Please note: Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them at the Board meeting.

Financing and Funding Framework

Annex 2: Operational Feasibility Assessment and Roadmap Annex

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary 3
2. Key Changes to Country-Level Processes 5
3. Summary of Implications 6
   A. Partnership Capacity 6
   B. Secretariat Capacity 10
   C. Governance 15
   D. Asset Management / Institutional Implications 16
4. Roadmap to 2018 18

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document assesses the operational feasibility of the GPE Financing and Funding Framework ("FFF") and the roadmap forward to implement the FFF in 2018. It builds on recommendations from the Assessment of Secretariat Capacity and Operations presented to the GPE Board in December 2016.

At country-level, the FFF's more diverse array of financing sources and more differentiated funding mechanisms imply both changes and enhancements to current processes. Under the FFF, countries will have access to multiple GPE funding mechanisms beyond the implementation grant (i.e., ESPIG). A greater number of non-state actors will also be eligible for new funding mechanisms (pending approval of the Private Sector Engagement Strategy). Similarly, interested countries will have the option to work with GPE to access more diverse sources of financing to support the ESP in a harmonized and coordinated way, such as more systematic MDB co-financing and ESP-aligned private investment. These funding and financing approaches could add some complexity beyond the needs-based GPE implementation grant.

Therefore, the FFF will require increased capacity, expertise, planning, coordination, and consultation across the Partnership – including for DCPs, LEGs, and Grant Agents. On the funding side, proposed mechanisms offer new ways to work with GPE and access resources. However, most funding activities that could incur increased transaction costs for various actors are optional and demand-driven. On the financing side, participation in new financing approaches will require additional time and effort from DCPs – as well as an understanding of the tools being deployed. In particular, the proposal to adopt an "education sector investment case" approach increases capacity requirements for the Secretariat, DCPs, and potentially the LEG – but offers benefits in return. These include: more and better-structured financing; potential to rally local and global actors around the education sector plan; enhanced alignment across funders and reduced aid fragmentation; and increased country ownership of financing coordination. However, while enhancements to the ESP process will be rolled out for all countries developing new ESPs going forward, processes to mobilize additional financing will be done in a demand-driven way grounded in country priorities. Regardless, GPE should aim to support partners with the capacity development and technical assistance required to access the FFF offerings.

Supporting the Partnership to mobilize and deploy resources in new ways will require incremental Secretariat expertise and capacity. A more thorough analysis of these capacity implications will be forthcoming in the strategic HR plan to be submitted to the Board in June 2017. For financing, modest capacity increases will help strengthen Secretariat expertise in development finance and resource mobilization around credible ESPs. Both – along with quality assurance capacity – will be essential to provide strategic and technical guidance to DCPs and actively facilitate the "education sector investment case" approach to crowd in more diverse sources of financing.

Although successful implementation of the FFF will require new efforts and investments, GPE aims to keep Secretariat operating expenses across the FFF within a range of 5-7% of total expenditure. This is consistent with current Secretariat administration and operational costs. Overall, the FFF aims to better connect appropriate sources of finance to key needs at the country and global levels, without adding undue transaction costs.

While this document provides an initial examination of the operational and resource implications of the FFF, the Board has called upon the Secretariat to conduct further analysis on its capacity needs to deliver on GPE 2020. This includes the implications of the FFF, ECW, and replenishment scenarios – with a view toward seeking greater efficiency. The Secretariat will therefore submit a comprehensive Human Resources Plan for the Board's consideration in June 2017, alongside the FY18 operating expenses budget. Therefore, there is no request for the Board to consider additional resources at the February 2017 Board meeting.

Lastly, operationalizing the FFF will not require any changes to GPE governance or asset management. However, if the Board approves the proposed Contributions and Safeguards Policy, GPE may need to update financial management procedures to allow for acceptance of targeting financing. Institutionally, the implementation of the FFF does not require any alterations to the GPE Fund or the role of the Trustee at the World Bank. Nonetheless, alternative institutional arrangements could potentially enhance implementation by opening up a wider range of operational strategies and partnership options.

