CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

Review Meeting participants: Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, Youmna Sfeir, Naoko Hosaka, Helena Murseli, Sissy Helguero, David Balwanz, Anne Joncheray and Adrien Boucher.

Review Meeting Date: June 9, 2020

Date of proposal submission: May 14, 2020

1. **Grant Summary:** This project will support the Government of Central African Republic in undertaking activities in its national COVID-19 Contingency Plan. It will fund activities to respond to the impacts of COVID-19 including sensibilization/communication and prevention activities against COVID-19, ensuring learning continuity during school closures (e.g. distance learning), and facilitating smooth integration of children to schools after reopening. The project also focuses on building a more resilient education system with a longer-term vision. These sets of activities are mutually reinforcing and clearly address the COVID pandemic. Girls are specified as one of the groups which will be most affected by COVID-19 and activities tailored for girls (training on VBG (GBV), psychological support, etc.) are included. The approach is in favor of partnership both at the central and local level with the involvement of parents, CSOs and decentralized ministry services.

2. **Key information:**

Country: Central African Republic		
a.	Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation	US$ 10,000,000
b.	Allocation Requested (100%)	US$ 10,000,000
c.	**Allocation Recommended**	US$ 7,000,000[1]
d.	Grant Agent	UNICEF
e.	Agency Fee % (US$ amount)	7% (US$ 490,000)
f.	Grant duration	12 months
g.	Expected Start Date	06/01/2020
h.	Expected End Date	05/31/2021

Secretariat assessment of proposal against program standards, with accompanying staff and management sign-off, is included as Annex 1. Grant Agent proposal is included as Annex 2.

3. **Recommendation: Grant is recommended for approval**

4. **Decision language:**

[1] Includes US$702,000 for the cost of the grant agent to perform its roles and responsibilities.

RECOMMENDED DECISION

In line with the delegated authority granted by the Board of Directors, the GPE CEO approves the COVID-19 accelerated funding request for Central African Republic in the amount of US$ 7,000,000 plus an additional US$ 490,000 in agency fees to UNICEF as Grant Agent. The grant has a start date of (DATE OF CEO APPROVAL LETTER), and an end date of June 30, 2021.

The GPE CEO recognized with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of Central African Republic in preparing a national response plan and grant proposal that will mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the education sector as well as support the recovery of the education system from the crisis.

The GPE Board approved the COVID-19 funding mechanism on a first come, first served approach for the first US$ 125 million of the original US$ 225 million COVID-19 country funding window. Although the remaining US$ 100 million has been subsequently significantly increased to US$ 350 million by the Board, the demand for the COVID-19 funding mechanism still exceeds the available funds and the maximum allocation for Central African Republic is now US$ 7,000,000, lower than the initial allocation and requested amount of US$ 10,000,000.

Unless otherwise indicated by the decision language request for Report-Back, and keeping within the original budget of each component, the government and grant agent have full authority to prioritize within the approved activities of the original application, after consultation with the local education group.

Recognizing the GPE Board's intent to proceed with the COVID-19 funding on a timeline which acknowledges the COVID-19 emergency, the Government and Grant Agent are asked to move forward with implementation immediately while addressing the following points and reporting back to the Secretariat by THREE WEEKS AFTER ENVISAGED APPROVAL DATE:

Request for Report-Back

1. The Grant Agent is requested to provide a revised program document (including results framework, budget and implementation plan), following consultation with the LEG and agreement by the Government. This revised program document needs to prioritize activities so as to keep within the new grant allocation and must address the requirements noted below. Upon receipt of the revised program document, the Secretariat will verify compliance with each of the requirements below, but there will be no additional grant approval issued, nor further re-assessment of the program.

i. Activities with clear and immediate impact on the continuation and safeguarding of education for vulnerable populations during the COVID-19 crisis should be prioritized over activities that provide lesser immediate value for money for this purpose. Building the resilient education system should be prioritized.

ii. The Secretariat commends the inclusion of interventions in the program that will directly support the return to school of the most vulnerable students. To that end, further clarification on the targeting criteria and methodology to be used to identify beneficiary schools should be provided in the revised program document.

iii. Ensure that the mapping of ECW interventions is cross-checked with coverage of GPE financing (intervention areas, targeted children, activities) to ensure complementarity. Ensure that sharing of the implementation progress of both ECW and GPE financing will be done through regular LEG meetings.

iv. Include actuals of baselines in the proposed Results Framework. Also include Indicator 4 of table 1 from the Guidance on monitoring and evaluation. Further, all core indicators from the Guidance included in the Results Framework should be reported as both the number and the percentage of the beneficiary population reached.

