a stretch effect as opposed to a mere continuation of current trends.

The GPE Program 2018-2021 is designed to respond directly to the challenges identified in the ESSP 2017-2021 facing the MOES in its efforts to provide educational services to girls and boys in Somaliland. These challenges are addressed under three headings: Access and Equity, Quality and Learning Outcome, and Efficient and Effective Education System. The program centers on primary education, with a strong focus on efficient and effective education systems to institutionalize systems and processes that support Access and Equity, and Quality and Learning Outcomes, particularly in Primary Education. There are also some selected interventions at the ECE level.

1. Equity

Click here to enter text.

2. Learning outcomes
Click here to enter text.
3. Efficiency
Click here to enter text.

V.3 Means of verification

Please complete the table below by providing an overview of means of verification for each of the three dimensions, the timing and methodology (including inclusiveness) of the process for determining whether the target is reached as well as the process to determine (partial) disbursements based on the results. The means of verification should include:

1) Responsible party
2) Source document
3) Indicative timing of validation by local education group.

➔ *Extend and adapt the table if more rows are needed to fit the Program, by copying/pasting rows as relevant.*

TABLE 10

Target attainment verification for disbursement		
Means of verification	**Month and year of target attainment verification**	**Month and year of disbursement of variable part**
1. Equity		
Indicator:		
Click here to enter text.		

➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		
2. Learning outcomes		
Indicator:	Click here to enter text.	
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		
3. Efficiency		
Indicator:	Click here to enter text.	
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		

VI. INCLUSIVE APPROACH

VI.1 Consultation

In 300 words, please:

- Discuss the scope and depth of collaboration in the development of the application within the local education group, the government and its development partners including civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, and the private sector.
- Describe if and how the development of the application has strengthened local education group collaboration.

The development of the application has been a very collaborative process where the education actors in Somaliland actively participated through a series of consultative sessions. To start with, Save the Children as the Grant Agent has closely worked and supported the MOES of Somaliland and the Education Sector Committee in developing the term of reference (TOR) for a consultant to facilitate the application development process. The selection of the consultant was done by a team composed up of representatives from the M0ES, representative of the Somaliland ESC members and SC.

Once the consultant was on board, a task force composed up of expertise from the different departments of the MOES, members of the ESC and the different education institutions were established and given induction to the task and directives by the MOES. This was followed up by a series of meetings of the task force and review of the ESA and ESSP documents to identify priorities of the MOES and there by develop the concept note/inception report. The draft inception report that was mainly developed by the MOES expertise was shared with the ESC for comments and feedback by the consultant. With the incorporation of the comments from the ESC and other education institutions and MOES working groups, the first draft was produced and widely shared with the education Stakeholder's in a workshop facilitated by the consultant.

The second draft of the document was developed by incorporating the feedbacks from the workshop participants and was shared with the ESC members including those in Nairobi, SC/USA and GPE by the Ministry. This has been a process for all drafts that was produced until we submitted the final version of the document, which has gone through the Coordinating Agent Nairobi ESC and other donors. This consultative and participatory process of developing the application, more than contributing to the capacity development of the Ministry in taking similar initiative in the future, has built a sense of ownership, in particular the staff engaged in the process and those of the members of the ESC. Moreover, this was great exercise of collaboration among the education stakeholders in general and that of the ESC and Ministry of education in particular.

VI.2 Sign-off

Signature of applicant ministry representative	
The below signatory endorses this application on behalf of the government. (Please scan this page after signature and include it as an attached file to the submission.)	
Name of signatory:	**Yasin H. Mohamed Hiir (Faraton)**
Date:	2/8/2018
Signature:	

Signature of the grant agent representative (Country Director of agency)	
The below signatory endorses this application on behalf of the grant agent agency or organization. (Please scan this page after signature and include it as an attached file to the submission.)	
Name of signatory:	**Timothy Bishop**
Date:	2/8/2018
Signature:	

Signature of the coordinating agency representative
The below signatory endorses this application on behalf of the development partner group. (Please scan this page after signature and include it as an attached file to the submission.)

