Appraisal of

Transitional Education Plan 2019-2021 for Yemen

Appraisal Report

Prepared by Robert C West

20 August 2019

This version of the Appraisal includes the "Matrix of Core Appraisal Questions" (previously submitted as a separate document) and the "Table of Changes to TEP based on GPE Recommendations", which was requested to be added after the submission of the initial Appraisal Report on 22 July 2019.

Appraisal of Transitional Education Plan 2019-2021 for Yemen

Appraisal Report

Prepared by Robert C West

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 4
2 DETAILED APPRAISAL 5
2.1 Whether the TEP is strategic 5
2.1.1 Relevance of policy and program priorities 5
2.1.2 Coherence 5
2.2 Whether the TEP is targeted 6
2.2.1 Choice of priorities 6
2.2.2 System capacity 6
2.3 Whether the TEP is shared 7
2.3.1 Leadership and ownership 7
2.3.2 Participatory process 8
2.3.3 Capacity development 8
2.4 Whether the TEP is evidence-based 8
2.4.1 Evidence-based analysis 8
2.5 Whether the TEP is operational 9
2.5.1 Financial feasibility 9
2.5.2 Soundness of the action plan 10
2.5.3 Governance and accountability 11
2.5.4 Robustness of the results framework 12
2.6 Whether the TEP is sensitive to the context and pays attention to disparities 12
2.6.1 Vulnerability analysis 12
2.6.2 Attention to disparities 13
3 RECOMMENDATIONS 13
4 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED 14
4.1 Global Partnership for Education Guidelines 14
4.2 Ministry of Education Planning Documents 14
4.3 Documents providing evidence of consultation (In chronological sequence) 15
4.4 Other Documents Consulted 16
5 INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED 16
6 MATRIX WITH CORE APPRAISAL QUESTIONS 17
7 ATTENTION TO GPE RECOMMENDATIONS 26

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DP	Development Partner
EiE	Education in Emergencies
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ESP	Education Sector Plan
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GIR	Gross Intake Ratio
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
GPI	Gender Parity Index
HDI	Human Development Index
HNO	(UN OCHA) Humanitarian Needs Overview
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
LEG	Local Education Group
MoE	Ministry of Education
MTRF	Medium term Results Framework
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OOSC	Out-of-school Children
TEP	Transitional Education Plan
YEC	Yemen Education Cluster
YHRP	Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan

1 INTRODUCTION

The guidelines for appraising a Transitional Education Plan acknowledge the variety of contextual conditions that necessitate such a plan.

The situation in Yemen has been and continues to be characterized by armed conflict in many parts of the country, with significant numbers of internally displaced persons, damaged infrastructure, and shortages of food and medical supplies. The presence of refugees in the country and environmental factors such as recent flash floods further exacerbate the situation. Economically, Yemen has been negatively affected by the war and port blockades, which have impacted on the currency exchange rate and availability of funds to government.

The earlier *Yemen education sector plan: Mid-term results framework 2013-2015*[1] was crafted for a country that (in 2011) ranked 154th out of 184 on the Human Development Index, and that had been experiencing political unrest, armed conflict, and deterioration of social services. The education sector was affected by damage to and occupation of schools, teacher absenteeism, and shortages of educational equipment and materials.[2] The Mid-term results framework accepted an estimate of 1.15 million children of primary school age (6 to 14) as being out of school, 69 per cent of them female.[3] The *Transitional Education Plan* has thus been developed for a country which in 2015 found itself with an education system that was already severely stressed.

The TEP has taken more than two years to develop (2017 to 2019), during which time conditions in the country have steadily worsened. It has been challenging to sketch alternative scenarios for education with a reasonable level of confidence. The plan proposes measures to address the conditions created by the war, but also includes activities carried forward from the previous full pre-tertiary sector plans.

In preparing the appraisal, supplementary documents have been consulted and interviews have been conducted remotely with representatives of the Ministry of Education and Development Partners.

The TEP is a well-structured document, covering all the aspects required in a transitional plan. The situation analysis is thorough. Updating some of the humanitarian data in the analysis would not have led to different priority programs and strategies in the plan. The four priority programs give a balanced approach to addressing some of the worst deficiencies caused by the crisis in the country, alongside measures for longer-term improvements in the quality of teaching and learning. The TEP is reasonably consistent with the *Yemen humanitarian response plan 2019*.

The operational (action) plan for the first year of implementation needs to be fleshed out in more detail so that implementation of the plan will not be delayed once funding becomes available. Since the plan is intended for the period 2019 to 2021, the operational plan for the first year should be ready for implementation no later than the start of the 2019/20 academic year.

The conclusion of the appraisal is that Yemen's *Transitional education plan 2019-2021* is credible and should be endorsed.

[1] There are three ministries dealing with education sub-sectors. The TEP, and consequently the appraisal, deal only with pre-tertiary education.

[2] Yemen education sector plan: Mid-term results framework 2013-2015, p.17-19.

[3] Page 24.

2 DETAILED APPRAISAL

2.1 Whether the TEP is strategic

2.1.1 Relevance of policy and program priorities

Given the current crisis in which the country finds itself, the proposed policy and program priorities form an appropriate response to the key education challenges.

The TEP identifies the armed conflict, with consequent economic decline and uncertainty, as the major underlying cause of the challenges currently faced by the education system. At the same time, it refers to curriculum reform, and the strengthening of supervision, which had already started prior to the conflict, [4] without further discussion of the underlying problems which were being addressed by these reforms.

Given the demoralization that has occurred as a result of the suspension of salary payments to educational staff,[5] the hope that teachers will adopt the improvements in pedagogical practice which short-term in-service training initiatives are intended to bring about, seems excessively optimistic. At the time when the TEP was presented for appraisal, there was no government budgetary provision for the payment of salaries during even the first year of the plan (even if arrears payments are to be deferred). Yet the TEP does not include "incentive" payments to teachers among the Tier 1 priority activities. Agreement will have to be reached on whether salaries will be paid, or whether incentives will be provided.[6]

The range of strategies proposed in the plan is relevant, but the scope of the activities seems overly ambitious given communication and access difficulties and financial constraints. There is no clear indication in the plan that the necessary human resources to undertake the activities are available. Some of the activities may have to be postponed.

The plan recognizes the needs of those who have been displaced by the conflict, as well as the needs of communities that have lost their schools through damage, destruction, and the repurposing of school buildings. The plan also attempts to retain girls in the system or to encourage their return to school.

Government budget projections are not provided,[7] nor does the plan include a projection of development partner funding for the plan period.

