REPUBLIC OF CONGO - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

Review meeting participants: Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, Douglas Lehman, David Balwanz, Sissy Helguero Arandia, Simon Hall, Anne Joncheray and Adrien Boucher.

Review meeting date: June 30, July 8, and July 14, 2020

Date of proposal submission: Revised proposal July 3, 2020 (previous versions on May 28 and June 26)

1. **Grant Summary:** The Republic of Congo is applying for a US$ 7 million grant to support implementation of the government plan to respond to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the education sector. The proposed project has three main objectives: (i) ensure learning continuity for all children at the basic education level during school closure (development and dissemination of printed learning contents, through radio (with distribution of radio sets to the most vulnerable), TV and online; SMS communication to parents on their children's learning); (ii) prepare and ensure schools' reopening according to standards that guarantee the protection of students, teachers and school personnel (schools' initial and regular disinfection; hand-washing/soap/masks kits; water points installation and rehabilitation; sensitization on disease prevention; guidance on school health and psychosocial support; school canteens; back-to-school campaign; learning assessment exercise and accelerated learning catch-up courses; and (iii) strengthen the response and resilience of the system against crises including the current pandemic, through better coordination of stakeholders and reinforcing monitoring and reporting of the COVID-19 response (support to LEG coordination; communication; school data collection; coordination of interventions).

2. **Key information:**

Country: Republic of Congo		
a.	Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation	US$ 7M (revised from US$ 10M by GPE Board on May 29, 2020)
b.	Allocation Requested (100%)	US$ 7,000,000
c.	Allocation Recommended	US$ 7,000,000[1]
d.	Grant Agent	UNICEF
e.	Agency Fee % + US$ amount	7% (US$ 490,000)
f.	Grant duration	18.5 months
g.	Expected Start Date	07/15/2020
h.	Expected End Date	1/31/2022

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$ 380,000 (5.42%) 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 the Republic of Congo 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 (DATE GRANT ENDS, NEEDS TO BE 18 MONTHS, NOT 19 MONTHS).

The GPE CEO recognized with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of the Republic of Congo 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 in the first quarterly progress report, unless otherwise indicated:

Request for Report-Back

1. Include indicator 6 from table 2 of GPE's M&E guidance and gender disaggregation, where relevant, in the results framework.
2. If any non-formal schools directly supported by the program are operated by for profit service providers, the Secretariat requests they be removed from the program in compliance with GPE's policy.
3. The Secretariat notes that non formal schools (i.e., ORA schools, NGO-run schools, other NFE schools), support some of Republic of Congo's most marginalized children. However, information provided did not allow for full assessment of the regulatory framework applicable to the different types of non-formal schools. The Secretariat therefore requests information within 3 weeks of grant approval on whether a regulatory framework is in place for these schools. If no regulatory framework is in yet in place, it is encouraged that government develop such a framework with support from partners, including if needed with financing from the upcoming ESPIG.
4. Regarding not for profit/community schools directly supported by the program, the Secretariat recognizes the education law is currently under review and requests a report back within six months of program start-up which provides an update on country dialogue / progress in further developing the regulatory framework for these schools. If needed, government and partners may consider drawing on financing in the upcoming ESPIG to support this work.

The Secretariat also raises the following point of observation, which is a recommendation rather than a requirement:

Observation

a) Given the urgency of the crisis, grant implementation 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.

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: July 21, 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:			REPUBLIC OF CONGO	
Grant Agent:			UNICEF	
Date of Submission:			Request submitted to GPE Secretariat: 5/28/2020	Application package resubmitted twice on June 26 and on July 3, after a Review Meeting was held on June 30. The final resubmission includes a standalone document that provides clarification on specific issues raised by the Secretariat.
			Secretariat Review completed 7/13/2020:	
Yes	No	N/A	**Eligibility**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding?	Yes. Up to US$ 7M after Board decision on May 29, 2020
☒	☐	☐	Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.*	Yes. UNICEF is the grant agent
☒	☐	☐	Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[2]	Yes. The process is documented in a letter that accompanied the proposal. Two agencies expressed interest (UNICEF and World Bank) and UNICEF was chosen by the three ministries following a detailed review. UNICEF was endorsed by the LEG at a meeting on May 12, 2020.
☒	☐	☐	Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)?	Yes, the cover email confirms that the proposal was endorsed by LEG. There is no Education Cluster in Congo.

