



FTI Board of Director's Meeting

Key Decisions

May 5-6, 2010

The Board agrees the following:

BOD/2010/05-01 – Scope of FTI: The FTI Partnership in its policy dialogue, capacity development and planning support, including Technical Assistance financing through the single trust fund, will cover the whole education sector for all low-income countries.

BOD/2010/05-02 – Scope of FTI: The Board confirms its ambition to make program financing available for the entire national education sector plan. However, given current resource constraints, the Board agrees that for the time being all six EFA goals – including learning needs, life-long learning, adult literacy and all aspects of quality of education – will be eligible for financing, while setting whole sector support as the target over time. The majority of financing will remain directed to basic education, defined as early child development and primary and lower secondary education. In the case of sector budget and other forms of sector-wide financing, performance indicators will be primarily pegged to the basic education cycle.

Three mechanisms will ensure a continued strong focus on basic education financing and outcomes: (i) the overarching results framework will have a focus on outcomes in the basic education cycle; (ii) the Secretariat will monitor the commitment to allocate the majority of resources to basic education; (iii) the Needs and Performance Framework used for resource allocation will continue to prioritize basic education needs.

BOD/2010/05-03 – Scope of FTI: The FTI will coordinate with other development partners to ensure implementation of the Aid Effectiveness principles in education.

BOD/2010/05-04 – Scope of FTI: The use of FTI trust funds for IDA3 countries is agreed for technical and capacity development support, but not for program implementation, with an exception for Small Island Developing States. The Secretariat is asked to prepare a proposal on transitional support to countries currently receiving CF financing which are graduating to IDA 3, and for countries affected by conflict.

BOD/2010/05-05 – Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy: The Secretariat is asked to prepare a communications document based on country-level impact and results from the ground by end-May 2010; and an outline of the results framework's high-level objectives by end-May 2010. The outline will inform the development of the results framework that will be finalized by end-July 2010 and will form the basis for the larger M&E strategy.

BOD/2010/05-06 – Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy: The M&E strategy will contain a results framework, an accountability matrix and an evaluation design.

BOD/2010/05-07 – Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy: A firm will be contracted to help finalize the M&E strategy.

BOD/2010/05-08 – Single Fund: Board members commit to promoting the Single Fund among constituencies.

BOD/2010/05-09 – Single Fund: The World Bank will be trustee for the Single Fund. Partners will be presented with options for the new single Trust Fund, which will include the key principles of the PACE approach.

BOD/2010/05-10 – Secretariat’s Work Plan & Budget: The Secretariat’s 1-year work plan and budget is agreed, with the condition that the Secretariat will provide the Board with additional information to underpin the work plan’s deliverables.

BOD/2010/05-11 – Board Composition: The principle of equity is approved. The number of developing country partner seats and votes will be equal to that of bilateral donors.

BOD/2010/05-12 – Board Composition: A governance model based on Model 2 from the Working Group on Board Composition (see Annex) including more developing country partners, a division of stakeholders into constituencies, and a technical/finance committee will be adopted. An expanded Working Group, including the current members + UNESCO + member of the CF Committee, will prepare a proposal for final decision by the Board at its next meeting.

BOD/2010/05-13 – Board Composition: A constituency-based Board structure will be introduced, replacing the current approach.

BOD/2010/05-14 – Board Composition: Board membership of donors will be linked to contributions to the Single Fund. A proposal will be prepared by the Secretariat for future consideration that could include overall support for basic education and adherence to aid effectiveness principles.

BOD/2010/05-15 – Board Composition: Working groups will be tasked to develop proposals for constituency groupings comprising respectively: developing country partners, donors, multilaterals and regional banks, UN agencies, CSOs and the private sector.

BOD/2010/05-16 – Board Composition: A finance/technical committee will be established. The Board asked that an expanded Working Group prepare a proposal regarding membership and responsibilities in the coming months.

BOD/2010/05-17 – Board Composition: Developing country partners serving on the Board will be provided with support to enable their effective participation on the Board. The Secretariat is tasked with preparing a detailed operational proposal in support of this decision.

Annex

Model 2

This model differs from the present Board in that it would have: 1) more partner countries, 2) division into constituencies, and 3) at least a technical/finance committee that would prepare and recommend decisions to the Board. The number of partner country votes would be equal to those of bilateral donors. Options include: 1) adding two partner country seats to the current structure, or 2) maintaining four partner country seats, while giving partner countries the same amount of votes as bilateral donors (i.e., each partner country vote could count as 1.5). As the Partnership grows, the number of partner countries would be equal to the number of donors.

Model 2	
Donors	6
Partners from low income countries	(4 ->) 6
CSO	3 (e.g., GCE, Southern-based service provider, possibly regional CSO such as ADEA)
Multilaterals	3 (WB, UNESCO/UNICEF sharing a seat, EC)
Private sector	1
TOTAL	17-19

Comments from the working group: *This model would make the Board more equitable and inclusive, as more members of the Partnership would, directly or indirectly, have a voice on the Board. Fewer partner countries than donors would not be a desirable situation long-term, but as a temporary “solution” it might allow time for the constituency system to start working among partner countries. Even though the Board is not likely to vote often, an option could be to have equal numbers of votes between partner and donor countries.*

With this Board size, decision-making might become slow, especially since financial decisions would be the responsibility of the Board. There would also be travel-related cost implications with a Board of this size. Both these concerns, however, could be mitigated if the Board agreed to use video/teleconferencing more frequently, and if there were committees supporting the Board.

The working group feels comfortable with this or a fairly similar model.