The Secretariat also raises the following points of observation, which are recommendations rather than requirements:

Observations

a) Given the urgency of the crisis, grant implementation is to commence on schedule and the Grant Agent to submit a cash transfer request within two weeks of approval to facilitate the timely release of funds in support of program implementation.

b) An appropriate reduction in implementation support costs is suggested, given the lower overall budget.

c) The Secretariat positively recognizes program activities to more systematically identify children with special educational needs and the GA's intent to work with implementing partners with experience in inclusive education programming. During the emergency response and in line with the new Education Sector Plan, the Secretariat encourages authorities and local partners to build on these initial steps and, where possible, further support the educational access and learning needs of students with disabilities. The Secretariat will pay particular attention to the support for children with disabilities that will be proposed in the upcoming ESPIG application.

d) The Secretariat recognizes the important role of community schools to the sector in reaching children in areas where there is no government access, and of the government's intent to extend access to public education over time. Recognizing the government's appreciation of the contribution of community schools to the sector, and of the existing mechanism for oversight,

the Secretariat recommends government and local partners initiate a dialogue over, and support progress toward, the further development and financing of a regulatory framework for community schools. If needed, partners may consider drawing on financing from the future ESPIG to support this work.

e) The Secretariat notes the participatory approach used to develop the sector's response plan, and further encourages the authorities to make it available online and beyond the LEG membership through its publication on the government's website.

Reporting

Please note that during the implementation period, the GPE Secretariat will require the Grant Agent to fill out a quarterly survey which will request core data on program implementation. At the end of the implementation period, the Grant Agent is expected to submit a completion report to the GPE Secretariat. Detailed information on the reporting requirement is available in the Guidelines for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding on GPE website.

Reprogramming

The Government and the Grant Agent may reprogram this grant, in consultation with the Local Education Group and where active the Education cluster, for an amount not to exceed 25% of the allocation without prior Secretariat approval but must disclose such cases to the Secretariat. For an amount of 25% or more, as well as for any extension, advance approval from the Secretariat must be sought. The process for advanced approval will be that of non-minor revisions of ESPIG which can be found here: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/policy-education-sector-program-implementation-grants

CEO Approval:
Alice P. Albright
Chief Executive Officer
Global Partnership for Education



Date: June 24, 2020

CEO Memo - Annex 1
Program Standards for Assessment of
COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Applications (Country Grants)

(Last updated April 2020)

The GPE Secretariat will complete this matrix to assess country applications for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding.

Program Standards: COVID-19 Accelerated Funding				Comments
Country:			CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	
Grant Agent:			UNICEF	
Date of Submission:			Request submitted to GPE Secretariat: 6/8/2020	
			Secretariat Review completed: 6/12/2020	
Yes	No	N/A	**Eligibility**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding?	Yes, up to US$ 10M at the time of submission, reduced to US$ 7M following Board decision on May 29, 2020
☒	☐	☐	Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.*	Yes, UNICEF is grant agent
☒	☐	☐	Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[2]	GA selection process is documented: initially two agencies expressed interested. However, only UNICEF confirmed. With facilitation of CA (EU), UNICEF was selected by the government, and endorsed by the LEG given its experience in emergency response, its current role as GA for the regular Accelerated Financing, as well as its presence in four regions with four field offices.
☒	☐	☐	Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)?	It was endorsed by the LEG and Education Cluster which has been playing an active role in the LEG with two representatives fully involved.

[2] If a grant agent has been selected for the 'regular' Accelerated Funding window announced in December 2019, the government can decide to maintain the same grant agent for the COVID-19 accelerated funding.

