



# REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS 21-22 MAY 2013, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

## INTRODUCTION

### *Information Session*

A half-day information session was held on 20 of May 2013, including updates from the Financial Advisory Committee, Strategic Plan Working Group, Governance Working Group and information on country-level support and pledge monitoring.

The agenda for the meeting can be found on the Global Partnership for Education website (“Global Partnership” or “GPE”)<sup>1</sup>. A list of participants is found in **Annex 1**.

This report presents a summary of the issues discussed and the decisions approved.

## **1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF MEETING REPORT**

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting and thanked the European Commission for hosting the meeting at its Conference Centre.

1.2 The Chair advised the Board that she had received a request from the Board member representing Donor 2 to amend Paragraph 7.10 of the report of the Board of Directors held in Paris from 19-20 November 2012 (BOD/2012/12 DOC 01)<sup>2</sup> to reflect the concern over the reputational risk for the Global Partnership due to potential funding shortfalls. The amendment to paragraph 7.10 of the report reads as follows:

“One Board member expressed concern over the growing reputational risk for GPE represented by the projected funding shortfall. The same Board member suggested that there may be a need for a comprehensive re-examination of the system for allocating GPE grants, given that demand for grants is outstripping supply.”

1.3 The Chair requested the approval of the report subject to this amendment being made.

1.4 The following decision was approved:

<sup>1</sup><http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Board/Brussels-2013/2013-05-Board-Meeting-Agenda.pdf>

<sup>2</sup>[http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Board/Paris-2012/Paris2012\\_Report.pdf](http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Board/Paris-2012/Paris2012_Report.pdf)

**BOD/2013/05-02 — Approval of Meeting Report:** The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Paris, France on 19-20 November 2012 (BOD/2012/11 DOC 01)

## **2. REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

2.1 The Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”), Alice Albright, presented the information in her report to the Board (BOD/2013/05 DOC 02), outlining key priorities for the next six months. It was noted that going forward, the CEO’s report would highlight key strategic issues, grant activity, donor contributions and funds management and budget utilization. Operational updates would continue to be provided in the regular newsletters. Some of the highlights are included in the following paragraphs.

2.2 The CEO shared her first impressions of the opportunities facing the Global Partnership. Increasingly education is garnering more attention and a greater sense of urgency both at the global and local levels. This was evident, for example, at the Learning for All Ministerial and related meetings, held in Washington from 15 to 21 April 2013. Highlights of the week included direct dialogues with ministries of education in seven countries (who together have close to half of the 61 million children out of school), an event at the White House, and a high-level Ministerial meeting hosted by the United Nations Secretary General and World Bank President. She further reported that the Secretariat had recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Islamic Development Bank (IsDB) seeking to foster greater cooperation, particularly in the area of innovative finance. The CEO noted that the Global Partnership had been requested to carry forward the follow-up to the Ministerial meetings and co-facilitate with the United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education a further round of consultations in the margins of the opening of the United Nations General Assembly in September 2013.

2.3 The CEO commented on the strength of the Global Partnership’s business model, citing that it is strongly aligned with country processes and positioned well to engage with a range of key partners. The breadth and reach of the partnership is substantial and can be further leveraged. She noted that the Partnership model has immense potential to help developing country partners deliver better basic education outcomes as well as ensure effective application of financial resources. One indicator of the success of the GPE model is that its “footprint” has virtually doubled in a few years due to increased demand.

2.4 The CEO observed that a number of challenges lie ahead. These include the need to further develop a strong, global advocacy voice for education. GPE needs to continue to refine its country model, embedding technical leadership and focus into its country work. Increasingly, the Global Partnership’s work will need to be more strategic and “upstream,” such that discussions with ministries and other members of Local Education Groups (“LEGs”) are held at the education sector plan development stage rather than simply around program implementation grant applications. Further challenges include figuring out how to incorporate and scale innovation and strengthening the Global Partnership’s core operations.

