PAPUA NEW GUINEA - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

Review Meeting participants: Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, Nilse Ryman, Muhammad Tariq Khan, Edward Davis, David A. Balwanz, Rudraksh Mitra, Sissy Arandia, Gauri Khanduja, Ana Tobar Lozano, Simon Hall, Anna Maria Tammi, and Arijeta Blakqori-Mjekiqi.

Review Meeting Date: May 13, 2020

Date of final proposal submission: May 10, 2020

1. **Grant Summary:** The proposal outlines interventions to prevent and control COVID-19 in schools as well as creating safe and healthy learning environments conducive to teaching and learning. The goal of this program, aligned with the Education Emergency Response and Recovery Plan (EERRP), is to sustain learning and inclusion during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. The EERRP focuses on the most vulnerable children (e.g., girls, children with disabilities, children from the bottom wealth quintile and those living in remote communities) who are at risk of being left behind in learning, dropping out of school, or will be exposed to greater risks as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. **Key information:**

Country: Papua New Guinea		
a.	Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation	US$ 10,000,000
b.	Allocation Requested (100%)	US$ 9,997,120
c.	Allocation Recommended	US$ 9,440,000[1]
d.	Grant Agent	UNICEF
e.	Agency Fee % + US$ amount	7% and US$ 660,800
f.	Grant duration	18 months
g.	Expected Start Date	06/01/2020
h.	Expected End Date	11/30/2021

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] [1] Includes US$471,910 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 Papua New Guinea in the amount of US$9,440,000 plus an additional US$660,800 in agency fees to UNICEF as Grant Agent. The grant has a start date of May 28, 2020, and an end date of November 30, 2021.

The GPE CEO recognizes with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of Papua New Guinea 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.

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 June 15, 2020:

1. While the school census is eligible to be funded, the Government and Grant Agent are requested to clarify what actions would be taken as a result of the census, e.g. to address reduction in enrollment resulting from COVID-19.

2. VET should be removed from the proposed program as GPE funding is focused on basic education only. The explanation from the country that VET is considered second chance education and will mainly benefit lower secondary aged students, has been assessed as insufficient in warranting exceptional approval of GPE funding of VET. The Government and Grant Agent are therefore requested to remove all budget items related to VET (US$ 561,540 from activities 2.66, 3.24, 4.18, 4.29, 4.36). This will reduce the grant to US$ 9,440,000 (with rounding). The Secretariat nevertheless recognizes the importance of this activity and encourages the country to explore alternate options to support the needs of the VET sub-sector through other funding sources.

3. The amount of funds for professional development and research (activities 4.4.2 and 4.4.4. respectively) are deemed excessive relative to the justifications provided and the Board approved focus of GPE COVID-19 funding. The Secretariat requests the Government and Grant Agent to reduce the budget for Activity 4.4.2 and 4.4.4 by 50%, and to reallocate these funds to other program activities.

4. The Government and Grant Agent are requested to ensure that the ICT infrastructure benefits Basic Education.

The Grant Agent is requested to provide a revised results framework and budget, to be sent retroactively after grant approval, reflecting the above adjustments. Please include targets for the number of children with disabilities who will benefit from the program.

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: May 28, 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:			PAPUA NEW GUINEA	
Grant Agent:			UNICEF	
Date of Submission:			Request submitted to GPE Secretariat: 5/5/2020	
			Secretariat Review completed: 5/25/2020	
Yes	No	N/A	**Eligibility**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding?	Yes
☒	☐	☐	Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.*	Yes
☒	☐	☐	Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[2]	Yes, the process is also documented in the proposal.
☒	☐	☐	Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)?	Yes, the Local Education Group/Education Cluster has endorsed the proposal.
☒	☐	☐	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.).*	Yes, the response plan is on the ministry's website.

[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.