The first year action plan will have to consider priorities against available resources.

2.1.2 Coherence

The plan presents a coherent set of priorities to address key challenges in the education sector.

The policy priorities are aligned with the evidence of the situation analysis and are logically structured. The strategies support the policy objectives, and are in turn supported by the activities. All activities have been costed.

Three of the four overall TEP objectives stem from the analysis of the crisis: Safe and equitable access, Rehabilitation of infrastructure, and Strengthening institutional capacities; but not all of the activities included under these headings are specifically crisis-related. While

[4] ESP MTRF 2013-2015, programs 2 and 3.

[5] "Teachers demotivated and not retained due to lack of or inconsistent payment." TEP, p.70.

[6] The TEP notes: "If the government does not pay the salaries … there will be a need to continue to pay incentives for the teachers …". Page.88.

[7] According to an informant the Government in Aden has passed a budget for the current fiscal year, but details have not been provided.

there is a logical arrangement of activities, the priority levels among the Tier 1 priority activities are not indicated. Implementation periods are not broken down below annual level. The overall objective of Improving teaching and learning is carried forward from earlier plans and not specifically related to the crisis. If there is insufficient funding, these are the strategies likely to be delayed.

The key indicators are the generally accepted system indicators. At activity level it is quantities of inputs that are used as indicators. While not entirely satisfactory, it is the most that can be hoped for under the crisis conditions.

To be sufficiently directive, the first year action plan needs to be fleshed out with proper sequencing of activities and allocation of responsibilities. Since this is dependent on activating the implementation mechanism (Chapter 6), this should be done in time for adequate operational planning to be done prior to the start of the 2019-2020 academic year.[8]

Representatives of development partners have made positive remarks about the TEP. It is not however clear that funding will be available to cover all activities. The TEP is consistent with the *Yemen humanitarian response plan 2019*.

2.2 Whether the TEP is targeted

2.2.1 Choice of priorities

The choice of priorities in relation to existing challenges and needs is appropriate.

The four TEP priority programs are relevant. The first and third (Safe, equitable access, and Rehabilitation of infrastructure) are essential. The fourth (Strengthening institutional capacity) is necessary under crisis conditions. The second (Improving teaching and learning) has been included to allow for the development of alternative learning modes for children unable to access school. It also allows, but this would be dependent upon availability of funding, for continuing with the implementation of curriculum reforms already initiated.

Phasing by year over the three years of the plan has been logically done, as shown in Annex I to the plan.

Immediate needs resulting from the crisis are addressed. Longer term needs are also addressed. Their implementation will depend on the level of funding provided. The longer-term development of the sector will not succeed if the short-term needs are not addressed.

2.2.2 System capacity

The plan does not identify or address existing capacity constraints at central, governorate, or district level for the implementation of the plan.

The TEP does not include a description of the capacities of the ministry. Weaknesses in supervision and school development capacity are addressed in the plan mainly at the school (and to some extent district) level (Strategies 1.2 and 2.3).

A structure specifically for the implementation of TEP activities is to be set up, with a steering committee and implementation unit bridging the MoE offices in Aden and Sana'a

[8] The Minister of Education has approved the terms of reference for the Executive Unit. Letter from the Minister of Education: "The Transitional Education Plan for Yemen", 27 June 2019.

(Chapter 6).[9] The actual implementation will be via the established MoE directorates and departments at governorate and district level. The extent to which the armed conflict might have impaired the capacity of some district or governorate offices is not indicated in the TEP, but the circumstances in which the Aden office of the MoE were set up implies that its capacity will not be equal to that of the more established Sana'a office.

Communication and access to schools has been negatively affected by the conflict. A full education census was last conducted in 2015/16.

There is provision in the TEP for the development of a 5-year ESP (Strategy 4.5). Whether this will be feasible will depend largely on ending the crisis. The length of time spent in developing the TEP suggests that the sector analysis for a 5-year ESP would have to start immediately if it is to be completed in time.

2.3 Whether the TEP is shared

2.3.1 Leadership and ownership

National leadership, at least from the Ministry of Education, and partners' support are reflected in the TEP.

The organizational arrangements for the preparation of the TEP were decided in July 2017. The MoE offices in Aden and Sana'a nominated focal points and members to serve on technical teams and working groups. The Minister of Education appears to have been regularly involved in the process.

It is not clear to what extent the preparation process has strengthened the MoE's technical leadership capacity.

The nature of the crisis and not, primarily, pre-crisis national plans dictate the content of the TEP. However, the third overall objective, Improvement of teaching and learning, takes forward activities from earlier plans.

The TEP is aligned with the *Yemen humanitarian response plan 2019*.

Although the Ministry of Finance has been consulted and been represented at some of the planning meetings, no budgetary forecasts have not been provided. It has thus not been possible to compare the cost of routine recurrent functions of the MoE with funding likely to be available from government. The simulation model projects zero growth in GDP and holds government expenditure as a percentage of GDP at 2015/16 levels. It is known that teacher salaries in at least eleven of the northern governorates are not being paid. Nor are details provided of the involvement of other ministries.

The TEP implementation arrangements specifically acknowledge the role to be played by Development Partners and the Education Cluster, which links with the LEG. The number of Education Cluster partners active in individual governorates varies between one to three and nine to 13 (Figure 4).

[9] See Section 2.2.1, above.

2.3.2 Participatory process

The plan is the result of consultation with partners and a range of stakeholders, despite restricted movement within the country.

There are two categories of activities in the TEP: those that are necessitated by the crisis, and those which would be likely to be found in a sector plan even if there were no crisis.

The former are typical activities that would be implemented in a situation where education has been disrupted by armed conflict and communities have been displaced. While consultation is needed on modes of implementation, the response needs to be flexible, depending on local conditions. Information on the effects of the crisis and on possible mitigating measures have been routinely received via district offices of the MoE, via partners, and via the Cluster.

Measures to encourage enrolment and retention, particularly of girls, to reduce dropout and improve the quality of education have been included in sector plans prior to the crisis. The response has been adapted to the crisis, but has also relied on consultation that took place at an earlier time.

Some activities are dependent on agreement between different interested parties on the ideological content of curricula and textbooks; these activities may have to be delayed beyond the three-year period of the TEP.[10]

Whether adequate consultation with stakeholders down to grass-roots level has informed all strategies in the TEP is debatable, but the technical groups appointed by the MoE have taken account of a wide range of expectations.