☒	☐	☐	Is the proposal based on a publicly available government response plan related to COVID-19, including education? *The proposal should explain where and how the response plan has been made publicly available (e.g., Government website, distribution to key stakeholders, etc.).*	The education COVID-19 response plan has been integrated in the broader government COVID-19 response plan, which covers not only education, but all government sectors. It was distributed through the LEG emailing list to around 50 partners (government, CSOs, donors, etc). Suggested Decision Language (observation): **The Secretariat notes the participatory approach used to develop the sector's response plan, and further encourages the authorities to make it available online and beyond the LEG membership through its publication on the government's website.**
☒	☐	☐	Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness?	The proposed start date being June 1, 2020, this will be adjusted accordingly upon approval decision. The project will be implemented over 12 months.
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Yes	No	N/A	**Program Design & Coordination**	
☒	☐	☐	Are proposal activities (i) supporting basic education only, (ii) within the boundary of eligible activities under this funding window (see COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Guidelines, which focus on recovery and mitigation), or, if not within the boundary, are from the government response plan and well-justified, and (iii) likely to support program objectives / progress toward expected outputs and intermediate outcomes?	(i) The proposal supports preschool, primary and lower secondary schools and will benefit children aged 5-18 years. Due to the conflict and the displacement of populations, late school enrollment and repetition are indeed common and explain the coverage of youth up to 18 years old. The proposal will also support out-of-school children. Following clarification received from the GA, upper secondary school level is not being targeted by the proposal. (ii) Proposed activities are within the boundary of eligible activities: component 1 focuses on sensibilization/ communication (children/parents), prevention activities (WASH kits), etc. Component 2 focuses on teaching during the school closure (e.g. distance learning), facilitating smooth integration of children to schools after the opening of schools. Component 3 focuses on building the resilience of the education system. Tents will be set-up in existing public schools in order to increase schools' capacities to host children. The construction aims to improve the classroom conditions: it will

				contribute to decreasing the pupil/classroom ratio for social distancing. Fans will be installed in schools for better air circulation. School feeding is supported by WFP, in complementarity with the regular GPE Accelerated Funding which contributes by providing cooking equipment. (iii) Activities are contributing to expected outputs/intermediate outcomes specified in the results framework.
☒	☐	☐	Does the program, to a sufficient degree, reach poor, vulnerable, or otherwise disadvantaged children, including girls, affected by the COVID-19 pandemic? *For targeted interventions, the proposal should include the targeting criteria to ensure equity (i.e., that interventions reach vulnerable populations).*	The following groups of children are identified as the most vulnerable: girls, children from the poorest households, refugee children, returnee children, internally displayed populations (IDP) children, children with disabilities. Following a request from the Secretariat, the GA confirmed that academic Inspections have data on the vulnerable children per region, and the targeting is done accordingly: the geographic focus (16 regions) is described in the proposal. GA also confirmed that there are large IDP camps in Bria, Kaga Bandoro ou Paoua, where ETAPE (temporary tent schools benefiting from accelerated and special learning program) are found. Children in these large IDP camps will also be covered by the proposal. The proposal includes supporting students and schools located in "urban centers" which are regional capital cities where the most vulnerable populations have gathered for security and safety reasons. Following clarification from the GA, and in compliance with UNICEF policy, the most vulnerable schools (public schools and community schools as well) will be identified by the ministry of education through field information from the deconcentrated level ("Inspecteur d'Académie") and based on clearly defined criteria. The GA committed to engage this discussion with the ministry early on in order to ensure agreement on the criteria and rapid identification of beneficiary schools. Proposed decision language: **Activities with clear and immediate impact on the continuation and safeguarding of education for vulnerable populations during the COVID-19 crisis should be prioritized over activities that provide lesser immediate value for money for this purpose. Building the resilient education system should be prioritized.**

				The Secretariat commends the inclusion of interventions in the program that will directly support the return to school of the most vulnerable students. To that end, further clarification on the targeting criteria and methodology to be used to identify beneficiary schools should be provided in the revised program document. The COVID-19 response plan does not include any activities targeting children with disabilities in the absence of existing initiatives and data on children with special needs in CAR. Therefore, as clarified by the GA, the suggestion is to address the needs of children with disabilities indirectly in this proposal by collecting data on currently enrolled children with disabilities and out of school children with disabilities. This is identified as a first step towards future interventions. The GA also stressed that implementing partners with inclusive education programs will be given priority to work with UNICEF. This will also support awareness raising at the ministry level in line with the recently approved ESP (2020-2029) that includes a clearly defined strategy towards inclusive education for children with disabilities. The school health program under component 1 therefore includes screenings to identify children with special needs, based on disabilities related to vision, hearing, language and other types of disabilities. The development of this program will aim to identify children with special needs, including children with hearing, language and mobility impairments which hinder their learning. This initiative will lead to the creation of a student database, to allow for the resolution of certain health problems in subsequent programs and ensure synergy between social services (health, family affairs, education) regarding referral and monitoring. Proposed decision language: **The Secretariat positively recognizes program activities to more systematically identify children with special educational needs and the GA's intent to work with implementing partners with experience in inclusive education programming. During the emergency response and in line with the new Education Sector Plan, the Secretariat encourages authorities and local partners to build on these initial steps and, where possible, further support the educational access and learning needs of students with disabilities. The Secretariat will pay particular attention**

