SOUTH SUDAN - COVID-19 AF: Approval Memo to CEO

Review meeting participants: Margarita Focas Licht, Matthew Smith, Fazle Rabbani, David A. Balwanz, Gauri Khanduja, Simon Hall, Ana Angela Tobar Lozano, Anne Joncheray and Sai Sudha Kanikicharla.

Review meeting date: June 10, 2020

Date of proposal submission: May 21, 2020

1. **Grant Summary:**

The proposed COVID-19 AF has been developed with the view that the current crisis is likely to further deepen the education challenges, inherited from the civil war, protracted armed conflict, displacements, and coupled with chronically fragile human and infrastructural capacities of South Sudan. The proposal aims to: (i) provide opportunities for children to continue their learning through various means including remote learning and alternative distance learning programmes; (ii) support the reopening of schools and prepare them to address the learning gaps resulting from school closures and other disruptions; and (iii) build capacities of the Education Ministry, State Ministries and schools to manage the current and future crises and shocks in order to safeguard education provision in emergency and unforeseen situations, strengthening the capacity of Education Task Force. The interventions will be implemented in all ten states and three administrative areas (AAs) of South Sudan. Overall more than one million children (approximately 50 per cent girls) out of 1.9 million school going children will directly and indirectly benefit from this intervention (120,000 through reading material, 800,000 from wash facilities and school disinfection; and 200,000 children reached through radio programmes, community mobilization and awareness sessions); whereas system strengthening will encompass a broader range of current and future beneficiaries.

Country: South Sudan		
a.	Accelerated Funding Covid-19 Allocation	US$ 10M revised to US$ 7M by GPE Board on May 29, 2020
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	18 months
g.	Expected Start Date	06/20/2020
h.	Expected End Date	11/30/2021

[1] Includes US$721,558 for the cost of the grant agent to perform its roles and responsibilities.

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.

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

3. **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 South Sudan 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 November 30, 2021.

The GPE CEO recognized with appreciation the leadership and commitment of the Government of South Sudan 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 South Sudan is now US$ 7 million, lower than the initial allocation and requested amount of US$ 10 million.

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 July 6, 2020:

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. The program, revised to accommodate the reduced allocation, should prioritize activities such as those in components 1 and 2 with clear and immediate impact on the continuation and safeguarding of education for vulnerable populations during the COVID-19 crisis over

activities that provide lesser immediate value for money for this purpose such as the activity for capacity-building workshops (modular) for 30 MoGEI and state staff (activity 3.1.1). If this capacity-building activity is retained, a stronger justification is requested.

ii. It is requested to provide a narrative and a breakdown of the equipment costs associated with emergency cell at MoGEI (activity 3.1.2) and equipment and learning materials in 10 CECs (activity 3.1.3) in the revised program document, if these activities are maintained.

iii. The GPE Secretariat appreciates that the proposed implementation arrangement is based on the current ESPIG. Nonetheless, roles and responsibilities should be clearly mapped for each activity in the revised implementation plan.

iv. It is requested to disaggregate the indicators on number of children reached through distance learning programs, number of children receiving reading packages and number of teachers trained to deliver radio lessons by gender; it is also requested to include number and percentage of beneficiaries reached for all indicators proposed in the program document which correspond to the GPE core indicators.

v. It is requested that the risk mitigation plan specifically include any risks and mitigating actions for vulnerable populations.

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 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 given the lower overall budget.

c) The Secretariat notes there is an application to ECW underway. We appreciate being copied in on the call for proposals and are assured that the GPE COVID-19 and ECW grants will be complementary because of the strong coordination mechanisms in place.

d) The Secretariat recognizes the important role of community schools to the sector in reaching children in rural, remote and marginalized areas, and of the Government's intent to transition community schools into government schools over time. Recognizing that the Education Act (2012) proposes that government make rules and regulations to govern the registration, inspection and operation of private and community schools, 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 private and community schools. If needed, partners may consider drawing on financing in the existing ESPIG to support this work.

e) The Secretariat recommends that MoGEI posts the plan on its website to ensure public access to the Education Sector COVID-19 Preparedness and Response Plan (ESC19RP).