[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 government plan was initially developed by authorities with inputs from members of the LEG. It was made available to key stakeholders (government offices, development partners, CSOs). It has later been updated to reflect evolution in the spread of the pandemic and revised interventions that can be implemented in an inclusive way and at local levels. The country confirmed that this revised version will be disseminated publicly, including on Government websites, as well as on the website of the coordinating agency and grant agent.
☒	☐	☐	Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness?	Yes. The program has a start date of July 15, 2020 and end date of 31 January 2022.
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) Yes. The project will focus directly on basic education, from preprimary to lower secondary education. (ii) Yes. The activities are aligned with the national response plan. The activity to support school canteens is not mentioned in the response plan but is eligible within the COVID-19 window. The proposed project has three main objectives: 1. Ensure learning continuity for all children at basic education level during school closure (development and dissemination of printed learning contents, through radio (with distribution of radio sets to the most vulnerable), TV and online; SMS communication to parents their children's learning); 2. Prepare and ensure schools' reopening according to standards that guarantee the protection of students, teachers and school personnel (schools' initial and regular disinfection; hand-washing/soap/masks kits; water points installation and rehabilitation; sensitization on disease prevention; guidance on school health and psychosocial support; school canteens (through WFP); back-to-school campaign; learning assessment exercise and accelerated learning catch-up courses; 3. Strengthen the response and resilience of the system against crises including the current pandemic, through better coordination of stakeholders and reinforcing

				monitoring and reporting of the COVID-19 response (support to LEG coordination; communication; school data collection; coordination of interventions). (iii) Yes. The overall objective of the program is to support the government to ensure the continuity of learning in a safe and protective environment. The activities support this objective.
☒	☐	☐	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 were identified as particularly vulnerable, and targeted support is included in the proposal: children living in rural and peri-urban areas, including refugee and displaced children (they will specifically benefit from printed materials and school canteens); girls (see section below); indigenous populations (less than 2% of total population – support will be provided through existing "Observe-Think-Act" schools (ORA in French) which are community schools that are meant to prepare indigenous students living in forests to integrate formal primary schools); orphans and other vulnerable children; children living with disabilities. For targeted interventions, criteria for targeting are clearly stated. On children with disabilities, the proposal includes support to hearing and sight impaired children in the continuity of the learning component. Learning videos will include subtitles and sign language translation to ensure that hearing impaired children can benefit. Under the equity section, the program mentions the provision of psycho-social support.
☒	☐	☐	Does the program, to a sufficient degree, identify and address specific barriers to learning faced by girls due to COVID-19?	The program identifies that girls are at an increased risk of gender-based violence, sexual abuse and exploitation in schools and online, in particular, in peripheral areas. The program mentions: integrating activities to prevent physical, moral and online violence; empowering of girls through audio-visual support (WhatsApp, Radio-school, TV-educational); remedial learning programs for girls in fragile situations without access to distance learning; and, WASH activities, in schools, including menstrual hygiene and the practice of life skills (non-formal education).
☒	☐	☐	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 proposal mentions that education in emergency activities are coordinated under the LEG. It is mentioned that MEPSA is leading the education response to the COVID crisis. MEPSA also chairs the LEG, together with UNICEF, the GA for this grant.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal (i) provide information on the sources of financing for COVID response and early	(i) Yes. The national response plan and the proposal provide information on the sources of financing for the COVID response, including from partners such as WFP,

