RWANDA - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

Review Meeting participants: Jo Bourne, Padraig Power, Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, Subrata S. Dhar, David A. Balwanz, Jean-Marc Bernard, Rudraksh Mitra, Anthony Bentil, Alice Yang and Arijeta Blakqori-Mjekiqi.

Review Meeting Date: April 23, 2020

Date of final proposal submission: April 21, 2020

1. **Grant Summary:** The proposed Grant/Additional Financing (AF) will add a fourth component ($10M, 18 months in total duration) to the World Bank's Rwanda Quality Basic Education for Human Capital Development Project (QBEP). It will finance select activities from MINEDUC's *Education Sector COVID-19 Response Plan*, to support continuation of quality learning while protecting the health and well-being of students and teachers in the short, medium, and long term. The proposed activities under this GPE financing are organized and sequenced to provide seamless support for the sector to resume its activities and emerge stronger and more resilient to face future shocks.
2.

Country: Rwanda		
a.	Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation	US$10 million
b.	Allocation Requested (100%)	US$10 million
c.	**Allocation Recommended**	US$10 million
d.	Grant Agent	World Bank
e.	Agency Fee % (US$ amount)	1.75% (US$175,000)
f.	Grant duration	18 months
g.	Expected Start Date	May 1, 2020
h.	Expected End Date	October 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:**

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 Rwanda in the amount of **US$10 million** plus an additional US$175,000 in agency fees to the World Bank as Grant Agent. The grant has a start date of May 1, 2020, and an end date of October 31, 2021.

The GPE CEO recognized with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of Rwanda 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 Grant Agent is asked to move forward with implementation immediately while addressing the following points together with the Government of Rwanda by May 15, 2020:

1. **Monitoring and Evaluation**
   (i) Further develop the monitoring and evaluation approach in the program by including a "Learning from evidence approach".
   (ii) Revise the results framework, to meet GPE-issued guidance on M&E of COVID-19 Accelerated Financing grants.

2. **Budget**
   (i) Revise the proposed budget to ensure it does not exceed the maximum GPE Board approved amount of US$ 10 million.
   (ii) Reduce supervision fees from US$ 300,000 to US$ 280,000 in line with GPE guidance.

3. **Implementation readiness**
   The Grant Agent should provide a detailed timeline for program implementation, showing how fast implementation will occur. Steps should be taken to minimize delays to commencement resulting from contract negotiations.

4. **Future revisions**
   Please note that although this proposal is treated as an additional financing to the QBEP, activities approved here by the GPE CEO are for COVID-19 related response and recovery. Therefore, none of the GPE Funds under component 4 may be reprogrammed into other components in QBEP without prior agreement from the GPE Secretariat. Also, if in an unlikely situation the parent program encounters delays, measures should be in place to ensure that the GPE supported COVID-19 Response Program continues to be implemented to the extent practicable.

5. **CL follow-up: Other issues arising from Secretariat review, not in decision language:**

The following issues were raised in the RM which were not considered as causes for delaying an approval, but which require further clarification or follow-up from the Grant Agent. These responses will be obtained by the CL subsequent to CEO approval:

1. **Psycho-social support** for teachers and children is lacking – while there is a mention on social support under helpline, additional details will be helpful to see how the issue will be tackled.

2. **Equity aspects** – while there are references and responses to equity issues including gender and disability, more clarity is needed on the plans and measures to reach the most marginalized segments of children such as the approximately 20 percent of the population who do not have access to radio and other media used for distance learning (e.g. children in rural areas and 11 districts lagging behind).

3. **School feeding** – noting that WFP participated in the review process and raised the issue of links between school feeding programs, ensure that the school feeding program is being coordinated with WFP and others, and clarify what measures are in place to ensure school feeding beyond three months, if necessary.

4. **Implementation readiness** - The below CL follow-up gives more information than the summary decision language: Whilst we are assured by the fact that 40% of the financing can be provided retroactively, and that activities can therefore commence immediately upon approval by the GPE, and that the government is already rolling out learning continuity activities, the GA should within 2 weeks provide a timeline for component 4 activity implementation. Annex 1, Table 7 of the project paper illustrates an adequate level of detail for such a plan.

5. **M&E** – The below CL follow-up gives more information than the summary decision language: While the results framework includes most required indicators from GPE's M&E guidance for COVID-19, some refinements and additional indicators are needed. Further, a "learning from evidence" plan, as required by GPE's guidance, is not included. Given that the program was prepared and submitted for approval very shortly after the M&E guidance was issued, the grant agent is asked to address these gaps in the early phase of implementation, as indicated in the decision language.