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 18, 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:			SOUTH SUDAN	
Grant Agent:			UNICEF	
Date of Submission:			Request submitted to GPE Secretariat: 5/21/2020	
			Secretariat Review completed: 6/10/2020	
Yes	No	N/A	**Eligibility**	
☒	☐	☐	Is the Country eligible for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding?	The GPE Board GPE Board approved originally on March 31, 2020 a US$ 10M allocation which was subsequently revised on May 29, 2020 to US$ 7M.
☒	☐	☐	Is the grant agent accredited by GPE? *Please confirm via COVID-19 FAQ list.*	UNICEF is an accredited GA.
☒	☐	☐	Has GA selection followed a clear and transparent process, with the process documented in the proposal?[2]	The Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI) requested for EOIs for GA selection. The MoGEI conducted a review based on published parameters and selected UNICEF as the GA. The decision was later endorsed by the Local Education Group, including the Education Cluster. UNICEF is also the GA for the regular ESPIG in South Sudan.
☒	☐	☐	Has the proposal been endorsed by the Local Education Group (and the Education Cluster where relevant)?	The proposal and the COVID-19 Strategic Plan received comments during design stage as well as endorsement on completion from the Education Donors Group (EDOG). The group is comprised of development partners active in the education sector, NGO Coalition, and the Education Cluster of South Sudan.

[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.).*	Guided by the High-Level Taskforce on COVID-19 response, the Ministry of General Education and Instruction prepared a national COVID-19 Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan to guide the sector's response to ensure continued education service delivery to students even after school closures. Proposed decision language: **To ensure public access to the government response plan, the Secretariat recommends that MoGEI post the plan on its website. (observation)**
☒	☐	☐	Will the program become effective within one month of GPE approval, with completion within 12-18 months from the date of program effectiveness?	The program is expected to become effective a month after GPE approval. June 20, 2020 is the expected start date of the program which will be implemented over a 17.5-month period.
	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 MoGEI in South Sudan has prepared a strategic national COVID-19 Preparedness Response Plan 2020 with support from key partners. The current proposal is aligned with the response plan prepared by the MoGEI. The proposal focuses on radio learning, school hygiene and WASH, accelerated learning, back to school activities / community sensitization, and on capacity building all of which respond well to the priorities of the funding window. The program will target public and community schools located in the disadvantaged and remote areas of the country. All the key program activities are intended to target schools catering for basic education i.e. primary and lower secondary levels. However, other schools and children from those schools will also benefit from certain programs that include guidelines, polices and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for reopening schools; radio programs focusing on awareness raising about the pandemic and necessary safety measures; community participation in education programs and safety measures and messages related to the well-being, awareness raising and learning continuity for the disabled children. Given the nature of some of the interventions it is understandable that other schools and other age groups may benefit from the programming (for instance some of the radio messaging may be focussed on

				more general audiences or can benefit children/teachers across different schools types and age groups). The review team sought clarification on a 30-day workshop for 30 participants costing US$ 367,000. The GA provided explanation on why the unit cost is significantly higher than other trainings in the current ESPIG. However, the objective of the training and its relevance to the COVID response, remains unclear. Proposed decision language: **When the program is revised to accommodate the reduced allocation, activities in components 1 and 2, and associated budget, should be retained. If the activity for capacity-building workshops (modular) for 30 MoGEI and state staff (3.1.1) is retained, a stronger justification is needed.**
☒	☐	☐	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).*	More than one million children (approximately 50 per cent girls) out of the 1.9 million school going children will directly and indirectly benefit from this intervention (120,000 through reading material, 800,000 from wash facilities and school disinfection; and 200,000 children reached through radio programmes, community mobilization and awareness sessions); whereas system strengthening will encompass a broader range of current and future beneficiaries. More specifically more than one quarter of the radio sets will be allocated to children with disabilities. Radio programs will have special segments to target children with special needs as well as will work to have customized messages catering for the needs of children with special needs. For the intervention on learning packages children from the lowest wealth quintiles (based on the findings of the recent OOSC study report) and children from families where more than one child can benefit from materials will be targeted. In addition to support from GPE, the application notes that WFP and the EU are providing support to school feeding and take-home rations.

☒	☐	☐	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 COVID-19 is likely to negatively impact the well-being of vulnerable groups, especially girls and aggravate gender inequities. In particular, it proposes activities such as providing Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) support, re-usable sanitary pads to young adolescent girls. In addition, it has activities related to awareness sessions for parents about importance of parental support for children at home and girls' education. The program aims to ensure that the needs of girls from poor families will override those of others, if there is a potential need for prioritization related to the provision of materials or other planned facilities within the states. Additionally, of note is the fact that girl schools from the most remote areas will be accorded preference for the provision of WASH and other facilities.
☒	☐	☐	Does the proposal identify a relevant COVID-19 response coordination mechanism(s) and confirm that the program will be represented in this mechanism?	A COVID-19 task force has been set up to work with the MOGEI and LEG along with the GA. These four actors will support and be a part of four technical working groups that have been operationalized alongside a steering committee to implement COVID-19 related programs. This program will be represented in that mechanism. The MoGEI will lead the steering committee whose role will be to share information and harmonize planned programs in response to COVID-19 as well as ensure that gaps are identified in terms of response and adequate support is gathered to try and fulfill those.
☒	☐	☐	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?	The Education Sector COVID-19 Preparedness and Response Plan (ESC19RP) contains a table (Pages 10-12) that shows funding sources and gaps across the various activities planned under the ESC19RP. The table shows activities funded sometimes by specific partners and other times by Educational partners which can be considered sufficient to demonstrate that GPE funds are complimentary. South Sudan will also apply for COVID-19 funding through ECWs second phase of funding under its COVID-19 First Emergency Response (FER) window. Work on developing a program will commence in the near future. Coordination mechanisms in South Sudan are strong and well established. The ECW is a part of the LEG and has shared its call for proposals with the GPE Secretariat and other members of the LEG. The existing mechanisms in place accompanied by the efforts of the various stakeholders will aid the development of programs that are complimentary to each other. Proposed decision language:

				The Secretariat notes there is an application to ECW underway. We appreciate being copied in on the call for proposals and are assured that the GPE COVID-19 and ECW grants will be complementary because of the strong coordination mechanisms in place. (observation)
	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 proposed budget of US$10 million is consistent with the GPE Board approved allocation for South Sudan but is now above the revised allocation of US$ 7 million and so a reduction will be needed.
☐	☒	☐	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) **	Proposed budget outlines outputs and activities, and it is presented in a separate spreadsheet. GA's implementation support costs (for the original US$10 million proposal) of US$ 721,558 represent 7.2% of the total budget, which is consider reasonable given the country context. Following a request from the Secretariat, the GA provided further clarification on the high costs for workshops as well as distribution of printed materials. The one particular 30-day workshop for 30 participants costing US$ 367,000 has been raised in the decision language under program design. Suggested decision language: **It is requested to provide a narrative and a breakdown of the equipment costs associated with emergency cell at MoGEI (activity 3.1.2) and equipment and learning materials in 10 CECs (activity 3.1.3) in the revised program document, if activities are maintained.** With the implementation of this decision language, the program standard will be met.
☒	☐	☐	Is there a clear indication of the program's sources of funding, including which parts of the program are supported by each source? *	GPE COVID-19 funding is part of the Education Sector COVID-19 preparedness and response plan and complementary to other sources of funding. The Education Sector response plan document includes a table indicating activities by other partners and area of support.
☒	☐	☐	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. **	Budget assumptions align with program description and other parts of the proposal document.

	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? **	Roles and responsibilities are clearly mapped, and the monitoring has been costed under the budget.
☐	☒	☐	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 key output indicators, baseline, target and data sources. The following core indicator should also be disaggregated by gender: 1) Number of children (5-18) participating/reached through distance learning programmes 2) # of children receiving reading packages 3) # of teachers trained to deliver radio lessons Recommended decision language: **It is requested to disaggregate the indicators on number of children reached through distance learning programs, number of children receiving reading packages and number of teachers trained to deliver radio lessons by gender.** With the implementation of this decision language, the 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? **	The following core indicators must be reported as number and % of beneficiaries reached: 1) # of children receiving reading packages (Pg. 26) 2) # of schools disinfected and washing stands provided 3) # of adolescent girls accessing sanitary kits 4) Number of children (5-18) participating/reached through distance learning programmes 5) # of material packages are provided 6) # of children receiving reading packages 7) # of campaigns targeting teachers, parents, children, and other community members towards precautions about COVID-19- this should be reported as the # and % of children, this should then also be disaggregated by gender

[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.

				8) # of teachers trained to deliver radio lessons 9) # of children benefitting from classroom teaching and safety and hygiene measures 10) # of schools with handwashing stands 11) # of school building disinfected Recommended decision language: **It is also requested to include number and percentage of beneficiaries reached for all indicators proposed in the program document which correspond to the GPE core indicators.** With the implementation of this decision language, the 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) **	The Technical Working Group 2 is responsible for analyzing the effectiveness of the programme delivery and provide guidance and support to restructure the programme components or any part of the components for necessary course corrections and quality improvement. The costs will be included in the monitoring budget.
	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 (excel sheet shared), however it does not list the entities responsible against activities. Recommended decision language: **The GPE Secretariat appreciates that the proposed implementation arrangement is based on the current ESPIG. Nonetheless, roles and responsibilities should be clearly mapped for each activity in the revised implementation plan.** With the implementation of this decision language, the program standard will be met.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements sufficiently well-described to identify program management structures, responsible actors and processes?	Implementation arrangements are sufficiently described and will mainly capitalize on and further strengthen management and support structures that are in place for the implementation of the ESPIG Program 2 for South Sudan. Efforts will be made to bolster the capacities of and further revitalize existing program management and support bodies. Broadly speaking it is noteworthy that most of the implementation work will be undertaken with the