Initial financial costing estimates imply minimum financing needs of ~$600M for 2018, increasing to ~$700M in 2019 and ~$800M by 2020. However, these amounts should not in any way be assumed as GPE's replenishment target.

Launching the FFF in January 2018 will require continued efforts throughout 2017. This includes a considerable amount of knowledge gathering and analytical work to further refine the design of the FFF and make decisions regarding operational features. For additional detail, please the roadmap in Section 5 – which will exist as a living document updated by the Secretariat.

2. KEY CHANGES TO COUNTRY-LEVEL PROCESSES

The FFF will offer a more diverse array of financing sources and more differentiated funding mechanisms to GPE countries. The FFF aims to connect appropriate sources of finance to key needs at the country and global levels, without adding undue transaction costs. However, new approaches to financing and funding will likely have an impact on some country-level processes:

- Funding: Under the FFF, countries will have access to multiple GPE funding mechanisms beyond the implementation grant (e.g., ESPIG). A greater number of non-state actors will also be eligible for the new funding mechanisms, including knowledge and innovation exchange and advocacy and social accountability (pending the approval of the Private Sector Engagement Strategy). The development of an expanded array of funding opportunities may result in increased upfront costs for set up, especially in the cases involving the management of competitive calls for proposals. The GPE Secretariat will need to explore ways to reduce such costs, such as streamlining procurement and assessment processes. The Secretariat will also aim to implement these mechanisms through partners and leverage existing expertise and capacity within the Partnership. GPE will also need to consider whether implementation of the FFF requires additional policy advice and capacity development support for countries – and if so, whether grant agents are currently well-positioned to meet these needs or whether additional measures are necessary. The roadmap in Section 5 accounts for thorough assessment of these capacity questions.

- Financing: Interested countries will have the option to work with GPE to access more diverse sources of financing to support the ESP in a harmonized and coordinated way, such as more systematic MDB co-financing and ESP-aligned private investment. This could add some complexity beyond the needs-based GPE implementation grant (e.g., ESPIG). However, GPE will minimize undue transaction costs and/or complexity by ensuring the Secretariat has additional capacity and expertise to support countries with this process. Countries will also pursue additional sources of finance based on their own interest and demand, if they decide that the benefits (e.g., access to incremental financing) outweigh the costs (e.g., increased transaction costs).

  The availability of leverage funding for non-ESPIG eligible countries will also imply adjustments to current country-level processes. Countries accessing leveraging funding from GPE (e.g., grant funding that is not an ESPIG MCA) will follow a slightly different

country-level process from that of the ESPIG. First, these countries must meet the 1:3 leveraging requirement in order to access GPE grant funding via a competitive process. In addition, Grant Agent selection will need to happen very early on in order to pursue leveraging arrangements with the MDB partner – who will likely act as Grant Agent and supervise the financing package. Development of a clear process to access leveraging funding is an action item in the roadmap in Section 5.

Across all financing recommendations, adoption of the "investment case" approach to crowd in resources for the implementation of the country ESP implies both enhancement of and adjustment to existing GPE processes. For additional detail, please see the FFF Annex B.1.

3. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

A. PARTNERSHIP CAPACITY

as detailed in the FFF annex, the investment case approach will 1) strengthen the finance and investment aspects of education sector planning, and 2) involve additional efforts to develop an investment case and crowd in additional financing around it. While enhancements to the ESP process will be rolled out for all countries developing new ESPs going forward, processes to mobilize additional financing will be done in a demand-driven way grounded in country priorities.

Table 1 **below outlines the potential capacity implications associated with the financing approaches and funding mechanisms proposed in the FFF** – given they offer new ways of working with GPE and accessing funding.

On the funding side, most activities that could incur increased transaction costs for various actors are optional and demand-driven. This includes the new reinforcing funding mechanisms. To minimize transaction costs for funding applicants, GPE will aim to streamline processes – particularly around applications and reporting – across all funding mechanisms.

On the financing side, participation in new financing approaches will require additional time and effort from DCPs – as well as an understanding of the tools being deployed. MDB co-financing may also require additional upfront coordination for LEGs, CAs and GAs. To mitigate risk, finance experts from the Secretariat will be available to advise stakeholders (DCPs, LEGs, CAs and GAs) at relevant points in the process *(see Secretariat capacity implications in section 3B)*. This is in addition to the support current country level partners and CST members provide. Moreover, similar to the funding mechanisms, the financing approaches are demand-driven.