2.5 In the context of the hosting relationship with the World Bank, the Chair reminded the Board that it had unanimously supported the “Status Quo Plus” option recommended in the Evans Report in October 2102. The CEO highlighted that there was considerable work to be done in implementing this Board decision and noted that initial conversations have begun, and that there appears to be goodwill on the part of both the World Bank and the Secretariat. The goal is to present a memorandum of understanding MOU on hosting to the Board at its next face-to-face meeting, currently scheduled to take place in November 2013.

2.6 The CEO discussed the reorganization of the Secretariat, which would be effective on 3 June 2013. She summarized the main drivers behind the re-organization including i) achieving a better alignment of the Global Partnership’s resources with its strategic plan, ii) strengthening the Country Support Team, iii) building a broader partnership and external relations platform, iv) improving the core operational backbone of the Global Partnership, including in its grant-making operations, and v) establishing a small and strategic independent monitoring and evaluation capability.

2.7 Apart from the re-organization and the hosting relationship, the CEO discussed other priorities. Chief among these is concluding a successful replenishment in June 2014; she also touched on the importance of adopting and enacting the Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan.

2.8 As regards misuse of funds, the CEO noted that no new cases had been identified since the last face-to-face Board meeting. Previously reported cases would be discussed in the session on the financial forecast.

## ***Discussion***

2.9 Board members thanked the CEO for a very helpful and strategic presentation. The Board noted that the proposed structural changes in the Secretariat would help address key concerns such as strengthening support for country needs, ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation of the impact of GPE-supported programs, and enhancing the visibility of education and the Global Partnership at both the global and local levels. These changes, when considered together, would also be important in achieving a successful replenishment campaign.

2.10 Board members noted that attention must also be paid to encouraging the development of inclusive, well governed and proactive LEGs which are critical pillars to the effectiveness of the partnership at country level. Some members noted that civil society organizations (CSOs), teachers and students should have greater representation on LEGs and in country-level consultations.

2.11 Several Board members considered that the Global Partnership needed to be more active in the Post-2015 agenda and in broader advocacy for education. The greater focus on strengthening the operations side of the Secretariat and on results was welcomed.

2.12 Board members strongly supported the attention being paid to improving the hosting arrangements with the World Bank, underlined the importance of the issue and requested that they be kept apprised of progress and closely consulted.

### **3. FINANCIAL FORECAST**

3.1 Pdraig Power, Senior Financial Officer of the Secretariat presented the financial forecast as outlined in the Report of the Financial Advisory Committee (“FAC”) (BOD/2013/05 DOC 07 – Annex 7). The financial forecast had previously been discussed at the meeting of the FAC held on 16-19 April 2013.

3.2 The forecast focuses on the uncommitted funds that are expected to be available to finance future allocations. As the forecast is a projection of future events, it is subject to significant change.

3.3 Demand for funding remains high while Secretariat projections of contributions have been reduced. The forecast of the uncommitted fund balance to the end of 2017 has reduced by US\$89m and as a result, it was currently anticipated that US\$406m of projected approvals in the current replenishment period would need to be financed from new contributions made in the next replenishment period.

3.4 No overall shortage in uncommitted assets is currently forecasted. However there is a risk of temporary shortfalls that could be caused by timing differences between the receipt of donor contributions and the need to commit funds primarily for program implementation grants. This risk can be reduced through donors increasing and/or advancing the timing of their contributions where possible.

3.5 The next financial forecast would be critical as it would be used to support the annual review of the indicative allocations for program implementation grants. This review would also need to take into account funding scenarios for the next replenishment, potential changes to eligibility for program implementation grants, possible adjustments to the Needs and Performance Framework (“NPF”) methodology, and the projected demand and absorption capacity for program implementation grants through the next replenishment period.

3.6 With regard to misuse of funds that had previously been reported to the Board of Directors, it was noted that in the case of Lesotho, the World Bank as Supervising Entity had written to the Ministry of Finance requesting the reimbursement of US\$234,226 associated with the construction component of the program. Also, Zambia had acknowledged ineligible expenditures and had made the necessary reimbursements. Further ineligible expenditures, if found, would also require to be reimbursed.