				to the support for children with disabilities that will be proposed in the upcoming ESPIG application.
☒	☐	☐	Does the program, to a sufficient degree, identify and address specific barriers to learning faced by girls due to COVID-19?	Girls are specified as one of the groups which will be most affected by COVID-19 (e.g. when there is a sick person in the household, girls are the ones to take care of the sick, thus, lose chances for learning, also the girls from the poor families in remote areas are most impacted). The training of teachers (Indicator 3.02) includes training on GBV, psychosocial support, hygiene. There are activities whose target includes girls among other vulnerable groups (indicators 1.01, 1.03, 1.04, 2.01, 3.02, 3.03, 3.04 are disaggregated by girls/boys), and activity 2.4 on development and dissemination of life skills courses on reproductive health.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal identify a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism(s) and confirm that the program will be represented in this mechanism?	There will be a technical committee (TC) for this proposal, and all the activities in the proposal will contribute to the COVID-19 national response plan. The response plan will be managed by a committee headed by the high government authority (president and prime minister) to ensure all the COVID-19 related actions are coordinated. Members of the Education Cluster (co-chaired by the MEPS Emergency Cell and UNICEF) are also those of LEG, therefore, the coordination between the LEG and Education Cluster will be ensured within the framework of LEG meetings. The regular updates on COVID-19 related activities will be done through LEG meetings. Moreover, the Education Cluster holds two monthly meetings with all implementing partners and the government.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal (i) provide information on the sources of financing for COVID response and early recovery activities planned and (ii) information demonstrating that GPE funds will be complementary to government or other donor funding, including from Education Cannot Wait, where relevant?	(i) There is a table describing partners (UNICEF, KfW, EU, WB, ECW, GPE) and their activities, geographical focus and contributions for COVID-19 response. (ii) A US$ 1M grant from ECW will support the following activities: sensibilization for COVID-19 prevention, distance learning by radio, training of Academic Inspections, Chief of circumscriptions, FNAPEC (PTA), psychosocial support, procurement of handwashing kits for all the provinces apart from Bangui, Lobaye, Ombella MPoko, Bamingui Bangoran, Basse Kotto. Following a request from the Secretariat, the GA confirmed that under the ECW grant, the amount allocated to UNICEF (750,000 USD) includes a large component for the provision of hygiene kits for the most vulnerable households identified in the area most affected by the pandemic in the corridor entry at the border with Cameroon (West). In view of the activities and geographic areas of each of the

				beneficiary organizations, the GA has confirmed after a request for clarification that it will maintain strict mapping to be done and followed both at UNICEF and the Cluster level, which is the privileged interlocutor of ECW. Suggested Decision Language: **Ensure that the mapping of ECW interventions is cross-checked with coverage of GPE financing (intervention areas, targeted children, activities) to ensure complementarity. Ensure that sharing of the implementation progress of both ECW and GPE financing will be done through regular LEG meetings.**
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Yes	No	N/A	**Budget**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the proposed budget (excluding agency fee) within the GPE Board approved allocation for the country? *	Proposed budget is consistent with the original GPE Board approved allocation (US$ 10 million), but above the revised allocation of US$ 7 million. As the allocation is revised, the agency fee should be US$ 490,000 representing 7 % of the allocation (note that the percentage on the cover note was wrongly calculated at 9.3%).
☒	☐	☐	Does the submitted budget clearly outline component, activity and grant agent implementation support costs? *Estimated unit costs and quantities should be clearly indicated. (Budget can be provided in a separate document from program document, preferably in a spreadsheet format) *	The proposal is supported by a separate spreadsheet with line-by-line calculations of activity budgets, including unit costs which appear reasonable for the context. Following a request from the Secretariat, the GA clarified that the GA support costs will be US$ 702,000. Support costs are high in comparison with some other UNICEF COVID-19 grants, but are appropriate in the complex context of CAR. The GA sufficiently clarified the terms of support costs for implementing partners, which will be capped at 25% depending on the activities.
☒	☐	☐	Is there a clear indication of the program's sources of funding, including which parts of the program are supported by each source? *	The budget is presented as stand-alone, and the proposal explains that similar activities supported by other donors are focused in different geographical regions.
☒	☐	☐	Is the budget, and its assumptions, coherent with other parts of the program design? *This includes coherence between budgeted quantities and results framework output indicators where*	Although there are minor misalignments and differences in quantities between the budgeted activities and the proposal, these are immaterial. The budgeted activities agree sufficiently with the activities proposed and the results framework.