The proposal to adopt an "education sector investment case" approach increases capacity requirements for the Secretariat, DCPs, and potentially the LEG – but offers benefits in return. The proposal would help DCPs crowd in financing from GPE as well as other public and private financiers active in the country. Therefore, the potential benefits could outweigh the costs. Advantages include:

- More and better financing (e.g., an increase in total amount as well as better-structured and tailored financing for select activities)
- Potential to rally local and global actors around the education sector plan
- Enhanced alignment across funders and reduced aid fragmentation
- Increased country ownership of financing coordination

It is recommended that additional Secretariat capacity related to financing, resource mobilization, quality assurance, and policy and planning technical advisory be put in place to support interested DCPs throughout this process. Technical enhancement of the ESP process is critical to successful financing. GPE may additionally consider the outsourcing of expertise to develop strong investment cases.

Moreover, as detailed in the FFF annex, the investment case approach will 1) strengthen the finance and investment aspects of education sector planning, and 2) involve additional efforts to develop an investment case and crowd in additional financing around it. While enhancements to the ESP process will be rolled out for all countries developing new ESPs going forward, processes to mobilize additional financing will be done in a demand-driven way grounded in country priorities.

Table 1: High-level capacity implications across the partnership

	DCPs	LEGs	Gas
Funding mechanisms	• **Increased capacity and expertise** to comply with enhancements to the ESPIG, notably around DRM, Results Based Funding and Data requirements - To mitigate capacity constraints, the FFF also calls for a review of capacity building mechanisms to identify ways that GPE can more effectively support in-country capacity to deliver on Education Sector Plans and ESPIGs • **Increased capacity and expertise** required to properly vet and provide input to proposals for new reinforcement funding mechanisms – To mitigate capacity constraints, GPE must ensure that DCP involvement in knowledge and innovation exchange activities is well-coordinated and complements existing processes and activities (e.g. supports sector plan development and implementation and does not distract from it)	• **Potential for increased LEG consultation** required during the Grant Agent selection process for reinforcement mechanisms	• **Increased DCP capacity-building** required for the enhancements to the core funding model and for the new reinforcement mechanisms that require engagement with national governments – To mitigate, Coordinating Agencies with Grant Agent(s) – if there are multiple – should work closely together to reduce duplication, ensure strong synergies, and maximize linkages across all GPE funding mechanisms accessed by the DCP
Financing approaches	• **Increased finance expertise** necessary to collaborate with GPE to	• **Adjustments and/or additional coordination required for the Grant Agent**	• **Greater upfront planning and coordination between GPE Secretariat and GAs** required to

	pursue non-grant financing approaches – To mitigate, modest increases in Secretariat capacity – with a focus on hiring finance experts – is proposed to provide strategic guidance and technical assistance to DCPs – GPE can also consider options beyond the Secretariat (e.g., hiring experts in technical assistance) to support DCPs – MDBs also provide an entry point to Ministries of Finance, who can provide some of the expertise and support required	**selection process,** primarily due to the MDB financing approach – To mitigate, decisions regarding the Grant Agent will likely need to happen as early as possible to ensure leveraging funding is secured, thereby allowing proposals to move forward	systematically pursue co-financing arrangements. This could increase upfront investment costs during the design phase. – However, co-financing could reduce transaction costs during implementation
Implementing the 'education sector investment case' approach	• **Additional effort and engagement required** given the investment case process should be country-led; for additional detail, please see the FFF Annex B.1	• **Improved LEG & development partner coordination and planning** needed to crowd in financial support for the education sector investment case**.** The Coordinating Agency could also play a large role in this process; for additional detail, please see the FFF Annex B.1	• **Increased coordination between GA and other financiers** making commitments to the investment case; however, the investment case process aims to crowd in resources around the ESP; it does not bring more financing to the GPE ESPIG managed by the GA. Nonetheless, GAs for ESPDGs should be aware of the approach and what it seeks to achieve

Regardless of whether new components of the FFF are optional, GPE should aim to support partners with the capacity development and technical assistance required to access these offerings. Ultimately, the new funding mechanisms and financing approaches proposed are intended to enhance impact in line with the goals laid out by GPE 2020. Consequently, as many interested DCPs as possible should be able to benefit from these FFF approaches. This suggests a need to reflect on how GPE currently supports capacity development and technical assistance and whether a more coordinated approach is required. This will be a focus for further exploration and study in 2017.