Name of signatory:	**Mohamed Sabul**
Date:	2/8/2018
Signature:	

Submission

➔ The coordinating agency submits the full ESPIG application package (see *ESPIG Guidelines* for details) on behalf of the government and the local education group via email addressed to gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org, with copy to the grant agent, the ministry focal point and the country lead within the Secretariat.

Annex I:

DEFINITIONS	
The definitions below explain how certain terms used in the template should be understood within the context of the ESPIG:	
Relating to funding modalities	
Sector Pooled	This refers to a scenario of diverse group of grant or credit modalities with varying instruments and mechanisms. The specificity for sector pooled funds is that multiple contributing partners deliver funds in a coordinated fashion to support implementation of the national education plan, or specific parts thereof. Under this modality, country systems are normally used for procurement, financial management, M&E and reporting.
Project Pooled/ Co-financed	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is made up of different source agency funds to support a common project.
Project/ Stand-alone	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is unilateral, or in other words, not pooled with any other sources of financing.
Relating to key indicators	
Number of textbooks purchased and distributed	This indicator tracks the number of school textbooks that were purchased and distributed through the Program during the reporting period. Textbooks are books designed for instructing pupils in specific subject areas. The requested data should include textbooks that have been distributed to schools and have either been distributed to pupils on loan or kept in schools for use in the classroom. The data on textbooks should exclude books in school libraries as well as novels and books for use by teachers (such as curriculum guides, syllabi and teacher guides). The data of textbooks can include textbooks in stock but not currently in use by pupils and should include all languages of instruction.

Number of teachers trained	This indicator tracks the number of teachers who received and completed formal training, according to national standards, through the Program during the reporting period. The requested data refers to formal teacher training (pre- or in-service) designed to equip teachers with the knowledge, attitude, behavior, and skills required for teaching at the relevant level and perform their tasks effectively. Teachers are comprised of professional teaching/instructional personnel who are directly involved in teaching students. They include classroom teachers; special education teachers; and other teachers who work with students as a class in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room, or in one-to-one teaching inside or outside a regular classroom. Teaching/ instructional staff excludes non-professional personnel who support teachers in providing instruction to students, such as teachers' aides and other paraprofessional personnel.
Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated	This indicator tracks the number of classrooms that were built and/or rehabilitated through the Program during this reporting period. Data on classrooms should be reported upon completion of the building or rehabilitation during the reporting period. Classrooms comprise rooms in which teaching or learning activities can take place. They are semi-permanent or permanent physical structures and may be located in a school.
Relating to system areas	
Education Monitoring and Information System EMIS	A system for the collection, integration, processing, maintenance and dissemination of data and information to support decision-making, policy-analysis and formulation, planning, monitoring and management at all levels of an education system. It is a system of people, technology, models, methods, processes, procedures, rules and regulations that function together to provide education leaders, decision-makers and managers at all levels with a comprehensive and integrated set of relevant, reliable, unambiguous and timely data and information to support them in fulfilling their responsibilities.[12]

[12] Definition of EMIS from the Global Monitoring Report (UNECO, 2008), page 101.

Learning assessment system	**Assessment** is "the process of gathering and evaluating information on what students know, understand, and can do in order to make an informed decision about next steps in the educational process," whereas an **assessment system** is "a group of policies, structures, practices, and tools for generating and using information on student learning and achievement."[13] It is the use of this information that is key for improving learning, and for that to be possible, learning data must be accompanied by contextual data so that factors that impact learning can be identified and action taken. When we talk about a **national learning assessment system**, then, what we are talking about is a functional apparatus, usually housed within a Ministry of Education, which gathers information on learning – together with contextual data – nationwide and feeds this information back to the policy, management, and classroom levels to improve learning. As Pedro Ravela and his colleagues point out: "Assessment in and of itself does not produce improvement. There must be stable links between the domains of assessment and those of curriculum development, teacher training, research, policy design, communications and outreach, among others."[14] In this way, a strong national learning assessment system closes the feedback loop to the rest of the education system to achieve meaningful improvement in learning.