			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?	UNICEF, UNESCO, WB, African Development Bank, AFD and telecommunication company MTN. (ii) ECW is not engaged in Congo Rep.
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? *	Yes. The final budget of US$ 7 million is consistent with the revised GPE Board approved allocation for Congo Rep.
☒	☐	☐	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) **	Yes. A final budget was provided (i.e. a separate spreadsheet with a line-by-line budget indicating component, activity and unit costs). The budget spreadsheet casts correctly, and unit costs provided are reasonable. The GA clarified the following points: • Unit cost for school disinfection was adjusted at US$ 200/school, which is reasonable. 3861 schools (or 50% of schools) will benefit from school disinfection, for a total of US$ 772K. • The unit cost for the installation of handwashing facilities at US$ 8500/unit includes drilling the borehole, equipment (i.e. pump, solar or electrical installation) and civil engineering infrastructure for drilling (storage of piped water) is reasonable. In total 20 handwashing facilities will be installed for at a cost of US$ 170K. • The lumpsum for IT equipment (activity 1.3.2) was reduced from US$ 353k to US$ 75k in final budget. Details on list of items part of IT equipment, the number of units and unit cost were provided. • Regarding the provision of tablets (activity 3.1.3), the GA indicated that 24 tablets at US$ 1900 per unit will be distributed to 12 departments (2 tablets per department) and used for data collection, picture taking and implementation monitoring. These tablets will improve communication between schools and decentralized education services, encourage the regular escalation of data to higher levels and give directors and teaching teams access to various resources. Unit cost including freight cost is deemed relatively high but reasonable.

				The GA implementation support cost is US$ 380K, representing 5.42% of the total budget, which is considered reasonable (and in line with UNICEF's average cost). The GA indicated that GA implementation support costs will be used to finance monitoring and coordination missions of the partner agent in the 12 departments of the country (about 20% of this amount), and the support of three UNICEF staff who will follow the full-time implementation of the project. These are the Administrator of Early Childhood Development (funded at 100%), an international staff responsible for reports and budget monitoring (funded at 39%), and a monitoring and evaluation manager (funded at 50%).
☒	☐	☐	Is there a clear indication of the program's sources of funding, including which parts of the program are supported by each source? *	Yes. The GPE funding is standalone for discrete activities.
☒	☐	☐	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. The activities described in the final budget are consistent with activities described in the narrative.
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 and responsible units are included.
☐	☒	☐	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. **	Output and outcome indicators are included. Baselines, targets, means of verification, data sources are included in the proposed results framework. Gender disaggregation, for new core indicators 4 and 5 from table 2 of GPE's M&E guidance, is also required. **See recommended decision language immediately below.**

[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.

				Following this decision language, the standard will be met to Secretariat satisfaction.
☐	☒	☐	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 required core indicators are included in the proposed results framework. Indicator 6 from table 2 of GPE's M&E guidance is also required – the GA has confirmed agreement to including this indicator. Recommended decision language: **Include indicator 6 from table 2 of GPE's M&E guidance and gender disaggregation, where relevant, in the results framework.** Following this decision language, the standard will be met to Secretariat satisfaction.
☒	☐	☐	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 learning from evidence plan is included under component 3.
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?	The proposal includes an implementation plan that indicates entities responsible for the implementation of each specific activity of the project, as well as a timeline for each activity. The implementation plan is sufficiently detailed in this proposal.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes?	Implementation arrangements are presented in the proposal with enough details. The project will be implemented either directly by UNICEF, through the Ministry (MEPSA) by applying the HACT approach or by WFP for the school canteens. UNICEF will provide support to the MEPSA for the planning, implementation and monitoring of interventions led by MEPSA. The budgeted action plan also indicates several specific entities responsible for the implementation of each activity: the MEPSA Cabinet, the MEPSA School Health Department, three commissions (for pedagogy (under the General Inspectorate), communication, and M&E) and UNICEF. The action plan includes sub-activities which provide a guide to the specific steps needed to implement an activity.

☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements are sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? *	Yes. The GA clarified the proposed chain of custody of funds in the final submission: GPE funds will be transferred to MEPSA bank account on a quarterly basis. The MEPSA Team will have to develop a ToR of the activities to be funded and make a request for single quarterly funding to UNICEF. The GA will control release of funds to IPs following the HACT procedures.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? *	Yes. The GA confirmed that it will provide direct financial management and its internal procedures will apply to procurement. The GA will control release of funds to IPs following the HACT procedures and perform mandatory programmatic visits of IPs to monitor activities carried out, achievement of results based on amount transferred to the partner's account. The GA will also conduct spot-checks to verify eligibility of expenses and supporting documents. The GA also indicated that independent audit procedures will apply through an external auditor.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate?	WFP will be sub-contracted to implement the school canteen activity (US$ 810K).
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described?	Implementation support and oversight arrangements by UNICEF are adequate. Following a request for clarification from the Secretariat, the country provided additional information on the GA's capacity to carry out its responsibilities. The proposed budget for implementation support (US$ 380K) will be used by the GA for monitoring and coordination missions, and to cover staff costs. Several teams at UNICEF Brazzaville office will support implementation of the grant (Section for Education, Protection, and Development of Adolescents; Communications team; Operations team; M&E team).
☒	☐	☐	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. The GA confirmed that implementation arrangements will be in place to ensure activities can be implemented from the indicated start date. Where possible, the GA will work with suppliers/providers that already have agreements in place and will use direct payments. The GA also indicated that the preparation of ToR is ongoing so these will be ready to be executed by the start date and that a procurement plan is being prepared which will prioritize, among other things, the disinfection of schools, to be effective before the start of the school year in September 2020.
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]	Risks that can affect the most vulnerable children have been identified and corresponding mitigation actions are included in the project's interventions.
☒	☐	☐	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. A risk assessment matrix is provided and covers broadly fiduciary risk. The GA has overall responsibility for the management of these risks and mitigation actions are implicitly described in section 8 under "operational arrangements". The cost of construction/rehabilitation of water point/handwash facilities is as small percentage of the budget (US$ 287k), thus it is reasonable that environmental risks can be assumed to be low and warrant no specific address in the proposal.
☐	☐	☒	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 grant includes direct support to several types of not for profit non-public providers of core education services, including: • Ecoles conventionnées, which are not for profit non public schools run and managed by different religious denominations who have signed partnership agreements with the state. These schools are considered as public schools by the government, operate under the same regulatory framework as public schools and represent a very small share of the total number of primary schools (4%). Support to these schools is in compliance with PSES. Schools classified as non-formal schools benefitting from the project, include: • "Organize, Reflect, Act" (ORA) schools mainly located in Sangha and Likouala regions. These schools are run by the Catholic Church and support indigenous and extremely vulnerable children and are recognized as non-formal schools by MEPSA's General Directorate of Literacy and Non-formal Education.

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

				• NGO-run schools affiliated with religious institutions which provide support to children with special needs. • Other types of non-formal schools which are not identified in the application. *Overall the program proposes supporting 496 schools classified as non-formal schools.* Based on the country response it is unclear the extent to which a regulatory framework is in place for the different types of non formal schools receiving direct support from the program, or whether the program includes any direct support to non formal schools run by for profit service providers. The proposal also includes support to not for profit schools opened by third parties (often individuals from the middle class, including local elected officials) with support from communities in peri-urban and rural areas where public service provision does not yet adequately respond to social demand for education. While the project will prioritize supporting public schools, a certain number of these not for profit schools (identified based on the same equity-based criteria as public schools) will be supported through one program activity: school disinfection. In follow-up, the country noted that while these schools are designated as 'private schools' under the existing MEPSA EMIS framework and are governed under the same regulatory framework as other private schools, the founding conditions of these schools and their operations have more in common with community schools. As with community schools supported though other GPE grants, fees paid by parents help to cover school operating expenses. << Cependant, elles [MEPSA] n'ont de privé que cette catégorisation qui satisfait les besoins de la classification quantitative (SIGE) mais ne rend pas compte des conditions de leur création et de leur fonctionnement interne.>>[5] The country response indicates that the current