B. SECRETARIAT CAPACITY

The Secretariat will present a comprehensive Human Resources Plan to the Board for consideration in June 2017. Therefore, this document details the types of capacity changes implied by the FFF, but does not provide specific Secretariat headcount estimates for Board consideration at the February/March 2017 meeting.

SUMMARY

- **General:** As previously discussed, supporting DCPs to crowd in financing around the "education sector investment case" has implications for how the Secretariat will work with DCPs and potential co-financiers; roles and activities under this process will need to be clearly defined *(see FFF annex B.1 for initial design and operational considerations)*. Development of the "investment case" will likely require additional expertise for robust ESP processes and also require further quality assurance capacities.
- **Expertise:** New approaches to attract financing to GPE and DCPs will require increased expertise and capacity for CST with the support of SPP and the cross-team cluster to ensure DCPs are familiar with the options available to them and adequately supported throughout the process. PERT will also require changes to support interested DCPs in crowding in resources around the investment case – often by helping mediate connections between global or regional partners and country-level work. It will also be important to train existing Secretariat staff to ensure sufficient understanding of the financing and funding approaches needed to reinforce linkages to education sector plans.
- **Resourcing:** The additional financing expertise mentioned above will translate to additional staff positions dedicated to performing select tasks (CST, PERT, and SPP). A precise analysis of head count implications will be presented as part of the Strategic HR plan to be delivered in June 2017. GPE will also maintain an appropriate ratio of operational costs to funding amounts disbursed (currently targeting a range of 5-7% for Secretariat operating costs across the FFF). Finally, receiving targeted contributions and ensuring these are in line with the approved Contributions and Safeguards Policy many require additional capacity given reporting requirements.

FINANCING

<u>Expertise</u>

Successful implementation of the financing approaches will require a modest increase in headcount and new capabilities and skills within the GPE Secretariat. Specifically, capacity increases will help strengthen Secretariat expertise in two areas:

- **Development finance**. GPE will require more staff with expertise in public and private finance to provide strategic and technical guidance to DCPs throughout education sector planning and, for interested countries, development of the investment case. Staff must have a strong understanding of non-grant financing instruments and mechanisms, and more senior hires should have experience working with a range of financing actors – MDBs/DFIs, bilateral donors, and/or the private sector. The ability to support the Ministry of Education in engaging in technical discussions with Ministries of Finance will be key.
- **Resource mobilization**. GPE will require more staff with dedicated capacity to help DCPs crowd in more diverse sources of financing around the education sector plan – via the "investment case" process. This could involve actively engaging potential funders at global and country levels, hosting a roundtable launch event for the investment case, and proactively leveraging the financing capabilities across the Partnership to support implementation of the ESP. For additional detail, please see the FFF annex B.1.

Current and Planned Resources

The GPE Finance team has completed recruitment of an Innovative Finance Lead (April 2017 start date) and is currently recruiting a Senior Finance Officer with significant experience in public financial management. Some existing GPE Country Leads, and SPP staff have a public financial management background. The SPP-led cross-team systems planning and finance cluster would also support with efforts to help DCPs access new financing approaches and use the ESP to develop an investment case to crowd in financing. This capacity could realistically help a number of priority or high-potential countries to crowd in resources around the ESP, but is likely insufficient to provide immediate support for all GPE countries.

However, it is likely that there will need to be additional resources for managing relationships and advancing technical cooperation with MDBs (including through the Education Commission MDB Platform) and supporting technical discussions with Ministries of Finance and Education and Development Partners to align financial support for the ESP.