<table>
<tr><td>☒</td><td>☐</td><td>☐</td><td>Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness?</td><td>Yes, the program has an intended start date of 1 June and implementation period of 18 months. The formal start date will be the date of the CEO letter.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐</td></tr>
<tr><td>Yes</td><td>No</td><td>N/A</td><td>Program Design & Coordination</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☒</td><td>☐</td><td>☐</td><td>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?</td><td>(i) Partially, the proposed program would support Early Childhood Education (ECE), elementary, primary and second chance including Flexible and Open Distance Education (FODE) and Vocational Education and Training (VET). FODE is an equivalency of lower secondary education. VET is not normally eligible for GPE support and GPE has not funded VET in cases where a country has not achieved Universal Primary Education. VET activities are identified as follows:
<table>
<tr><th>Activity</th><th>Description</th><th>Activity costs US$</th><th>UNICEF costs US$</th></tr>
<tr><td>2.6.6</td><td>VTC Back to School incentive packs procured and distributed to students and teachers in most affected schools</td><td>13,456</td><td>708</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.4</td><td>Vocational Education Training courses developed and uploaded online/ through innovative platforms</td><td>502,353</td><td>26,447</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.1.8</td><td>Vocational Education Training courses developed and uploaded online/ through innovative platforms</td><td>5,882</td><td>310</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.2.9</td><td>Vocational Education Training courses developed and uploaded online/ through innovative platforms</td><td>5,882</td><td>310</td></tr>
<tr><td>4.3.6</td><td>Vocational Education Training courses developed and uploaded online/ through innovative platforms</td><td>5,882</td><td>310</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Sub-total to be removed</td><td>533,455</td><td>28,085</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Total to be removed</td><td colspan="2">561,540</td></tr>
</table>
See decision language below.

(ii) Partially. Activities are drawn directly from the response plan, with a particular focus on return to school, learning in school and building resilience in the education system. While all activities (with the exception of VET) are deemed eligible for full funding under the COVID AF window, the amount proposed for research and professional development is</td></tr>
</table>

				deemed by the Secretariat review to be excessive for the proposed 18-month program, relative to the justifications provided for these activities . The Secretariat recommends to reduce the budget for these activities by 50% - see decision language below. (iii) Yes. The majority of activities are likely to support objectives; this is also elaborated in the government's COVID-19 response plan's theory of change. With the above adjustments, the proposal meets the program design criteria. Suggested decision language: • **While the school census is eligible to be funded, the Government and Grant Agent are requested to clarify what actions would be taken as a result of the census, e.g. to address reduction in enrollment resulting from COVID-19.** • **VET should be removed from the proposed program as GPE funding is focused on basic education only. The explanation from the country that VET is considered second chance education and will mainly benefit lower secondary aged students, has been assessed as insufficient in warranting exceptional approval of GPE funding of VET. The Government and Grant Agent are therefore requested to remove all budget items related to VET (US$ 561,540 from activities 2.66, 3.24, 4.18, 4.29, 4.36). This will reduce the grant to US$ 9,440,000 (with rounding). The Secretariat nevertheless recognizes the importance of this activity and encourages the country to explore alternate options to support the needs of the VET sub-sector through other funding sources.** • **The amount of funds for professional development and research (activities 4.4.2 and 4.4.4. respectively) are deemed excessive relative to the justifications provided and the Board approved focus of GPE COVID-19 funding. The Secretariat requests the Government**

				and Grant Agent to reduce the budget for Activity 4.4.2 and 4.4.4 by 50%, and to reallocate these funds to other program activities. • **The Government and Grant Agent are requested to ensure that the ICT infrastructure benefits Basic Education.** • **The Grant Agent is requested to provide a revised results framework and budget, to be sent retroactively after grant approval, reflecting the above adjustments.**
☒	☐	☐	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).*	Yes, the response plan and the proposal focus on the most vulnerable children (e.g., girls, children with disabilities, children from the bottom wealth quintile and those living in remote communities). Beyond the national level interventions, the proposal targets schools according to two separate criteria: schools in urban settings with high density and overcrowded classrooms; and very and extremely remote schools in the provinces bordering Indonesia. The program identifies limited access to WASH in school compounds, low awareness of rights of children with disabilities and limited budgets to further exacerbate the low enrolment of children with disabilities in schools. It proposes activities related to disability inclusive, home-based learning packages and content to meet the needs of children with special needs. Suggested decision language: • **Please include targets for the number of children with disabilities who will benefit from the program.**
☒	☐	☐	Does the program, to a sufficient degree, identify and address specific barriers to learning faced by girls due to COVID-19?	Yes. The program identifies and addresses specific barriers faced by girls. It identifies an increase in cases of sexual abuse, exploitation and gender-based violence during school closures as a potential barrier to girls returning to schools. It proposes activities related to messaging and sensitization campaigns around GBV.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal identify a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism(s) and confirm that the program will be represented in this mechanism?	Yes, the Education Cluster led by the NDoE will oversee the implementation of the COVID-19 Education Program. Every quarter, UNICEF as EC co-lead, will report to the LEG on program progress.