2.3.3 Capacity development

The available information does not show the extent to which plan preparation was used as an opportunity to develop national capacities in education policy and planning.[11]

The plan was developed by the national team with technical assistance from the IIEP. Face to face work was limited by the difficulties of getting MoE participants from Sana'a and Aden together within Yemen, and the difficulties of conducting frequent meetings outside the country.

Skills development for staff other than teachers focuses mainly on EMIS, education in emergencies (EiE), school management, and supervision.

2.4 Whether the TEP is evidence-based

2.4.1 Evidence-based analysis

The TEP includes an evidence-based situation analysis, using mainly EMIS and OCHA data.

Basic education data is drawn from the 2015/16 EMIS education census. No complete EMIS census has been possible since that date, largely because of difficulties in accessing schools.

[10] They should also be considered against the analysis and recommendations of publications such as MENA: *Expectations and Aspirations: A New Framework for Education in the Middle East and North Africa*. Nov. 13, 2018.

[11] Program 8 of the *ESP MTRF 2013-2015* provided for "Restructuring of the Ministry and capacity building …". No reporting was seen on the extent to which this program was implemented.

The analysis also makes use of December 2017 OCHA data from the *Humanitarian Needs Overview*, collected via the Education Cluster and other mechanisms. Although the 2019 *HNO* (reporting December 2018 data) has been available for some months, the TEP situation analysis had been completed earlier and was already being utilized in preparing the plan. Data sources are clearly referenced in the *TEP*.

Strategy 4.3 provides for strengthening EMIS. It acknowledges progress made over the past decade, but notes the limitation imposed by the manual data collection and entry at district and at governorate level. Also to be noted is that the MoE office in Aden has limited capacity and cannot link into the database in Sana'a. The proposed improvement in EMIS over the *TEP* period aims at the collection of data from 100 per cent of schools each year, but does not provide for changes to the manual mode of collecting and entering data.[12]

The *TEP* is based on financial data to the extent that the "operational plan" activities are costed. These costs are added to the cost of recurrent expenditure which should be covered by government: the projected cost of salaries and of textbooks, with an annual amount allowed for other recurrent costs (Table 14).[13]

2.5 Whether the TEP is operational

2.5.1 Financial feasibility

There is insufficient evidence as to whether the TEP is fiscally viable, but it is likely[14] that funds will be available at least for those activities that most directly respond to conditions created by the crisis.

The crisis in the country has resulted in gaps in relevant data on the population to be served, on available human resources, and on potentially available financial resources.

Projections covering enrolment, human and physical resources, and financial requirements were modeled, using two scenarios. Actual unit cost data from 2015/16 were used as the baseline, no more recent reliable data being available.

The simulation model set the annual percentage change in GDP at zero, government expenditure at a constant 36.8 per cent of GDP, and the allocation to the MoE at four per cent of government expenditure. It is understood that the Ministry of Finance was unable to provide any data.[15]

As a result of the crisis, the number of teachers for each of the three years of the TEP is projected as being lower than the 2015/16 number. The question of remunerating additionally recruited teachers does not arise. But the hope is expressed that government will take a group of 2,300 trained rural female teachers onto the civil service payroll.[16]

Where the *TEP* has been able to make use of reasonable assumptions for projecting financial needs, it has done so.

[12] "Attempts to explore opportunities for online data entry are currently on hold …". TEP, Strategy 4.3, p.73.
[13] As already noted, the funding expected from government is based on zero growth in GDP and no change since 2015/16 in the percentage of government budget for education.
[14] From information provided in interviews.
[15] Interviews conducted remotely by the author.
[16] Strategy 1.7.

- There is a clear indication of the minimum expected from government, which differs for the two scenarios, according to the different enrolment projections and consequent different teacher requirements for each.[17]
- USD 105 million is budgeted in the *2019 Yemen HRP* as "annual requirement", which equates to USD 315 million over three years.[18] There is overlap between the *YHRP 2019* and the *TEP*, but the former includes as its top priority the payment of incentives to teachers, while the *TEP* lists this activity as one to be funded only if additional funds become available.
- In the *TEP* in-kind incentives for teachers are costed at USD 45 million p.a.[19] and School feeding at USD 18.5 million p.a.[20] The total per annum for these two items is USD 63.5 million, while the *2019 YHRP* budgets USD 64 million for these two activities plus four others, which include temporary learning spaces and conducting the national examinations.[21] While it is to be expected that there would be overlap between the *YHRP* and the *TEP*, neither plan provides sufficient information to test which of the budgets for these items is more realistic.
- The *TEP* does not provide any indication of anticipated Development Partner contributions to the *TEP* budget. But it is expected that DPs will be funding at least selected activities from the *TEP*, as they will be funding selected activities from the *YHRP 2019*. Additional potential sources of external funding are not identified.
- Accordingly, the respective financing gaps for the two scenarios is the difference between anticipated (but unverified) government budget for recurrent costs for pre-tertiary education and the total anticipated cost of activities, as shown in Table 15 of the *TEP*: USD 269 million for Scenario 1, and USD 291 million for Scenario 2 (3-year cumulative).

2.5.2 Soundness of the action plan

The action plan has an incomplete operational framework. Although the activities for each year are clearly indicated, there is insufficient detail on the timing of implementation during the first year of the plan.

The activities cover the *TEP* program objectives. Activities are defined and linked to targets.

The nature of the crisis makes it impossible to fully determine whether the volume and timing of the activities are realistic. It is not possible to determine with any certainty how conditions might develop. Apart from the uncertainty of the direct consequences of the conflict, there is population movement as residents are displaced or return to their homes on a significant scale. Implementation will need flexibility to take account of local conditions. The timing of interventions will sometimes depend on the advice of education staff at district or governorate level.

The *TEP* specifies risks to implementation with possible mitigation measures. Given the fluidity of the situation, these cannot be described in greater detail in advance.

Costs are allocated, in Annex I to the *TEP*, to each set of activities by year.

[17] TEP Table 14, and Yemen education simulation model.
[18] YHRP 2019, p.24.
[19] TEP Annex II, Priority Program 1. Annex II's Tier 2 priority programs are not included in the TEP budget.
[20] TEP Program 1.6.
[21] YHRP 2019, p.24.

Sources of funding are not identified. Development Partners who have been financially supporting education sector activities, and who have been involved as LEG members in the preparation of the *TEP*, are likely to continue their financial support.

"Is the action plan structured so that it is compatible with the budget lines/classification?" It is not clear whether this question relates to government budget classification. If so, it cannot be answered, since recent government budgets have not been available. If it relates to the *TEP* itself, estimated costs are clearly allocated to each activity.