Other costs

- Short-term consultants could support with development of the "investment case," building on the ESP and its multi-year action plan

FUNDING

Expertise

- The enhancements to the core funding model will require additional expertise in topics such as the Alignment agenda, Domestic Resource Mobilization and supporting countries to adopt more effective approaches to education data management.
- Management of the new reinforcing mechanisms will require technical expertise related to innovation, knowledge exchange, and advocacy and social accountability. It will also be important that any grant agents selected to administer these funds have sufficient technical expertise in tools such as challenge funds, prizes, crowd sourcing, matching funds, market shaping mechanisms, co-financing facilities and technical assistance facilities. Grant agents for the ASA mechanism will need technical expertise in advocacy and social accountability. There will also be some up-front capacity implications of taking on the design work of these two new, major mechanisms.

Current and planned resources

- There will be capacity implications to operationalize the various recommendations to enhance the core funding model – especially those recommendations that call for updates to guidelines, policies and quality assurance practices, among others. These capacity implications will be included in the Strategic HR plan.
- Management of the knowledge and innovation exchange mechanism will require dedicated resources in the Secretariat. Precise capacity implications will be presented in the Strategic HR plan in June of 2017. With a minimum envelope of US$5 million per thematic area, the Secretariat will contain transaction costs at approximately 7%; the percentage will decrease as the amount of resources per multi-year program increases.

Other costs

- Costs will be required for the Secretariat to commission the design of the new reinforcing mechanisms.

C. GOVERNANCE

The FFF architecture does not imply changes to GPE governance structure. The FFF assumes the GPE Board would continue to act as the primary governance and strategic

decision-making body for the Partnership, without changing existing structures. The FFF would allow the Board to elevate their level of discussions on individual GRA or KGPE projects to a higher level, strategic oversight of an integrated program of work under the new Knowledge and Innovation Exchange mechanism.

If the Board approves the proposed Contributions and Safeguard Policy – thereby allowing more targeted financing – a review of processes by which these contributions are approved would be necessary. Currently, the Secretariat must approach the Board and the Finance and Risk Committee to approve each transaction. In order to reduce the administrative burden on the Secretariat, it may be appropriate to equip the Secretariat with more authority to accept these contributions – or at least create a more streamlined process for requesting approval.

D. Asset Management / Institutional Implications

The FFF will increase the complexity and workload for GPE's Finance team in terms of financial planning and reporting due to the range of financing and funding mechanisms offered and the introduction of targeted financing. However at this stage, it is not likely to require any alteration to the GPE Fund or the role of the Trustee, and the Secretariat Finance team has the capacity to cope with these changes.

At present, operationalization of the FFF does not require a change to GPE's institutional arrangement – as there are viable pathways for implementation. However, there are limitations in terms of GPE's flexibility to transfer funds directly to non-traditional implementing partners for the new reinforcing funding mechanisms, in particular. While not insurmountable, GPE's current institutional structure does limit the options and the potential efficiency of delivery.

In the future, new structures beyond the GPE Fund could become a part of the GPE funding platform. If the leverage fund is successful, an expansion of this could see the creation of a dedicated trust fund for receipt of contributions that would leverage development partner financing. Similarly, the operationalization of any proposals on risk financing may require creation of a special purpose vehicle. Such additional funding and financing structures will depend on the specific operational arrangements – and will be the focus of further Secretariat analysis and planning following the finalization of the final FFF. However as stated

above, these new structures are not currently required to operationalize the proposed components of the FFF.

4. ROADMAP TO 2018

Legend for responsibilities:

	Secretariat is responsible
	Involves Committee work or decision
	Involved Board consideration and decision