3.7 The CEO noted that the discipline of financial forecasting is essential and the Secretariat would continue to provide regular information to the Board of Directors.

### ***Discussion***

3.8 Board members welcomed the clarity provided by the Secretariat through the presentation and financial forecast, and requested that updated financial information through the quarterly financial reports should be shared with them and provided on the website as soon as possible.

3.9 Board members, while welcoming the continued high demand for funding, also noted with concern the decrease in projected contributions and the resulting increase in funds projected to be required from the next replenishment to finance program implementation grants that will be requested in the current replenishment period. Board members noted that the forecast was subject to change and therefore the funding difference might further increase. Some Board members highlighted that in order to manage this risk, a more flexible approach might be required compared to how indicative allocations are currently made.

3.10 The Board made the following decision:

**BOD/2013/05-XX– Review of Indicative Allocation Model:** The Board of Directors welcomes the continued high demand for funding from developing country partners to support design and implementation of Education Sector Plans.

The Board of Directors recognizes that ongoing high demand could potentially result in the value of allocations exceeding available funds through the end of 2014(BOD/2013/05/DOC07 – Annex 7). The Board notes that the forecasted funding difference has grown by US\$89 million since the November 2012 Board meeting to US\$406 million and that this is subject to further change.

The Board of Directors recognizes the existing allocation model does not adequately recognize the reality that both supply and demand for funding can fluctuate and this represents a potential reputational risk for GPE.

The Board of Directors therefore requests the Secretariat to provide to the Financial Advisory Committee for consideration as part of its annual review of indicative allocations in October 2013 the following:

- (i) options to revise the existing indicative allocation model (which will be operative until YE 2013) to provide flexibility to balance allocations with forecasted available resources; and
- (ii) an analysis of risks associated with maintaining the existing allocation model for 2014 grant applications, based on the next Financial Forecast (to be completed by November 2013) and suggested options for remedy.

FAC recommendations would then be reviewed by the Board at the next face-to face meeting to be held in November 2013

#### **4. PLEDGE MONITORING**

4.1 Charles Tapp, of the Secretariat discussed the Pledge Monitoring Report, which summarized the status of pledges made in connection with the GPE 2011 replenishment campaign (BOD/2013/05 DOC 03). Understanding the lessons learned from this pledge monitoring effort would be important in preparation for the Global Partnership's upcoming replenishment in June 2014. The full Pledge Monitoring report would be published in June 2013.

4.2 For the GPE Fund, no donors have failed to contribute as pledged. To date, a total of US\$1.6 billion has been secured in signed contributions and a further US\$80million has been formally pledged. Since the time that the Board paper had been prepared, the Secretariat had received written notification of additional commitments from Switzerland of US\$20 million and €1.5 million from Italy. The Secretariat projected contributions of over US\$2 billion dollars for the GPE Fund for this replenishment period.

4.3 Although the pledging conference provided a strong platform to engage partners, it is not possible to attribute any increases in basic education funding directly to the GPE replenishment campaign. The Secretariat recommended that the Global Partnership in future should only monitor basic education funding at the national level rather than global level, due to the challenges to getting timely data and a danger of duplication of efforts with other partners. It was also recommended that the next replenishment framework should have clear, measurable and specific deliverables, particularly if it is to include policy-related commitments. The Strategic Plan and the Implementation Plan together should be helpful in this regard. Partners should also support clear sector monitoring frameworks, and support national capacity to monitor. It was the view of the Secretariat that key elements of the next replenishment should include: a) encouraging traditional donors to maintain and increase basic education aid; b) engaging non-traditional donors who may help to increase total available basic education investments; c) ensuring that commitments are measurable; and 4) focusing on national level monitoring.

#### ***Discussion***

4.4 Board members noted that private corporations' pledges were not included in the final report, Board members supported the inclusive approach to pledging, but noted that the next replenishment should request pledges which are simple, measurable and transparent, and advance notice should be given of what kinds of commitments were being requested and how partners will be held accountable for their commitments.

4.5 Board members requested more communication between the Secretariat and UNESCO on monitoring efforts to ensure better coherence in reporting.