The *TEP* specifies units responsible for reporting on implementation against targets. Chapter 6 of the *TEP* describes in broad terms the responsibilities within the Implementation Framework, down to district and school level. The National TEP Coordination Committee with its Technical Office will be responsible for initiating the implementation of specific programs and activities. The Minister of Education on 27 June 2019 issued the Terms of Reference for the Executive Unit. The membership of the Committee and staffing of the Technical Office should be determined as soon as possible, and units (and where possible staff members) expected to play a role in implementation should be alerted so that they may familiarize themselves with the relevant contextual conditions.

Regular reporting will depend on two-way communication between the Technical Office and those doing the actual implementation. It is expected that EMIS will play a role. The risk of incomplete reporting may be judged by the inability of EMIS to collect school census returns for the past three years. Where it is possible to undertake reporting on implementation via the Cluster, this should be done, even if it duplicates the efforts of EMIS.

2.5.3 Governance and accountability

The plan includes strategies of ensure management accountability through the implementation and monitoring and evaluation frameworks (Chapters 6 and 7).

The *TEP* specifies units responsible for reporting on implementation against targets. Chapter 6 describes in broad terms the responsibilities within the Implementation Framework, down to district and school level. The National TEP Coordination Committee with its Technical Office will be responsible for initiating the implementation of specific programs and activities.

Although it is not confirmed in the *TEP* that the ministry has clear definitions of the roles and responsibilities of education staff, the fact that the MoE has already been implementing many activities similar to those in the present plan, some with financial support from the GPE, strongly suggests that these must exist. The MoE office in Aden is possibly constrained by having been more recently established with a smaller staff to perform a wide variety of functions.

The *TEP* does not refer to a strategy to help stakeholders at different levels better understand their respective roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the plan, nor is strengthened accountability to beneficiaries detailed in the plan.

The *TEP* does not assess the reliability of public financial management systems or ability of the education system to strengthen its own financial management over time. Specific actions to monitor education expenditure and leakage are not included. Since much of the disbursement will be managed by DPs, it is likely to be carefully monitored. The payment of salaries, to the extent that it happens, will be controlled by the MoE.

Implementation risks and proposed mitigation measures are described in Chapter 4 of the *TEP*.

Key implementation capacity constraints have not been assessed in the *TEP*. Figure 4 indicates the number of cluster partners active in each of the governorates as at August 2018, but it should be noted that this does not guarantee easy access to all districts within the governorate.

2.5.4 Robustness of the results framework

The results framework includes an adequate set of indicators to monitor progress toward fulfilling the TEP objectives.

Outcome indicators are of the type generally used in pre-tertiary education: Gross Intake Rate (GIR), Gross Enrolment Rate (GER), disaggregated by gender, Gender Parity Index (GPI), together with estimates of the numbers of out-of-school children (OOSC), partially damaged schools, and schools hosting IDPs.

Output indicators are provided for all programs, sometimes to activity level, with targets in Chapter 3 of the *TEP* cumulative for the third year, with Annex I breaking them down by year. Almost all targets are quantitative, e.g. "Number of teachers trained", "Percentage of textbooks preserved and reused", or "Pupil-textbook ratio". Given the scale of the task, it would be too much to hope for more qualitative targets, such as "Number of teachers using active learning skills in the classroom".

The outcome indicators are reasonable in number. There are 46 output indicators, between ten and 14 for each of the four programs. These are not excessive in number, are necessary for adjusting the plan from year to year or in response to changing conditions, and for planning beyond the *TEP*.

For the outcome indicators the baseline derives from 2015/16 EMIS data or Cluster information, except that the baseline and targets for OOSC are estimates. Output baselines appear to be based on actual information; many of them start from a zero baseline since they are new initiatives.

Monitoring mechanisms are set out in Chapter 7 of the *TEP*. Much of the data collection will devolve upon EMIS. Difficulties experienced by EMIS over the past three years are outlined, together with approaches to overcome them. Data will also be collected via the Education Cluster and OCHA.

2.6 Whether the TEP is sensitive to the context and pays attention to disparities

2.6.1 Vulnerability analysis

The TEP assesses and addresses the presence of risks and their potential impact on the education system.

Chapter 4 of the *TEP* describes the contextual risks under four broad headings: Political and security; Economic; Institutional capacity; and Operational, together with "Potential mitigation measures".

TEP activities specifically addressing short-term and protracted displacement contexts include ensuring refugees' access to public schools (Strategy 1.5), piloting an alternative learning program (Strategy 1.8), and provision of temporary classrooms (Strategy 3.1).

The *TEP*, at Figure 1, provides the OCHA Needs Severity Index for December 2017. Also available to the team developing the plan were the severity ratings determined by the Yemen Education Cluster (YEC). The *TEP* undertakes to be guided in implementation by new data as it becomes available (Chapter 2, second paragraph).

The principle of "do no harm" appears to have been followed throughout the *TEP*.

The origins of the conflict are political and remedies lie largely outside the competence of the school. (A coordinated approach to peace education in schools would probably require modification of the curriculum, which would require extended consultation.)

Safety concerns are addressed in the *TEP* through the training of school staff (Strategy 1.2), the establishment of parents' councils (Strategy 1.1), and the development of school-level emergency response plans (Strategy 1.3), among others.

2.6.2 Attention to disparities

The policy and program priorities go as far as is feasible in addressing existing education disparities.

The situation analysis recognizes that access for both girls and boys has been exacerbated by the conflict: damaged infrastructure, internal migration, teacher absenteeism, and security fears all contributing. For many children, distance to school continues to make access difficult. The *TEP* addresses these challenges, except the last-mentioned.

Gender is addressed in the situation analysis. Table 3, for example, shows changes in GER between 1998/99, 2010/11, and 2015/16. Over the earlier 12-year period female GER in basic education increased by 33.3 percentage points, with GPI increasing from 0.52 to 0.79. Over the more recent 5-year period there was a further increase in GPI to 0.84, but this was contributed to by a decline in male GER alongside a 2.2 percentage point increase in female GER. From the 2007/08 academic year school fees were abolished for girls in grades 1 to 6 and for boys in grades 1 to 3. Plans to extend this in 2013 were put on hold because of the conflict. The *TEP* addresses the historical undervaluing of girls' education, the practice of early marriage for girls, and safety issues in school attendance. It also aims to preserve gains made in the number of female teachers at rural schools.

Factors affecting quality are analyzed: inputs, the learning process, the overall context, and the examination system are all identified as having an influence. The second priority program of the *TEP* aims to improve teaching and learning, by attending both to short-term improvements such as school supplies and psychosocial support, and to longer-term changes in the teaching of literacy and numeracy skills and the use of active learning approaches.