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																			
			2017											2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Financing																			
Disaster and political risk financing	Consulting team, Secretariat	Continue analytical work to explore disaster and political risk financing opportunity	x	x	x	x													
Disaster and political risk financing	Secretariat	Present materials at the June 2017 Board meeting with decision language on whether to pursue this opportunity					x												
Disaster and political risk financing	Secretariat	If approved by the Board, begin official design process to launch the insurance product						x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Domestic financing – public	Secretariat, GPC	Propose for Board approval a policy for taking appropriate action where the commitments are not being met, with better data as a foundation *(see funding enhancement section)*											x						
Domestic financing – private & private investment	Secretariat with external support	Map opportunities for private sector engagement – including mobilization of private investment and grant financing from non-state actors – at country-level in 2018, as part of Strategies for GPE Engagement with the Private Sector and Foundations (2018; to be aligned with other GPE roadmaps)												x	x	x	x	x	x
Domestic financing – private	Secretariat with external support	Deepen and refine FFF recommendations, based on the findings from the mapping (2018; to be aligned with other GPE roadmaps)												x	x	x	x	x	x
Financing – private investment	Secretariat	Deepen and refine FFF recommendations, based on the findings from the mapping (2018; to be aligned with other GPE roadmaps)												x	x	x	x	x	x

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																					
			2017												2018						
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Financing unlocked by GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Reach out to MDB partners following the February 2017 Board meeting to provide an update		x															
Financing unlocked by GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Reach out to the Education Commission following the February 2017 Board meeting to provide an update and identify any potential for linkage with the MDB platform		x															
GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Schedule working session with relevant members of World Bank leadership to develop solutions that address identified constraints to IDA-WB co-financing		x															
GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Work with other country-level partners – and in particular Grant Agents – to identify prospects for greater co-financing and leveraging, and to work to identify and remove the obstacles that impede such approaches		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Report on the above efforts to the Grants and Performance Committee on a regular basis			x		x				x			x			x		x
Financing unlocked by GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Work with prioritized MDB partners (e.g., World Bank, IsDB) to develop operational guidelines for any collaboration		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								
Financing unlocked by GPE – MDBs and DPs	Secretariat	Certify new MDB partners (e.g., IsDB) as Grant Agents, as needed		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Financing – leveraging funding	Secretariat	Develop clear process for LMICs not receiving ESPIGs to access leveraging funding – highlighting any deviations from the standard ESPIG processes		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								
Financing – leveraging funding	Secretariat	Develop key communications materials explaining the leveraging funding opportunity for LMICs									x	x							
Financing – leveraging funding	Secretariat	Subject to availability of resources following the replenishment, create US$100 million leverage funding pool that may be accessed by LMICs									x	x	x						
Financing – leveraging funding	Secretariat	Present leveraging opportunity to an initial set of eligible countries and potential partners; confirm interest and path forward									x	x	x						

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																				
			2017												2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Financing – leveraging funding	Finance and Risk Committee	Subject to available resources, consider proposal to create a leverage funding pool that may be accessed as a top up to the MCAs for ESPIG-eligible countries that can demonstrate co-financing of GPE grant resources and leveraging of external financing of at least US$3 to US$1 of any GPE funds accessed from the leverage pool										x	x							
Financing – leveraging funding	Secretariat	If approved by Board, develop clear guidelines and processes for ESPIG-eligible countries to access the leverage funding pool											x	x	x	x				
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Map DCPs based on their education sector plan development and implementation process – considering both stage of completion and quality. After comprehensive mapping, select interested countries to prioritize for the investment case approach.		x	x	x	x													
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Solicit input from DCPs, donors, and LEGs and work with them to further develop the investment case approach (workshops or one-on-ones).		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Present the investment case approach and solicit input at constituency meeting with DCPs in May.				x														
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Continue conversation with analogues and benchmarks to capture best practices and lessons learned related to design and implementation (e.g., GFF for Every Woman Every Child, USAID Private Capital Management)		x	x	x														
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Create detailed implementation plan for rollout of the approach in an efficient and effective manner, which should include a learning mechanism				x	x	x	x	x	x	x								
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Ensure any required capacity increases are outlined in Human Resources Plan requested by the Board for June 2017 Following presentation of Human Resources Plan in June and Board decisions, put in place approved Secretariat capacity to support interested DCPs				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																						
			2017												2018							
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Financing – Investment case approach	Secretariat	Launch investment case approach; support DCPs to use ESP financing framework and action plans as basis to promote development of investment case, and to actively engage with relevant government departments, multilateral and bilateral agencies, and the private sector with the aim to promote additionality, coordinated financing, co-financing, and leveraging opportunities to crowd in resources												x	x	x	x	x	x
Reinforcing funding mechanisms																						
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat, SIC	Work with the SIC to design and operationalize mechanisms for advancing advocacy and social accountability									x	x	x	x	x							
Funding – Advocacy & Social Accountability	Board	Board to approve final design of advocacy and social accountability mechanism											x									
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Determine transaction costs for the administration of grants, including overhead of Grant Agents in managing grants of the sizes proposed to the recipients proposed and Secretariat staffing											x									
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Determine grant size required for relative impact, including assessment of different kinds of activity and scales (e.g. social accountability at national scale, vs. core coalition activities)											x									
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Identify existing activities or programs currently supported for advocacy and social accountability in education at the national level by other funders Explore areas identified as requiring additional advocacy or social accountability work, including an assessment of evidence gaps, weak policy adoption or implementation, and under-resourced actors doing effective work in these areas											x									