## **5. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND REPLENISHMENT**

5.1 Charles Tapp of the Secretariat presented a broad strategy and a time line for the Global Partnership's upcoming replenishment campaign which would culminate in a pledging conference in June 2014 (BOD/2013/05 DOC 04).

5.2 The Board had provided useful feedback on an earlier paper on replenishment circulated in April 2013 (BOD/2013/03 DOC 01). Board members had expressed a strong preference for a replenishment pledging conference to be held back-to-back with a Board meeting in June 2014. Board members had also provided very helpful inputs on the prerequisites of a strong and effective case for investment in the coming replenishment period. These inputs would help the Secretariat fashion the final replenishment business case later in 2013. Board members had also expressed a strong preference that the upcoming replenishment not just be focused on contributions to the GPE Fund but more broadly to commitments to education.

5.3 Central to the strategy for a successful replenishment was the need to focus on financing from four core target groups, namely traditional donors, developing country partners, emerging donors and the private sector, including private foundations. The Secretariat raised some questions around how the Partnership could ensure that financing would be truly additional; whether the current fund structure adequately meet the Partnership's emerging financing needs; and the Partnership's approach to innovative financing. Some very tentative ideas around innovation and buying down concessional financing were raised as examples of possible innovative financing options.

5.4 The Secretariat outlined the next steps in planning for the upcoming replenishment campaign, including recruiting staff, securing a host and champions, securing a high profile chair, preparing for a results meeting in November 2013 and officially launching the replenishment in the margins of United Nations General Assembly meetings in September 2013.

### *Discussion*

5.5 Board members strongly supported the proposed strategy and timing for the replenishment, even in the context of some austerity among traditional donors. This latter point meant that the linkages to clear results, effectiveness and a strong profile were essential for a successful replenishment. There were various commitments for political support and the offer of co-sponsorship from Germany.

5.6 Board members agreed that, in the context of lessons learned from the previous pledging process in Copenhagen, determining the criteria for pledges well ahead of June 2014 would be

very important. A greater focus on new sources of financing would be necessary as would strategies to leverage support from the Partnership in a much broader way than had been achieved to date. The role of civil society organizations as advocates for the replenishment was seen to be very important.

5.7 Board members also noted that for the next replenishment campaign, the level to which developing partner countries would commit to increasing their domestic education budgets would greatly impact external financial inflows. Domestic funding would therefore need to become a key platform for the replenishment campaign. Board members were also interested in options for innovative financing and greater financing for innovation, as well as means of attracting private sector contributions.

5.8 Some Board members requested that the Secretariat define what sort of political leadership would be helpful to the success of the replenishment campaign and the Board asked the Secretariat to bring a detailed replenishment plan to its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013.

5.9 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-03 – Resource Mobilization and Replenishment:** The Board of Directors:

- a. endorses the broad strategy and timeline for a replenishment campaign outlined in BOD/2013/05 DOC 04, including convening a pledging conference in June 2014; and
- b. calls upon all Board members and other partners to provide political leadership and strongly support the replenishment campaign

## **6. REPORT FROM ETHIOPIA**

6.1 Mr. Solomon Shiferaw Bogale, Director, EMIS, Planning and Resource Mobilization Directorate, Federal Ministry of Education, Ethiopia, representing the Minister of Education and Deputy Prime Minister, presented an overview of the Ethiopian Ministry of Education's plan of action to accelerate progress to achieving Millennium Development Goal ("MDG") for basic education.

6.2 The presentation covered the progress made over the last two decades, barriers and bottlenecks slowing progress on access and learning to reach MDGs, solutions proposed to overcome these barriers, and financing solutions. Following the end of the civil war in 1991, the country's education budget had increased from 11.3% to 25.3% of the national budget. Gross enrollment of children in school had increased from 3.7 million to 16.99 million. About three million children remain out-of-school and girls still find greater obstacles to access.

6.3 The total estimated cost of proposed solutions to 2015 was US\$792 million, of which the Government would finance US\$503 million from domestic resources and funding of US\$289



million (or 36%) would be proposed for funding by development partners over the three year period.