While the crisis persists, there will be ongoing challenges to full coverage in the collection of data. The improvement of EMIS is covered in the *TEP*.

There are strategies in the plan for children of disadvantaged groups. Strategy 3.3 includes a modest effort to cater for special needs children.

Equity will remain a challenge throughout the *TEP* period. This is not the intention of the plan, but the consequence of limited financial and human resources.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Yemen's *Transitional education plan 2019-2021* is credible and should be endorsed. (Section 1, above)

2. The membership of the Committee and staffing of the Technical Office for implementation should be determined as soon as possible, and units (and where possible staff members) expected to play a role in implementation should be alerted so that they may familiarize themselves with the relevant contextual conditions. (Section B, 5.2)
3. The first year action plan needs to be fleshed out with proper sequencing of activities and allocation of responsibilities. (Section B, 1.2)
4. Where it is possible to undertake reporting on implementation via the Cluster, this should be done, even if it duplicates the efforts of EMIS. (Section B, 5.2)
5. The target for 1.4, Access to clean drinking water, needs to be rephrased, since it implies that 150% of schools will have been reached by the end of the three years. (Section B, 5.4)
6. Care should be taken to ensure that all documents are dated.[22]

4 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

4.1 Global Partnership for Education Guidelines

GEP. *Guidelines for Transitional education plan preparation*. May 2016.

GEP. *Guidelines for Transitional education plan appraisal*. May 2017.

4.2 Ministry of Education Planning Documents[23]

"Guidance document: The organizational structure for the preparation of the Transitional Education Plan (TEP) 2018-2020 in Yemen. Draft." Undated.

"No-cost extension for the 5th Global Partnership for Education grant to Yemen (2014-2018)". Letter from UNICEF to GPE, 26 February 2019.

Simulation model for Scenario 1 - Integrated Ops Plan matrix-revision1-lb.xlsx.

Simulation model for Scenario 2 - Projection model Scenario 2 and readmission of dropouts13Feb.xlsx.

"The Transitional Education Plan for Yemen". Letter from the Minister of Education providing "Terms of Reference of the Executive Unit for the Administration of Education Projects Funded by Foreign Loans and Aid at the Ministry of Education". 27 June 2019.

Yemen. *Education sector plan: Mid term results framework 2013-2015*. Dated "Feb 24".

Yemen. EMIS data for year 2015/2016 [selected tables].

Yemen. *Medium term results framework 2006 to 2010: Outcomes, strategy and policy framework*. April 2006.

Yemen. Operational plan to accompany TEP. 2 June 2019.

[22] A number of the documents consulted have either been undated or have an incomplete date.

[23] Some earlier versions of documents were provided. Those that had not relevance to the appraisal have not been included in the list.

Yemen. *Transitional education plan 2019-2021*. Not dated [July 2019].

Working groups for the TEP. Memo to GiZ. Undated.

4.3 Documents providing evidence of consultation (In chronological sequence)

"Minutes LEG meeting." Amman. 28-29 January 2016.

"Yemen Local Education Group meeting: Agenda." Beirut. April 2017.

"Minutes of the Local Education Group meeting." Beirut. 18-21 April 2017.

"Yemen Local Education Group meeting: Participants list." Beirut. April 2017.

"Yemen at a glance: Global context and educational update." LEG meeting, Beirut. April 2017.

"Feedback form: Yemen Transitional Education Plan: Full draft – March 2018."

"Yemen Local Education Group meeting." Beirut. 28 February & 2 March 2018.

"Yemen – LEG and DP programme mapping." - Programming Map - Yemen DP 2018 (v.3) 08.18.xlsx –April 2018.

"Yemen Development Partners meeting". Minutes. 22 May 2018.

"Yemen – Local Education Group & Development Partners. August meeting." ("Collation of DP comments on the TEP priority programmes.") August [?2018].

"Yemen Development Partners meeting online." 17 October 2018.

"Report on the National Workshop about matrix of components, programs and activities of the Transitional Plan of Education." Aden. 20-21 November 2018.

"Meeting of Yemen Ministry of Education and Development Partners." UNESCO Office, Beirut. 7 December 2018.

"Concept and agenda: Technical workshop on the finalization of Transitional Education Plan (26-30 January 2019); Meeting of Yemen Ministry of Education and Development Partners (31 January 2019)."

"Meeting of Yemen MoE and Development Partners Group." 31 January 2019.

"Yemen MoE and DPG meeting: List of participants." _31 January 2019.

"Yemen DP and LEG membership". - Yemen DP and LEG Membership - Updated 10 April 2019.xlsx 10 April 2019.

"Comments on draft TEP" - Consolidated_comments_IIEP_0306_clean.docx - Undated.

"Yemen Development Partners Group virtual group meeting: Issues raised/discussed and agreed action points. 2 May 2019."

"Cash incentives to support teachers and school-based staff in Yemen: Project overview for LEG meeting." 13 June 2019.

"Yemen: June virtual meeting action points, UNICEF presentation on the teacher incentives, and TEP revised timelines as at 15 June 2019." Email to members, 14 June 2019.

4.4 Other Documents Consulted

MENA. *Expectations and Aspirations: A New Framework for Education in the Middle East and North Africa*. Nov. 13, 2018.

Migration, displacement and education: Building bridges, not walls. GEMR. Brussels. 4 December 2018.

Republic of Yemen. Supreme Political Council. *National Vision: For the modern Yemeni State*. 26 March 2019.

UN: The sustainable development goals report, 2017.

UNHCR. Operational update: Yemen. 5 April 2019.

UNOCHA. Yemen humanitarian needs overview 2018. December 2017.

UNOCHA. Yemen humanitarian needs overview 2019. December 2018.

UNOCHA. Humanitarian response plan January to December 2019. Feb 2019.

5 INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

Dr Dagmar Awad-Gladewitz, Director, Yemen Quality of Education Improvement Program, GIZ.

Ms Randa Bamuqabel, TEP Preparation team member, Ministry of Education, Aden.

Ms Andrea Berther, Chief of Education, UNICEF Yemen Country Office.

Mr Abdullah Othman, TEP Preparation team member / Head of Technical Office, Ministry of Education, Aden.

Dr Insaf Abdu Qassem Sanad, TEP Preparation team member, Ministry of Education, Sana'a.

Ms Anna Seeger, Team Leader, TEP Preparation technical team, IIEP.