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																				
			2017												2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Identify the potential for targeted funding to be raised in this area including potential thematic or geographic focus of targeted funding (pending recommendations in the Contributions and Safeguards Policy), and the sovereign, private, or other donors that may be willing to finance or co-finance work in this area	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Conduct mapping of global advocacy actors, campaigns and existing efforts in global education advocacy including drawing on those working in other development or public financial management sectors which may have experience to bear on the education sector	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Identify and fully elaborate all of the potential linkages with knowledge and innovation exchange funding windows and ensure coherence among the activities, recipients, and outcomes sought through each mechanism	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Funding - Advocacy & Social Accountability	Secretariat	Define the criteria and selection process for potential Grant Agents with the capacity to administer this kind of program, and undertake an initial mapping of organizations which may be interested in playing such a role. This may also include an accreditation process to bring on new Grant Agents.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Funding - Knowledge & innovation exchange	Secretariat	Commission the design of and operationalize mechanisms for advancing knowledge, innovation and exchange of good practice across the Partnership									x								
Funding - Knowledge & innovation exchange	SIC, Secretariat	Develop a coherent knowledge & innovation strategy that weaves together the existing KGPE strategy and innovation. As part of this, reflect on KGPE stage 1									x								
Funding – Knowledge & innovation exchange	Board	Board to approve final design of knowledge and innovation exchange mechanism											x						
Funding - Knowledge & innovation exchange	Secretariat	Perform more detailed costing and benchmarking based on similar funding windows to test transaction costs, especially at the country level	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																				
			2017												2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Funding - Knowledge & innovation exchange	Secretariat	Conduct additional market analysis around potential collaborators and existing initiatives	x	x	x	x	x	x											
Funding - Knowledge & innovation exchange	Secretariat	Complete mapping of potential donors, and market analysis of which donors would be more or less likely to fund specific thematic areas; conduct initial scoping and conversations with non-traditional donors; recommend a potential donor pipeline that solves for the risk of fragmentation of donor financing.	x	x	x	x	x	x											
Enhancements to funding model																				
Funding – Capacity development	Secretariat	Commission the examination of the efficiency and effectiveness of Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies, and LEGs to deliver on GPE 2020[1] It is important to see these changes alongside the evaluation strategy and use these evaluations to effectively benchmark performance				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							
Funding – Capacity development	Secretariat	Based on findings, make improvements to the provision of capacity building and technical assistance throughout the GPE model												x	x	x	x	x	x
Funding - Alignment to national systems	Secretariat	Identify (February to July 2017) and deploy (July to December 2017) existing and potential levers to incentivize aligned modalities for aid delivery in education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							
Funding - Domestic resource mobilization	Secretariat	Design a process for monitoring domestic resource commitments made as a basis for satisfying the requirements of an approved ESPIG application	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								
Funding - Domestic resource mobilization	Secretariat, GPC	Develop and disseminate improved guidance on how to set the parameters for DRM requirements	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							
Funding - Domestic resource mobilization	Secretariat, GPC	Propose for Board approval a policy for taking appropriate action where the commitments are not being met, with better data as a foundation											x						

[1] This study should include an examination of their respective roles in providing capacity building and technical advice, and identify options to clarify or adjust these roles including provision of additional support as needed