6.4 The Ethiopian government expressed its appreciation for the support received over the years in donor financing of basic education which had contributed to transforming the country to one of the fastest growing economies in the developing world.

6.5 Board members welcomed the report. It was also noted that the next Board meeting would be held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on 17-19 November 2013 and the Board would, subject to availability and logistics, have opportunities to visit some of the schools and projects supported and funded by the Global Partnership.

## **7. STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-2015**

7.1 Geeta Rao Gupta and Jesper Andersen, co-Chairs of the Strategic Plan Working Group (“SPWG”), and Charles Tapp of the Secretariat presented the report of the SPWG (BOD/2013/05 DoC 05) which contained a detailed Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan, for approval by the Board.

7.2 The presentation came after a discussion the previous day during the Information Session, when Board members were updated on the work of the Technical Group on Indicators, which had been tasked with recommending final impact indicators under the Strategic Plan and the means and costs to measure and report on them. No decisions were being recommended to the Board on impact indicators under the Strategic Plan at this stage. This would occur at the next face-to-face meeting. The co-chairs underlined the fact that this aspect was still a work in progress, though extremely important for both the Global Partnership and the education sector more broadly.

7.3 The co-chairs outlined that significant consultation had occurred in the finalization of the Implementation Plan, and while some of the detail could always be refined on an ongoing basis, it was time to approve the document and move forward quickly with implementation. The SPWG strongly recommended that the Implementation Plan should be a living document, consistent with the dynamic and evolving nature of the Partnership as a whole. Determining the level of specificity in terms of actors undertaking different actions had been challenging for SPWG. At this stage being too proscriptive could alienate new partners who might wish to opt-in to different activities in the future.

7.4 The SPWG considered that the Implementation Plan would only be achieved if partners actively opted-in to participate in the delivery of different outcomes. While placing additional demands on the Secretariat, the plan was for the whole Partnership and required broad

participation. The Secretariat would actively encourage more partners to engage in the Implementation Plan and would regularly keep the Board of Directors updated on progress

7.5 Implementation cost projections had only been included for the Secretariat. It was noted that some implementing partners could require additional financial support, but determining this had been outside the scope of the work of SPWG. The co-chairs also highlighted that an outcome on inclusive education (with associated actions, actors and timeframes) had been accidentally omitted in the final editing of the document prepared for the Board and requested that it be included within the final plan, would be posted to the website.

### ***Discussion***

7.6 The Board thanked the SPWG and Secretariat for defining the plan and agreed that the plan could now proceed to the implementation stage. Board members also thanked the SPWG for its hard and impressive work over the preceding 15 months.

7.7 In the course of discussion, Board members underlined the importance of the further work on impact indicators and requested that they be kept updated on progress of the Technical Group. The linkages with the Learning Metrics task Force were very important and both the Secretariat and Technical group were cautioned to maintain focus and ensure that the final recommendations on impact indicators be simple and few. There was some confusion between the impact indicators of the Strategic Plan and the process indicators included in the Implementation Plan that would help track whether the Partnership was on track in delivering against outcomes and activities contained in the Implementation Plan. Some Board members suggested that a discussion in the future would be useful on the balance between the need for country-level data and analysis and the increasing demand for aggregated global results.

7.8 Board Members agreed on the importance of partners opting-in to the Implementation Plan and requested that the Secretariat continue to facilitate this in an active manner. Greater guidance and communication on how partners could opt-in and what this might involve was also requested. Some members suggested that greater definition of what is required of a partner in GPE would be helpful. The Secretariat was also asked to help in the establishment and functioning of any communities of practice that might emerge through implementation of the Plan.

7.9 Board Members welcomed the proposal for regular reporting on progress of the Implementation Plan and requested specifically that updates on which partners were becoming involved in which outcomes be provided regularly in coming months. This would help reassure the Board that there was adequate leadership and specificity of actors against core outcomes.