CEO Approval: Date: April 27, 2020



Alice P. Albright
Chief Executive Officer
Global Partnership for Education

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:			RWANDA	
Grant Agent:			WORLD BANK	
Date of Submission:			Request submitted to GPE Secretariat:4/21/2020	
			Secretariat Review completed: Click or tap to enter a date. 4/23/2020	
Yes	No	N/A	**Eligibility**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding?	
☒	☐	☐	Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.*	
☒	☐	☐	Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[1]	ESWG minutes from April 6, 2020
☒	☐	☐	Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)?	ESWG minutes from April 21, 2020
☒	☐	☐	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*	Plan on gov't website; Website also contains clear information on learning continuity programs with links to further information.

[1] 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.

			publicly available (e.g., Government website, distribution to key stakeholders, etc.).	
☒	☐	☐	Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness?	Cover note says April 1 but CL confirmed it's an error. Actual start date will be date of formal approval.
	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?	The proposal is firmly aligned to the government COVID response plan, focusing clearly on learning continuity during school closures and on activities related to the reopening of schools.
☒	☐	☐	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).*	Two issues raised for CL follow-up: **Psycho-social support for teachers and children is not clear – while there is a mention on social support under helpline, additional details will be helpful to see how the issue will be tackled.** **Equity aspects – more clarity on the plans and measures to reach the most marginalized segments of children such as those not being able to be reached by the program (e.g. children in rural areas and 11 districts lagging behind).**
☒	☐	☐	Does the program, to a sufficient degree, identify and address specific barriers to learning faced by girls due to COVID-19? **	The program identifies specific barriers such as increased risk of GBV, teenage pregnancy, increased opportunity cost of education for girls post-COVID etc. The program addresses these barriers through interventions, including content on GBV and teenage pregnancy in distance learning materials and through a back-to-school campaign that includes girls.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal identify a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism(s) and confirm	AF will be mainstreamed within MINEDUC and REB with the project activities falling under the responsibility of the relevant departments/agencies. The Project has been designed and will be implemented in collaboration with the

			that the program will be represented in this mechanism?	national platform of the Local Education Group (LEG) made up of education development partners and civil society organizations. Further clarification by the CL confirmed that the Rwandan government has strong coordination mechanisms in place. Also CL follow-up recommended: **Clarify if the school feeding program is being coordinated with WFP and others, and what measures are in place to ensure school feeding beyond three months, if necessary.**
☒	☐	☐	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?	Yes in Annex 2 of proposal. There is no ECW funding in Rwanda, and the education cluster has not been activated. COVID-19 response is coordinated by the government with the LEG.
	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? *	The budget requested amount is $9,412 over the approved allocation of $10,000,000 and needs to be reduced by this amount. The budget includes a Supervision fee of $300,000 for the grant which has proposed implementation period of 18 months which needs to be reduced in line with GPE guidance. The original supervision fee was $375,000 (see action points section in the ESWG 21 April 2020 minutes). Recommend decision language: **(i) Revise the proposed budget to ensure it does not exceed the maximum GPE Board approved amount of US$ 10 million.** (ii) **Reduce supervision fees from US$ 300,000 to US$ 280,000 in line with GPE guidance.** Following this decision language, the program standard will be met.

☒	☐	☐	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) **	Component, sub-component, and activity costs are clearly outlined. The budget also includes unit costs and quantities per activity.
☒	☐	☐	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 indicates GPE as the sole source of funding. However, the program application states that "… in the event additional resources are generated by another response program for an activity proposed under this component, resources will be shifted towards other relevant activities requiring additional funds" Rwanda Application document, Pages 17-18).
☒	☐	☐	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. **	The budget assumptions align with the program design and description presented in the program document. Clear assumptions for the unit costs are not provided but overall, they seem reasonable.
	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?[2] Are roles and responsibilities clearly mapped? **	The M&E framework is not costed. Roles and responsibilities are indicated, including utilizing the M&E arrangements of the CBEP program. Note: the grant agent clarified that the parent program's M&E arrangements will be used, no direct M&E costs are foreseen.
☒	☐	☐	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. ***	A results framework with output indicators is included (Section 7). No outcome indicators are included, even though the program proposes to assess learning on a sample basis. Some revisions to proposed output indicators, and additional output indicators, are needed to comply with GPE's M&E guidance. Means of verification are also currently specified as "To be determined".

[2] 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.

				Recommend decision language: **Revise the results framework, to meet GPE-issued guidance on M&E of COVID-19 Accelerated Financing grants.**
☐	☒	☐	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 not included. Indicator 3 from table 1 of the M&E guidance is required because activities on reducing risk of GBV are proposed. Further, all indicators currently proposed should be reported as both the number and the percentage of the beneficiary population reached. Recommend decision language: **Revise the results framework, to meet GPE-issued guidance on M&E of COVID-19 Accelerated Financing grants.** Following this decision language, the program 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) **	No, neither an activity line, budget or approach for learning from evidence is included. Note: the grant agent clarified that the parent program's M&E arrangements will be used, no direct M&E costs are foreseen. Recommended decision language: **Further develop the monitoring and evaluation approach in the program by including a "Learning from evidence approach".** Following this decision language, the program standard will be met to Secretariat satisfaction.
	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?	Missing timeline and detailed activities. Roles and responsibilities follow those of QBEP. Recommended decision language:

				The Grant Agent should provide a detailed timeline for program implementation, showing how fast implementation will occur. Steps should be taken to minimize delays to commencement resulting from contract negotiations. CL follow up recommended: **Whilst we are assured by the fact that 40% of the financing can be provided retroactively, and that activities can therefore commence immediately upon approval by the GPE, and that the government is already rolling out learning continuity activities, the GA should within 2 weeks provide a timeline for component 4 activity implementation. Annex 1, Table 7 of the project paper illustrates an adequate level of detail for such a plan.** It is noted already that the GA has agreed activities will be added to the Annual Work Program (AWP) of MINEDUC and REB SPIUs and have already informed CL that these details are being worked on with the ministry and partners. Following this CL follow-up, the program standard will be met to Secretariat satisfaction.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes?	For implementation arrangements, the Project will follow the same model designed to support the delivery of QBEP, in line with the existing Government arrangements for project implementation.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? *	Disbursement and flow of funds are summarized in section 6 of the program document. There will be 2 Designated Accounts – one at MINEDUC and the other at REB – from which eligible expenditure will be paid. Schools receiving capitation grants will use their existing school capitation bank account to receive this amount.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? *	The Financial Management arrangement for this GPE grant will follow the same FM arrangement put in place to manage the main QBEP. QBEP's FM performance rating is currently assessed as Satisfactory. Procurement under the project will be carried out in accordance with the World Bank's

				Procurement Framework. Audit will be conducted by the State Audit Organization (SAO) on consolidated financial statements showing the IDA QBEP and the GPE AF financial information.
☐	☐	☒	Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate?	
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described?	Following those of QBEP.
☒	☐	☐	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? *	By using the existing arrangements, the project can save time in preparation and roll-out of proposed emergency response interventions. CL clarified that agreed retroactive financing with a provision that 40% of the grant can be used even before actual effectiveness gives additional leeway to start implementation right after approval. Recommended decision language: **The Grant Agent should provide a detailed timeline for program implementation, showing how fast implementation will occur. Steps should be taken to minimize delays to commencement resulting from contract negotiations.** CL follow-up recommended: **Whilst we are assured by the fact that 40% of the financing can be provided retroactively, and that activities can therefore commence immediately upon approval by the GPE, and that the government is already rolling out learning continuity activities, the GA should within 2 weeks provide a timeline for component 4 activity implementation. Annex 1, Table 7 of the project paper illustrates an adequate level of detail for such a plan.**
	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?[3]	Application covered general social risk, not specific threats to vulnerable population.
☒	☐	☐	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? *	No risks related to FM and governance have been identified. Procurement risk is rated "substantial" – due to exogeneous factors such as disruption of global supply chain – but lowered to "moderate" after considering mitigation measures. Environmental and Social risk is rated as "moderate".
☐	☐	☒	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.)?	
☐	☒	☐	Does the proposal trigger any GPE policies (e.g., GPE Private Sector Policy) which would require extraordinary consultation with GPE governance structures?	The country has confirmed that the program does not cover any for-profit schools. The program includes support to 'government-aided' schools – which, in the context of Rwanda, are not-for-profit schools owned by faith-based institutions (mainly Catholic and Protestant churches). Government-aided schools account for the majority of schools and primary school enrollment in Rwanda. Alongside public schools, government-aided schools are integrated into decentralized government management and oversight structures; the GoR also provides teachers for government-aided schools and recurrent budget to cover teacher salaries. In reference to the GPE private sector engagement strategy, government-aided schools provide core educational services and operate within a well-articulated government oversight and regulatory framework. [Prime Minister's Order determining special regulations governing government subsidized schools] GOR considers these public schools, but mostly they're run by the Catholic church (not-

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

				for-profit, faith-based, so eligible for GPE ESPIG funding). Faith-based schools are integrated into government oversight and regulatory mechanisms (PSES).

The section meets GPE's COVID-AF requirements: Yes ☒ No ☐
Please provide additional comments/details, if necessary. All significant items raised have been included in CL follow-up or decision language.

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):	**Alice Yang**	**4/21/2020**
Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *):	**Anthony Fiifi Bentil**	**4/21/2020**
	Ana Angela Tobar Lozano	**4/21/2020**
Completed by (M & E related questions as per **):	**Rudraksh Mitra**	**4/21/2020**
Reviewed by (CL):	**Subrata S. Dhar**	**4/21/2020**
Reviewed by (QA):	**David Balwanz**	**4/22/2020**

Reviewed by (Team Lead):	**Matthew Smith**	**4/22 & 4/25/2020**
Approved by (jointly by QA and Team Lead if <$1m):	**n/a**	
Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m):	**Margarita Focas Licht**	**04/25/2020**
Approved by (Manager 2 if >$10m):	**n/a**	