Ms Maria Tsvetkova. Regional Program Adviser: School feeding, WFP Regional Bureau for the Middle East, North Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

Ms Jeannette Vogelaar, Regional Education Advisor, UNICEF Middle East and North Africa Regional Office.

6 MATRIX WITH CORE APPRAISAL QUESTIONS

The fourth and fifth columns of the matrix below were completed as part of the appraisal process, as required by the Global Partnership for Education.

TEP Characteristics A sound and credible TEP is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
A. Strategic: It identifies strategies that not only help address the education system's immediate needs, but also build the foundation for realizing the system's long-term vision. The TEP presents arguments for the choice of these strategies; the direction it offers guides national authorities and their partners. It therefore helps avoid the type of ad hoc, uncoordinated action that may prevail in situations where significant amounts of project-based support occur outside the government's education plan.	A1. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in EQUITY?	2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP.	2	The situation analysis directs attention to the need to provide for the needs of those who are losing out because of the crisis.,
	A2. Are the underlying causes of the EQUITY challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?	2: All causes specified were addressed. 1: Some of the causes specified were addressed. 0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.	1	The plan recognizes that resources (financial and human) will not permit equity to be attained during the 3-year TEP period.

	A3. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in LEARNING?	2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP.	2	Apart from the challenges that are directly crisis-related, the TEP also attempts to take forward activities to strengthen learning from earlier plans.
	A4. Are the underlying causes of the LEARNING challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?	2: All causes specified were addressed. 1: Some of the causes specified were addressed. 0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.	1.5	The causes specified are addressed, but limited resources restrict the amount that can be done.
	A5. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in EFFICIENCY?	2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP	1.5	Teacher absenteeism and the need for curriculum review are identified, as well as inefficient school management and supervision. The efficiency of education offices (central, governorate, and district) is not clearly addressed.

	A6. Are the underlying causes of the EFFICIENCY challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?	2: All causes specified were addressed. 1: Some of the causes specified were addressed. 0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.	2	Those specified are addressed.
	A7. Is the content that addresses the EQUITY, LEARNING and EFFICIENCY challenges consistent throughout the TEP?	2: All content is consistent. 1: There are a few minor inconsistencies. 0: There are major or many inconsistencies.	2	Content is consistent.
B. Targeted: The plan focuses on critical education needs in the short and medium terms, and on system capacity development, including the preparation of the next ESP. It focuses on a limited number of policy priorities most likely to drive effective results over the planned period, taking into account the scarcity of the resources available and the capacity/contextual constraints.	B1. Does the TEP identify and prioritize responses to critical education needs?	2: The TEP targets programmatic responses to critical needs identified in the situation analysis. 0: The TEP does not focus on critical needs, or critical needs are clearly identified but no programmatic responses are included.	2	Programmatic responses are organized under four overall objectives.
	B2. Does the TEP articulate immediate and longer-term priorities?	2: The TEP articulates (with a clear sequencing/phasing of the priorities) immediate and longer-term priorities.	1	Immediate and longer-term priorities are articulated, but there is inadequate ranking of priorities. The three-year operational plan breaks down activities over three years, clearly showing what

As such, the TEP may not cover the full education sector. It is an intermediate document and tool within a progressive approach to education sector plan development.		1: The TEP mixes immediate and longer-term priorities with no clear articulation. 0: The TEP does **NOT** mix immediate and longer-term priorities (focusing exclusively on immediate or longer terms), or immediate and longer-term priorities are not clearly identified and distinguished, thus no articulation is provided.		needs to be tackled in the first year of implementation.
	B3. Does the TEP include a plan for the preparation of a comprehensive ESP?	2: The TEP includes a specific plan for developing a sector-wide ESP in the course of the TEP implementation (identified as one program/activity). 1: The TEP mentions that an ESP will be prepared, but there is no "plan" as such (not strictly identified in a program or activity). 0: Otherwise.	1	The preparation of a sector-wide plan is placed in the third year of the TEP without elaboration. The sector analysis would have to start immediately if there were to be any hope of completing the ESP in time. There is no indication that the MoE has the requisite capacity.
	B4. Does the TEP include a capacity-building plan or elaborate on strategies to build capacity?	2: The TEP includes a development plan for administrative, institutional and management capacities (pedagogical activities such as teacher training are not	1	Capacity-building for school development and supervision are included, but not for central,

		considered relevant for this question). 1: The TEP includes strategies to build capacities, but no plans or details. 0: The TEP does **NOT** include a capacity-building plan, or capacity-building strategies are not elaborated upon.		governorate or district offices (apart from their role in supervision).
C. Evidence-based: The plan addresses key challenges identified through an evidence-based analysis of the education system. In situations where a comprehensive education sector analysis is not practical due to limitations in data or the amount of time and capacity required for a thorough analysis, the best available data and evidence are used to identify immediate and longer-term needs and to examine the causes of the issues identified. Following this, responsive and viable shorter- or medium-term remediation strategies are developed.	C1. Is the TEP based on a situation analysis or on the best available data and evidence?	2: The TEP mentions the existence (and use) of a situation analysis and summarizes key results, **OR** the TEP provides an analysis section with the best available data and evidence. 1: The TEP mentions the existence (and use) of a situation analysis, **BUT** does not summarize key results. 0: The TEP does not mention the existence of a situation analysis and does not summarize any results, nor does it make use of the best available data or evidence in an analytical section.	2	The situation analysis uses the most recent available data, which in the case of EMIS is from 2015/16. Data from OCHA is from December 2017, since the situation analysis was completed before the December humanitarian resource needs reporting was available.

D. Operational: The TEP is a feasible, multi-year plan that includes well-argued implementation and financial hypotheses not only for meeting agreed-upon priorities but also for system development and strategies to overcome financial, data, technical and political constraints. It provides a detailed framework for implementing programs, regularly monitoring progress achieved and corresponding expenditures, as well as assessing the effectiveness of the strategies implemented. It is a lively policy instrument that is monitored regularly and adapts to the changing environment in the course of its implementation. At a minimum, a TEP should be carefully costed, clearly identify implementation roles and responsibilities, and include an achievable results framework.	D1. Does the TEP provide operational elements for the whole planned period?	2: The TEP includes activities **AND** provides the vast majority (as described in pp. 23-24 of TEP guidelines): (i) A precise timeline (by month, quarter or year). (ii) Responsible authority for implementation. (iii) Information about the cost. (iv) Information on the source of funding. 1: The TEP includes activities **AND** provides the vast majority (as described in pp. 23-24 of TEP guidelines): (i) A precise timeline (by month, quarter or year). (ii) Responsible authority for implementation. (iii) Information about the cost. 0: The TEP does not include operational elements at the level of the activity **OR** it does not provide information on one of the three items above.	1	The timeline provided is by year. For the first year of the plan a monthly or at least a quarterly timeline is essential. Information about the authority responsible for implementation and the cost is provided. The source of funding is not identified.
	D2. Is the TEP carefully costed?	2: Using a projection model, the TEP includes the "regular functioning" of the subsectors, such as the overall staff salaries	2	Routine recurrent costs are derived from the simulation model, but government budgetary data have not available. Projections have had to be