			*possible. **	
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Yes	No	N/A	**M & E and Results Framework**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the proposed M & E framework costed and likely to support effective monitoring of program implementation and results reporting? [3] Are roles and responsibilities clearly mapped? **	M&E activities are costed. M&E arrangements appear to be adequate.
☐	☒	☐	Does the program include a complete results framework, including the key output and outcome indicators, baselines and targets and data sources? *Indicators should be disaggregated by gender where relevant. **	The results framework includes output and outcome indicators, targets, means of verification and relevant disaggregation. Baselines should be defined and included in the results framework proposed. Suggested decision language: **Include actuals of baselines in the proposed Results Framework.** Once this decision language is implemented then this program standard will be met.
☐	☒	☐	Does the proposal confirm agreement to collect and report on required core indicators (where relevant) and follow GPE M&E Guidance for COVID-19 AF Grants, including on standardized program reporting? **	Not all core indicators are included in the results framework proposed. Indicator 4 of table 1 from M&E guidance needs to be included because teacher training activities on distance learning (act. 2.1) are proposed. There is a need to ensure that all core indicators report both the number and the percentage of the beneficiary population reached. Suggested decision language: **Also include Indicator 4 of table 1 from the Guidance on monitoring and evaluation. Further, all core indicators from the Guidance included in the Results**

[3] Government-led school census and EMIS activities may be disrupted because of the pandemic; the proposal should ensure available capacity and financing for data collection with this risk in mind.

				Framework should be reported as both the number and the percentage of the beneficiary population reached. Once this decision language is implemented then this program standard will be met.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal include an activity line and budget for development and implementation of an approach to learning from evidence? *(see GPE M&E Guidance for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Grants) **	A costed learning from evidence approach is present.
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Yes	No	N/A	**Implementation Arrangements & Readiness**	
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal include a sufficiently detailed implementation plan with a timeline, activities, and roles and responsibilities clearly described?	There is an implementation plan with a timeline and activities. Roles and responsibilities for each partner (UNICEF, CSOs, Academic Inspections, etc.) are specified next to the results framework indicators per results area.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes?	Implementing partners per results area are specified in the results framework. Implementation will be managed by UNICEF Country Office in collaboration with UNICEF field offices. While UNICEF field offices will closely work with Academic Inspections as well as CSOs, UNICEF will oversee these collaborations and ensure monitoring of activities.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? *	The proposal states that harmonized approach to cash transfer (HACT) procedures will be followed, including funding authorization and certificate of expenditures (FACE) forms for funding requests, and provides explanation on the chain of custody of funds and methods of transfer from GA to Implementing partners and via direct payment to vendors.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? *	HACT arrangements will apply, and in response to the Secretariat's request, the GA provided clarification regarding responsibility for financial management (i.e. list of procedures that could be developed in the context of emergency). The GA also confirmed that the selected implementing partners will be required to comply with