☒	☐	☐	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) Yes, information on other sources of financing is included. (ii) N/A. ECW is not engaged in PNG.
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 within the Board approved allocation.
☒	☐	☐	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 presented budget is structured per component, activities and sub-activities. The budget was provided in a spreadsheet containing a summary budget and separate worksheets for each phase/component. GA implementation support costs of $471,910, represent 5% of budget, which is deemed reasonable.
☒	☐	☐	Is there a clear indication of the program's sources of funding, including which parts of the program are supported by each source? *	The program is solely funded by GPE. The COVID-19 AF window program is considered part of the COVID-19 Education Emergency Response and Recovery Plan. The proposal provides a budget which indicates the requested amount to GPE, and contributions needed from other partners.
☒	☐	☐	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 possible. **	Yes, budget assumptions presented in the budget spreadsheet are aligned with the program description and other parts of the program.
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	The results framework provided in the Annex of the program document is costed and outlines roles and responsibilities

			and results reporting? [3] Are roles and responsibilities clearly mapped? **	
☒	☐	☐	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 is included and outlines outcomes and intermediate outcomes along with gender and disability level disaggregation wherever applicable. Baseline, targets and means of verification/data sources are also included.
☒	☐	☐	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? **	All required core indicators are included, and reporting arrangements are adequate.
☒	☐	☐	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) **	This is included and costed as an intermediate outcome under Phase 4 (learning from response to improve decision making and resilience in case of future outbreaks)
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?	Yes. The budget document also notes the timeline and roles per each phase of the response plan.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes?	Yes. Majority of activities will be implemented by NDoE. An NDoE Education in Emergencies Task Force will oversee the COVID response, supported by a UNICEF-recruited specialist. In addition, UNICEF will establish program cooperation agreements with CEAs and NGOs. UNICEF will disburse funds to the NDoE and their permittable payees to implement program interventions.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements are sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? *	Yes. GA will disburse funds to the NDoE and utilize UN Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) to transfer funds to implementing partners.

[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.

☒	☐	☐	Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? *	Yes. GA will support NDoE in financial management. Independent audits will apply to partners receiving over US$ 100,000. GA's finance officers will perform spot checks and assurance exercises. Procurement will be through GA's existing and established network and logistical capabilities in PNG and globally.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate?	Yes, HACT will be used for sub-contracting.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described?	Yes. UNICEF will recruit a specialist to be based at NDoE to support the task force overseeing the COVID response, including in relation to this program. Oversight arrangements are sufficiently described.
☒	☐	☐	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 will be ready to be launched by the proposed start date? *	Yes. GA will draw on existing partnership arrangements, where due diligence assessments have already been undertaken, in order to disburse funds to progress implementation.
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, displaced children) identified, with mitigation actions proposed?[4]	Yes. Child safeguarding risks are identified and mitigation actions proposed.
☒	☐	☐	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? *	Yes. Risks affecting financial management, materials procurement, safeguarding and governance are identified in the risk assessment and appropriate mitigating measures are stated.
☐	☐	☒	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	N/A

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

			do not appear to be mitigated (e.g. through increased support from regional or HQ level, etc.)?	
☐	☒	☐	Does the proposal trigger any GPE policies (e.g., GPE Private Sector Policy) which would require extraordinary consultation with GPE governance structures?	No. Funding will go to public and church schools, which are not-for-profit. In PNG, church schools are supported by the government. Church schools fall under the 1983 Education Act of PNG and are considered part of the education system. The Government of PNG employs teachers in church schools and church schools also receive Government Tuition Fee Subsidies to support the management and operations of these schools.
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): Anna-Maria Tammi **Date 05/05/2020**

Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *): Simon Hall & Ana Tobar Lozano **Date 05/05/2020**

Completed by (M & E related questions as per **): Gauri Khanduja **Date 5/6/2020**

Reviewed by (CL): Muhammad Tariq Khan **Date 5/6/2020**

Reviewed by (QA): Ed Davis & David Balwanz **Date 5/6/2020**

Reviewed by (Team Lead): Matthew Smith **Date 5/24/2020**

Approved by (jointly by QA and Team Lead if <$1m): n/a

Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m): Margarita Licht **Date 5/27/2020**

Approved by (Manager 2 if >$10m): n/a