		as well as the additional programmatic costs. 1: The TEP mostly includes the programmatic costs, i.e., the sum of the activity costs, and assumptions are available (unit costs, quantity of inputs etc.). 0: The TEP does not include costing or or partial costing.		based on economic and budgetary data no more recent than 2015/16. Other operational plan activities are based on unit costs.
	D3. Are the OUTCOMES formulated in the key learning strategy relevant for measuring the objectives?	2: All objectives have corresponding outcomes. 1: Some objectives have corresponding outcomes. 0: There are no outcomes. Notes: When a results framework(s) exists, we will only refer to the information inside the results framework(s) to complete this section. If there is more than one results framework and they are consistent/complementary, we can draw information from all results frameworks. When there are multiple results frameworks that are inconsistent, please only	1	There is no clear results framework for the four overall objectives. The key implementation indicators are the usual ones for access (GER, GIR and dropout) with gender disaggregation (GPI), and the transition rate to grade 10. There are not specific outcome indicators for improved teaching and learning or for strengthened institutional capacity. The provision of infrastructure and equipment contributes to access and retention. Given the challenges to collecting data, it is unlikely that more could be done for the foreseeable future.

		assess the most complete/coherent one. When there is no results framework, please obtain the information from other relevant sections in the TEP.		
	D4. Does the TEP include a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) that are well defined?	2: All KPIs for marginalized populations are well defined. 1: Some KPIs for marginalized populations are well defined. 0: No KPIs are well defined, or there are no KPIs.	0	Given the difficulty of collecting comprehensive reliable data on marginalized populations, it is not possible at this stage to go beyond measuring the attainment of input targets.
	D5. Does the TEP describe monitoring tools and mechanisms at the relevant geographical levels?	2: The TEP describes the monitoring tools **AND** mechanisms at the relevant levels (see p. 29 and following of TEP guidelines). 1: The TEP plans to develop relevant mechanisms and tools (included in the strategies section), **OR** the TEP only discusses some of the monitoring tools and mechanisms (regular	1	For monitoring it is intended to use typical EMIS data as well as questions specific to the TEP activities. These instruments have still to be designed. The fact that EMIS census data have not been collected country-wide since 2015/16 is noted. Some data will (also) come via the Education Cluster.

		monitoring, joint annual review meetings, results framework). 0: No description is included.		
E. Sensitive to the context and pays attention to disparities: The plan includes an analysis of the vulnerabilities specific to the country. These might include consideration of the immediate and longer-term negative effects of conflicts, disasters, or political or economic crises on education, as well as the potential for the education system to exacerbate tensions and conflict through, for example, existing policies, curriculum and textbook content or exclusion of marginalized groups. To reduce the risk that education might contribute to societal grievances, a TEP identifies and addresses existing disparities based on sex, age, race, color, ethnicity, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social	E1. Does the TEP mention identified risks for implementation and propose solutions?	2: The TEP provides a description of the risks related to the implementation and provides solutions. 1: The TEP only provides descriptions of the implementation risks but does not propose solutions. 0: No information is provided.	1.5	Risks and mitigation measures are provided only in broad terms. The greatest threat to teacher motivation is the non-payment of salaries. The TEP states that payment of salaries is a prerequisite for the success of the TEP, but provides among Tier 2 priority activities for the payment of incentives "should additional funds become available". The HRP ranks the payment of incentives as the top priority (in the absence of government salaries).
	E2. Is the TEP based on a vulnerability/fragility/conflict analysis, or does it refer to one?	2: A specific analysis has been conducted and is mentioned as such and summarized in the TEP. 1: It is unclear whether a specific vulnerability analysis has been conducted, or there is no particular reference to an analysis of vulnerability — **BUT** vulnerability, fragility and conflict are discussed, **OR** a	2	The TEP uses the OCHA vulnerability analysis, to which the Education Cluster has contributed.

origin, property or birth, as well as persons with disabilities, migrants, indigenous peoples, and children and youth.		vulnerability analysis is planned as part of the TEP activities. 0: It is unclear that a vulnerability analysis has been conducted **AND** no elements are presented.		
	E3. Does the TEP include the gender parity index (GPI) on any of the indicators GER, GIR, CR or similar (like sex-disaggregated enrollment ratios) **OR**, when data are not available, does it include a gender analysis?	2: The indicator/analysis is available for primary and secondary. 1: The indicator/analysis is available at least for primary. 0: Otherwise.	2	But it is based on 2015/16 EMIS data.
	E4. Does the TEP include an analysis of geographic disparities?	2: The analysis is available for primary and secondary. 1: The analysis is available only for primary. 0: Otherwise.	0	With internal displacement and ongoing conflict, together with the constraints on EMIS, geographically disaggregated data are not available since 2015/16. OCHA estimates of people in need are available by governorate and district.

7 ATTENTION TO GPE RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the submission of Sections 1 to 5, above, the GPE commented on that "The AR seems coherent with the Secretariat's TEP initial comments; however, it is recommended that the AR incorporates a table describing how the Secretariat's comments [on the March 2019 draft] were addressed into the final TEP document." The Table below describes how each of the recommendations has been dealt with in producing the

July 2019 version. The "Rating" column indicates whether the recommendation has been dealt with "Well" (Green), with "Some Room for Improvement" (Yellow), or with "Room for Improvement" (Blue).