[5] The country response on this question includes the following: « En effet, le MEPSA est conscient de ce que la couverture éducative nationale souffre de nombreuses disparités et que pour répondre à la demande sociale d'éducation, des tiers en collaboration avec les communautés locales, se sont organisés pour ouvrir des écoles. Dans la nomenclature utilisée par la Direction des études et de la planification (DEP/MEPSA) pour la collecte des données, ces écoles sont recensées comme privées (SIGE). Cependant, elles n'ont de privé que cette catégorisation qui satisfait les besoins de la classification quantitative (SIGE) mais ne

				education law does not adequately differentiate the above schools (which operate in areas where public supply of education is not adequate) from other forms of non public provision of education, but that a process for reviewing the current school law has been initiated, and that this issue is among those to be reviewed. Proposed decision language: **If any non formal schools directly supported by the program are operated by for profit service providers, the Secretariat requests they be removed from the program in compliance with GPE's policy. [Report-Back]** **The Secretariat notes that non formal schools (i.e., ORA schools, NGO-run schools, other NFE schools), support some of Republic of Congo's most marginalized children. However, information provided did not allow for full assessment of the regulatory framework applicable to the different types of non-formal schools. The Secretariat therefore requests information within 3 weeks of grant approval on whether a regulatory framework is in place for these schools. If no regulatory framework is in yet in place, it is encouraged that government develop such a framework with support from partners, including if needed with financing from the upcoming ESPIG. [Report-Back]** **Regarding not for profit/community schools directly supported by the program, the Secretariat recognizes the education law is currently under review and requests a report back within six months of program start-up which provides an update on country dialogue / progress in further developing the regulatory framework for**

rend pas compte des conditions de leur création et de leur fonctionnement interne. En tenant compte de cette spécificité, ces écoles représentent une moyenne de 56% de l'ensemble des écoles logées dans le privé et se retrouvent dans tous les cycles d'enseignement. Elles ne sont financées ni par des entreprises, ni par des fondations. A but non lucratif, le fonctionnement de ces écoles est essentiellement basé sur la contribution des parents d'élèves sous le leadership des personnes motivées ou des élus locaux (soucieux de l'avenir scolaire des populations) qui les supportent à bout de bras notamment à travers la prise en charge des enseignants et d'autres charges de fonctionnement. Mais du fait qu'elles ne sont pas listées comme publiques ou non formelles, elles sont classées comme « privées » et considérées comme tel ; néanmoins elles sont régies par le même cadre réglementaire que les écoles privées grâce auquel elles bénéficient (au gré des ressources disponibles), du suivi et de l'encadrement pédagogiques fournis par les services étatiques dédiés (Directions départementales/DDEPSAs et inspections pédagogiques). » (email from grant agent; July 10, 2020)

				these schools. If needed, government and partners may consider drawing on financing in the upcoming ESPIG to support this work. [Report-Back]
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: 6/9/2020 / Adrien Boucher 6/29/2020 – 7/13/2020

Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *): Simon Hall and Anne Joncheray **Date:** 7/13/2020

Completed by (M & E related questions as per **): Sissy Helguero **Date:** 6/29/2020

Reviewed by (CL): Doug Lehman **Date:** 7/14/2020

Reviewed by (QA): David Balwanz **Date:** 7/13/2020

Reviewed by (Team Lead): Matthew Smith **Date:** 7/13/2020

Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m): Margarita Focas Licht **Date:** 7/16/2020