				support of the four Technical Working Committees (TWGs). The TWGs, which are already in place, will be more intensively engaged to expedite implementation of the accelerated program on a day-to-day basis.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation arrangements are sufficiently described to determine flow of funds? *	Funds disbursement will be in accordance with existing agreed practices that have been adopted for the South Sudan GPEII program.
☒	☐	☐	Are proposed financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements clearly described and appropriate for the country context? *	UNICEF will take the overall responsibility for funds management and will disburse the funds in accordance with the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT). Procurement arrangements will be in accordance with existing agreed practices that have been adopted for the South Sudan GPEII program and will follow UNICEF standard procurement procedures. Following on a request from the Secretariat, the GA provided additional information on implementation arrangements and clarified how the HACT procedure will be followed, describing spot checks and confirming that audits will be conducted by an external reputed auditor in line with international audit standards.
☐	☐	☒	Are proposed sub-contracting arrangements clearly described and appropriate?	There is no sub-contracting. UNICEF has 32 NGOs already registered as EiE partners who carry out most of the work. The mechanism is well described in the ESPIG program document.
☒	☐	☐	Are implementation support and oversight arrangements by the grant agent well described?	The Program management arrangements section provides an overview of the proposed implementation support and oversight arrangements planned by the GA. The implementation arrangements for this AF window will be aligned with those of the GPE Education Sector Plan Implementation grant (ESPIG II). Given the complementary nature of both interventions, efforts will be made to leverage the already functioning bodies, with an emphasis on greater coherence, alignment and effectiveness. This will provide an opportunity to further bolster the existing capacities and their mutual coordination to deliver the overall GPE-supported programme more effectively. An overview of the actors involved in implementation at the state as well as national level is presented.
☒	☐	☐	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?	Yes. As GPEII resources and infrastructure will be used, financial management implementation arrangements are in place. Provision for fast-track procurement is also outlined.

			Will major interventions will be ready to be launched by the proposed start date? *	
	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]	The proposal mentions girls and children from vulnerable and marginalized populations as beneficiaries, and this is demonstrated throughout the program document. The risk mitigation plan does not specifically include any risks and corresponding mitigation actions on these populations or for girls and so the decision language is below. Recommended decision language: **The risk mitigation plan should specifically include any risks and mitigating actions for vulnerable populations.** With the implementation of this decision language, the program standard will be met.
☒	☐	☐	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 application of HACT procedures provides assurance over implicit fiduciary risks, including procurement, for which rapid measures are proposed as a risk mitigation. Following on a request from the Secretariat, the GA confirmed that the fiduciary risk associated with the existing GPEII program and respective mitigations cover the fiduciary risks associated with the activities under this grant. Component 1 includes measures for safety measures for vulnerable groups. As there are no civil works, environmental risks are reasonably not considered to be significant.
☐	☐	☒	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

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

☐	☒	☐	Does the proposal trigger any GPE policies (e.g., GPE Private Sector Policy) which would require extraordinary consultation with GPE governance structures?	The assessment confirmed that the program will not benefit for-profit providers of core education services (e.g., for profit private schools). The program does propose activities which benefit community schools, which are considered as not-for-profit non-public providers of core education services. Community schools in South Sudan are community established and run schools operating in remote and disadvantaged areas not reached by government. Government regulation related to community schools includes legal recognition, paying salaries for some teachers working in community schools, and intermittently, provision of textbooks following government curriculum. The proposal did not include further information on the regulatory framework governing not for profit non state providers of core education services. Recommended decision language: **The Secretariat recognizes the important role of community schools to the sector in reaching children in rural, remote and marginalized areas, and of the GoSS intent to transition community schools into government schools over time. Recognizing that the Education Act (2012) proposes that government make rules and regulations to govern the registration, inspection and operation of private and community schools, 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 private and community schools. If needed, partners may consider drawing on financing in the existing 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): Sai Sudha Kanikicharla **Date:** 6/2/2020

Completed by (Risk and Finance related questions as per *): Simon Hall and Ana Tobar Lozano **Date:** 5/27/2020

Completed by (M & E related questions as per **): Gauri Khanduja **Date:** 6/2/2020

Reviewed by (CL): Fazle Rabbani **Date:** 6/11/2020

Reviewed by (QA): David Balwanz **Date:** 6/11/2020

Reviewed by (Team Lead): Matthew Smith **Date:** 6/15/2020

Approved by (Manager 1 if >$1m and up to $10m): Margarita Focas Licht **Date: 6/15/2020**

Approved by (Manager 2 if considered high risk following Manager 1 review): n/a