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																					
			2017													2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Funding - Domestic resource mobilization	Secretariat	Make any required modifications to the Operational Framework for the requirements and incentives of the Funding Model, and the ESPIG policy to ensure consistency with this process												x	x	x	x		
Funding – Education data	Board	Modify the data requirement for ESPIG applications as follows: *For countries that require a plan to address data gaps, and for which financing to implement that plan within the agreed timeline is not identified by the time of the application, a portion of the ESPIG grant must finance the unfinanced portion of the data plan*. Apply these modifications to applications within the 2015-2018 period.	x																	
Funding - Emergency support	Secretariat	Add more specific provisions in the TOR for Grant Agents to deliver TA on resilience and preparedness in FCAS countries								x	x	x								
Funding - Emergency support	Secretariat	Develop a final recommendation on risk financing instruments based on on-going work *(see financing section)*					x													
Funding - Emergency support	Secretariat	Develop a clear interface with ECW so as to maximize potential impact by December 2017											x							
Funding – Emergency support	Secretariat, SIC	Incorporate the topics of resiliency and conflict as cross-cutting topic across Knowledge and Innovation exchange thematic programs																		x
Funding – Regional approaches	Secretariat	Develop a review of best practices and guidance that would encourage and facilitate regional funding approaches in two separate instances: (a) small, islands, and land locked states; (b) regional/crisis situations for approval by the Grants and Performance Committee																		x
Funding – Variable part / results-based financing	Secretariat, GPC	Finalize GPC reflections (February) and communicate to new GPC committee (April)	x		x															
Funding – Variable part / results-based financing	Secretariat, GPC	Strengthen approach to QA for variable funding tranche (by December 2017) April 2017 meeting should focus on testing revised approach, providing recommendations, and adjusting as needed for June reviews			x	x	x													

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																				
			2017												2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Funding – Variable part / results-based financing	Secretariat	Develop improved guidance on variable part that should include attention to stronger linkages with transformative strategies with ESPs	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Funding – Variable part / results-based financing	Secretariat, SIC	Examine opportunities to strengthen the variable tranche to support results achievements in the three areas of learning, equity and efficiency when designing Knowledge and Innovation Exchange mechanism, and promote knowledge sharing and exchange of practices around tested policy solutions that governments can employ to realize stretch targets in learning equity and efficiency			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						
CSP																				
CSP	Board	Approve CSP		x	x															
CSP	Secretariat	Develop template for reviewing targeted financing proposals			x															
CSP	Secretariat, GPE CEO	Secretariat to assess all targeted financing offers received against CSP, using standard template agreed by GPC GPE CEO to authorize/ deny all targeted financing proposals received – ongoing, but likely high around replenishment	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
CSP	Finance and Risk Committee	Regularly monitor CSP implementation and if necessary to propose changes to the policy based on lessons learned during its application; such monitoring will require annual quantitative and qualitative reports from the Secretariat on fundraising and application of the Policy									x						x			
CSP	Secretariat	Conduct independent review of how CSP operating and recommend adjustments required to GPC and the Board –frequency TBC, possibly on a bi-annual basis.												x	x					
CSP	Secretariat with external support	Conduct detailed mapping of Private Sector and Foundations thematic interest – replenishment strategy (June 2017 Board)					x													
CSP	Board	Develop and review private Sector strategy– Dec 2017											x							
CSP	Board	Develop and review foundations strategy – Dec 2017											x							
Cross-cutting																				
Crosscutting	Secretariat	Develop Human Resources Plan to present to the Board in June 2017	x	x	x	x														
Crosscutting	Secretariat	If approved by the Board, put in place additional Secretariat capacity and expertise, per the recommendations in the Human Resources Plan						x	x	x	x	x	x							

Operational Feasibility Roadmap																			
			2017											2018					
Component	**Responsible**	**Activity**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**	**J**	**A**	**S**	**O**	**N**	**D**	**J**	**F**	**M**	**A**	**M**	**J**
Crosscutting	Finance and Risk Committee	Develop a proposal on prioritization of resources for the FFF to cover scenarios where the forecast of available assets is either insufficient to finance all the components of the FFF at minimum levels, or is more than sufficient to finance at minimum levels	x	x	x	x	x	x											