GPE RECOMMENDATION	HOW THE JULY 2019 VERSION OF THE TEP HAS APPLIED THE RECOMMENDATION	RATING
1 Introduction		
2 Scope and Structure		
Further strengthen the OP with clear identification of the agency or unit that is responsible for implementation of activities.	This has not been done.	
In addition, organize the strategies, indicators and activities with a unique number and then similar classifications consistently throughout the document.	This has been done in Chapter 3 of the TEP and in the *Operational Plan to accompany TEP* (2 June 2019). In Table 13 (p.84) the sequence of the strategies has been aligned with that in Chapter 3, but the strategies are not numbered;[24] this should be attended to.	
Clearly articulate the role of Education Cluster and agree on priorities and financial commitments to avoid duplication.	The paragraph on the "Yemen Education Cluster" has been expanded in the July 2019 TEP (p.94). The mechanism for decision-making on priorities and on coordination financial allocations still needs clarification.	
Include mapping and analysis of the support currently provided by development partners including the current GPE Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG) by GPE and ECW in the ESA/TEP.	Figure 5 (p.16) has been added to the TEP showing the coverage of UNICEF activities, funded by six agencies, and on page 15 the membership of the LEG as at April 2019 has been added. However, this still fails to provide information on the value of partner funding, or on the specific activities supported by development partners, with geographic coverage. ESPIG support is not described, nor is ECW support (if any) outside of UNICEF.	

[24] Strategy 2.5 is omitted from table 13 because it is funded by the MoE. It should be included, with a zero cost, or a footnote should be added to explain why it is omitted. It has been included in the *Operational Plan*. Staff salaries could be dealt with in the same way.

Ensure adequate participation of all stakeholders in the finalization of the TEP to facilitate better and coordinated implementation.	The evidence shows that efforts were made, but that the difficulties attendant upon holding meetings outside Yemen, or at a single venue within Yemen, prevented full participation by some stakeholders.	
3 Strategies for Equity Learning Outcomes and Efficiency		
3.1 Equity Dimension		
Further clarify key underlying causes for low enrolment of girls in primary and secondary schools in comparison to boys and how the proposed TEP activities will address these causes.	The last paragraph under the heading "2.2 Schooling patterns" has been expanded with anecdotal evidence of the reasons for girls being out of school. Robust statistical data on the causes of drop-out and non-enrolment of girls (relative to boys) are not available. Contributory causes listed in the Situation Analysis (Chapter 2) include safety concerns, distance to a functioning school, sanitary facilities at the school, availability of teachers, and early marriage. All of these are addressed, both directly and indirectly, in the TEP, e.g. parent councils (Activity 1.1.3), awareness raising (1.3.1, 1.5.1, 1.5.2 & 1.5.3), school counselling (1.3.4), washrooms and drinking water (1.4.1), rehabilitation of facilities and the provision of temporary classrooms (3.1.3, 3.1.5 & 3.3.1), even though specific mention of girls is not made in the narrative under each of these strategies.	
Prior to implementation, the OP should consider how the interventions will be targeted.	This has not been done. No changes have been made to the TEP to clarify targeting of activities. The "share of activity targets and costs per governorate" are determined by the National TEP Coordination Committee (p.92), with a footnote suggesting that the formula might be based on the proportion of public schools or on the OCHA Severity Needs Index. There is no indication as to which body determines priorities if there is insufficient funding.	
3.2 Efficiency Dimension		
Consider including an assessment of needs before developing annual plans for EMIS upgrades.	In the narrative for Strategy 4.3, page 73, a sentence has been inserted indicating that information data gaps and data needs will be jointly determined by the MoE and the Education Cluster. This only partly to meets the GPE's recommendation. There are faulty technical processes	

	whose causes should be identified in greater detail than that given in the first paragraph of "7.2 M&E Tools" (p.96), which is unchanged from the March 2019 version. Corrective activities would have to be prioritized.	
3.3 Learning Outcome		
Consider continued support to the implementation of the National Assessment System (NAS) and explore an alternate mechanism to measure the current level of learning outcomes, at least at the primary level.	Strategy 4.1 (p.71; Activity 4.1.3) allows for the expansion of the test item bank to grades 1 to 3 and grades 7 to 9 (This is also in the March 2019 TEP). The July 2019 TEP adds (p.71) "small scale testing [to] be conducted as possible", or the identification of "potential alternate mechanisms to measure the current level of learning". This appears to be less than the GPE was recommending.	
4 Financing		
Given the critical importance of teachers and textbooks to the operation of the sector, it is recommended to include these costs in the operation plan.	The *Operational Plan* of the TEP excludes the costs to be met by the MoE, although these are included in Table 14, the "Summary of all plan costs" (p.86), as they were in the March 2019 version of the TEP. If, however, the MoE fails to pay all teachers, there will be a need for "incentives" to be covered, which are not included in the *Operational Plan* because they have been classified as Tier II priorities. In the *Operational Plan* a line for Textbooks has been included (Activity 2.5.1) with no cost against it (but also included in Table 14).	
Also, it will be helpful in the TEP to identify different scenarios over the short and medium term for increasing the number of teachers across the country who receive a salary, or alternative forms of compensation, on a regular basis, and potential sources of financing (government, cluster partners, etc.) these payments.	This has not been done.	
Also, for rural female teachers, it will be good to have costing for the entire three-year period.	The narrative for Strategy 1.7, and Activity 1.7.1 of the *Operational Plan* allow funds for all three years of the TEP.	
In addition, it will be good to include the cost of other supplementary teaching and learning materials.	Strategy 2.9 (p.65), also in the March 2019 TEP, provides for teaching aids, specifically for rehabilitated schools. Strategy 1.6 (p.57) includes	

	the provision of school bags, without specifying what (if anything) the bags will contain.	
5 Monitoring and Evaluation		
Clearly describe roles and responsibilities including coordination mechanisms between authorities in Aden and Sana'a as well as with DPs for the implementation and monitoring of TEP.	The coordination and implementation structure for the TEP is detailed in Chapter 6 (p.89ff). There is no clear indication of coordination mechanisms between the MoE offices in Aden and Sana'a. Strategy 4.3 (p.72) allows for JARs to be conducted at "sub-national" level ("governorate level", p.99) with reports being fed back to the National TEP Coordination Committee (p.99). There is no mention of a JAR at national level. It is not clear how the central MoE offices or the DPs will be represented at 21 sub-national meetings all taking place roughly at the same time.	
Consider using Joint Annual Review (JARs) or other consultation forums such as LEG meetings to further prioritize interventions given the strained financial context and consider trade-offs (e.g., prioritizing school feeding and textbook delivery over computer labs, for example).	No changes have been made to the TEP to clarify prioritization of interventions. The "share of activity targets and costs per governorate" are determined by the National TEP Coordination Committee (p.92), with a footnote suggesting that the formula might be based on the proportion of public schools or on the OCHA Severity Needs Index. There is no indication as to which body determines priorities if there is insufficient funding. It is possible, although it is not stated, that recommendations from JARs will influence the prioritization of activities for the following year. The LEG "align[s] technical and financial support to the education sector" and identifies potential funding sources (p.93). There is nothing to indicate that it will play a role in prioritizing activities.	