Annex II:

Case scenarios related to effects of the drought on programme implementation

Working assumptions:

1. In all scenarios, water scarcity, food insecurity, human migration and displacement remain prominent concerns.
2. Political stability and security in Somaliland allows flow of international assistance for drought response activities.
3. Schools are points of convergence and response by different humanitarian agencies

The following scenarios are based on weather forecasts and predictions. The scenarios are broken down into **'best case** and **'worst case'** in order to inform the Ministry's response strategy. In Somaliland, both the two scenarios are high possibilities with the worst-case scenario presenting

[13] *Clarke, M. (2012) "What Matters Most for Student Assessment Systems: A Framework Paper."* SABER-Student Assessment Working Paper 1. *Washington, DC: WB.*

[14] Ravela, P. et al. (2008). "The Educational Assessment that Latin America Needs". *Working Paper Series No. 40*. Washington, DC: PREAL, p. 17.

massive loss of livelihoods, human life, displacement and exacerbating human suffering, some affected schools closing and children dropping out of school.

1. Worst case scenario

Somaliland experienced over four consecutive seasons of below normal rains since Deyr 2015. According to FSNAU post Gu 2017 assessments, below average rains were received in parts of Hawd, East Golis, northwest agro-pastoral areas and Togdheer agro-pastoral regions. Poor rains were also received in Guban Pastoral region and Parts of NIP. The situation did not improve with the Deyr rains of 2017. FEWSNET November seasonal monitor indicated that in general below average and poorly distributed late rains occurred in September and October in the northwest. 2018 *Gu* rains expected to come in April and situation could deteriorate if it is below normal or fails and this will result with reduced production and household purchasing power across all livelihoods, especially among the pastoral communities, the number of people in need rises. This is likely to affect many more households currently stressed to drift into crisis, emergency and famine situations over time. Food security trends continue to worsen through September, 2018 for pastoralist (livestock and fishing communities). Recovery activities are inadequate to reach and support households and schools in dire need as weather conditions remain cannot sustain existing livelihood systems. A large portion of the most vulnerable populations, including children in and out of school, will still need lifesaving and education support through 2018. Humanitarian access remains unstable with some interruptions in programming. Increased movement of people in search of better livelihood opportunities in urban centres and IDP areas

Health and Nutrition facilities are overwhelmed with the rise in malnutrition rates and Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates already exceeding emergency thresholds. Due to global demand on nutrition supplies, pipeline problems result in periods of stock out in some facilities.

Sporadic outbreaks of livestock, zoonotic and human diseases occur due to overcrowding, inadequate and contaminated water. The humanitarian response focuses on the outbreak of human diseases that include communicable diseases with mixed levels of success. There is a high level of morbidity and mortality among livestock.

Livestock body mass and value depreciate due to the effects of the drought and loss of market in the Middle East. With about 60per cent of the population in Somaliland relying on livestock for their livelihoods, such as loss further strains household income leading to an increase in household debt. Fundraising efforts are moderately successful with the needs outweighing the available resources and funding streams.

Effect on Education:

Up to 30-40 per cent of schools close with up to 50 per cent of school children dropping out of school in affected areas. In some cases, especially in urban areas, schools are overcrowded by displaced communities and children from other schools. Teachers are also displaced and relocate to other urban centres. Implementation of the GPE programme at school level might be affected. Focus will be on drought response and office based activities including strengthening systems at MOES.

2. Best case scenario

The GU' Rain will perform better or normal and there will be adequate water and communities will not migrate. They will gradually recover from the drought situation and there would be adequate financial and material resources for distribution to households and schools affected by the drought.

Effect on Education:
Schools operate at optimal levels. There is increase in attendance and children previously out of school access education.