				the terms and conditions for financial management set out in a Programme Coordination Agreement. Auditing and procurement arrangements are otherwise adequately described.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate?	The GA provided additional information which has clarified how the HACT arrangement will be used for the implementation and monitoring of the project in regions by international NGOs.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described?	A Task Force (whose members will be nominated by MEPS) will be established for the project implementation oversight. The Office of the Permanent Secretary as an operations body of the ministry will ensure daily operations such as staff per diem payment and delivery of equipment. UNICEF Country Office (including Education section, Child Protection section, and Health/WASH section) and 4 field offices will support implementation. These field offices will work closely with Academic Inspections at the decentralized level as well as implementing partners (CSOs). UNICEF Country Office will also use a "Third Party" monitoring system to audit/monitor the activities in the zone where UNICEF staff has no access.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal ensure implementation arrangements will be in place to ensure rapid start-up? Specifically, will fiduciary and administrative arrangements allow for disbursement by the proposed start date? Will major interventions be ready to be launched by the proposed start date? *	In response to the Secretariat's request for further information, the GA outlined rapid implementation procedures including: coordination by the joint UNICEF / MEPS Emergency Cell, direct procurement by UNICEF, simplified emergency onboarding of implementing partners, etc.
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Yes	No	N/A	**Risk Assessment and Mitigation**	
☒	☐	☐	Are risks / insecurity that could threaten any vulnerable population (e.g. girls,	Under the risk section, security/access risk and fiduciary risk and their mitigation actions are proposed. It also refers to "do no harm" principles. Further description of how these risks affect vulnerable populations is provided in the narrative of the proposal (e.g. children from the poorest families/displaced children are immediately hit by the consequences of COVID-19 without having access to schools). Annex 2 also refers to the risk of delays in distributing materials,

			displaced children) identified, with mitigation actions proposed?[4]	communities' lack of understanding to distance learning, lack of financing. Mitigation actions are suggested for all identified risks.
☒	☐	☐	Are risks related to fiduciary arrangements, including financial management, procurement, governance, and safeguards issues (harm to people or the environment) and adequate mitigation actions are identified? *	The proposal adequately describes HACT procedure-based mitigations against fraud / misuse of funds, vendor performance risks and capacity limitations. Alternative UNICEF-led procurement arrangements are proposed should local market supply be incapable of fulfilling demand. As there are no significant civil works, it is reasonable that environmental risk is not discussed. Security risks are considered and support of populations of vulnerable children is programmed within components 1 and 2.
☐	☐	☒	For grants exceeding US$ 5 million and the Grant Agent is an INGO: are there any significant risks regarding the capacity of the country office to perform the GA role that do not appear to be mitigated (e.g. through increased support from regional or HQ level, etc.)?	n/a
☐	☒	☐	Does the proposal trigger any GPE policies (e.g., GPE Private Sector Policy) which would require extraordinary consultation with GPE governance structures?	The proposal only targets public schools and community schools (identified as not for profit not state providers of education, in the context of PSES). In CAR, community schools have been a response from parents to provide their children with schooling in areas where the government has not had access due to the conflict and did not have the resources. The ESP aims to improve access to government schools, with a progressive reduction of community schools. This expansion will be a long process taking into consideration the very limited resources of the country although the government has committed to increasing budget allocated to education. School statistics inform us that there are 2416 public schools and 221 community schools at the primary level. Following communication with country partners, it is understood that there is no regulatory framework in CAR for private and community schools, however, the Ministry provides oversight of community schools through its representative at the regional level, the Inspecteur d'Académie.

[4] For example, does the proposal refer to international health and safety standards regarding school closure, or guidance on re-opening schools?

				In the proposed program, community schools are included as beneficiaries in an effort to target the most vulnerable students and communities and mitigate poorer learning conditions and limited access to public resources affecting these schools. Proposed decision language: **The Secretariat recognizes the important role of community schools to the sector in reaching children in areas where there is no government access, and of the government's intent to extend access to public education over time. Recognizing the government's appreciation of the contribution of community schools to the sector, and of the existing mechanism for oversight, the Secretariat recommends government and local partners initiate a dialogue over, and support progress toward, the further development and financing of a regulatory framework for community schools. If needed, partners may consider drawing on financing from the future ESPIG to support this work.**
The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐				
Please provide additional comments/details, if necessary.				

Feedback in the above templated was completed, reviewed and approved for CEO decision by the following persons, on the date indicated:

Completed by (COVID-19 Education Specialist): Naoko Hosaka	**Date** 6/09/2020
Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *) Simon Hall and Anne Joncheray	**Date:** 6/9/2020
Completed by (M & E related questions as per **): Sissy Helguero	**Date:** 6/2/2020
Reviewed by (CL): Youmna Sfeir	**Date:** 6/10/2020
Reviewed by (QA): David Balwanz	**Date:** 6/12/2020
Reviewed by (Team Lead): Matthew Smith	**Date:** 6/20/2020
Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m): Margarita Focas Licht	**Date: 6/22/2020**