7.10 Board Members reiterated the importance of strengthening country-level processes and actions. It was very important that the country-led foundations of GPE be reinforced, including

through greater support to the Local Education Groups (LEGs) and facilitation of broad participation in the LEGs including CSOs, private sector and teachers.

7.11 The Secretariat confirmed that a full-time position would be dedicated to supporting the Implementation Plan, facilitating opting-in and also tracking progress. This position was included in the revised budget contained in BOD/2013/05 DOC 09.

7.12 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-04 – Approval of the Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015:** The Board of Directors:

- a. approves the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015 contained in Annex 1 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 05 (the “Implementation Plan”), including the indicators to measure progress of the plan;
- b. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the further refinement of the work on the impact indicators as outlined in Annex 1 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 05, and report back to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013 with concrete recommendations;
- c. reiterates its request in decision BOD/2012/11-02 urging all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible;
- d. requests the Secretariat to report to the Board of Directors on an annual basis, starting with its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013, on progress on the implementation of the Implementation Plan; and
- e. decides that the SPWG shall cease to be operational given the completion of the Strategic Plan and the Implementation Plan.

## **8. REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP**

8.1 Peter Colenso, Interim Chair of the Governance Working Group (“GWG”) presented the recommendations of the GWG contained in BOD/2013/05 DOC 06.

8.2 The package of recommendations that were proposed by the GWG were based on the challenges and opportunities facing the Partnership including the need for the Board of Directors to play a more strategic role in the leadership of the Global Partnership while maintaining its inclusivity. Specific recommendations were made as follows:

- **Recommendation 1: Board Size Composition:** The recommendation was to consolidate the two Board seats reserved for each of UNESCO and UNICEF into one United Nations seat;
- **Recommendation 2: Improving Decision-Making and Oversight by the Establishment of New Committees:** The recommendation was an agreement in principle to establish an Executive Committee and three new standing committees: a Country Grants and Performance Committee; a Knowledge, Policy and Innovation Committee (dividing the current role of the FAC into two); and a Governance, Ethics and Risk Management Committee (building on the current terms of reference of the Ethics Committee);
- **Recommendation 3: Rationalizing the Board of Directors Chair and CEO roles and Launch of Search for the New Chair for 2014:** This recommendation consisted of:
  - changing the Chair role into a part-time unremunerated position as of 1 July 2013, which would eliminate the need for UNESCO to host the position and the return from UNESCO to the GPE Fund of the amounts approved for support of that role;
  - approving a budget of US\$75,000 for the chair’s expenses from 1 July 2013 to 31 December 2013;
  - amending the Charter to delete references to the role being hosted by a partner organization; and
  - launching the search for a new Board Chair to take on the role as of 1 January 2014

## **Recommendation 1: Board Size and Composition**

### *Discussion*

8.3 The recommendation to consolidate the UNESCO and UNICEF seats into one seat did not receive sufficient support from the Board of Directors. Some Board members noted the unique role that each of UNESCO and UNICEF played in the partnership, and there was no overall consensus for this recommendation.

8.4 Based on the Board’s comments, the Board Chair and GWG Chair decided not to present the recommendation for a decision.

## **Recommendation 2: Improving Decision-Making and Oversight by the Establishment of New Committees**

### *Discussion*

8.5 The support for the GWG’s recommendations in this area was mixed. A number of Board members expressed the strong support of their constituency for the GWG’s proposal, noting that it would assist the Board of Directors to focus on strategic issues, enable the Board of Directors

to operate in a more efficient manner and improve decision-making both at face-to-face Board meetings and in between Board meetings.

8.6 However, some Board members were concerned about some of the aspects of the new committee structure. It was noted that the details of the committees would need to be fleshed out, including the particular roles and responsibilities, as well as membership of each committee. Concern was also expressed that the current Board structure, with two standing committees (the FAC and the Ethics Committee) had only been in place for two years and it was premature to propose major changes when all the lessons learned had not yet been considered. Other Board members noted that the mandate of the GWG was to propose governance changes that were necessary. The rationale will be better fleshed out when the terms of reference are drafted.

8.7 Particular issues were raised in connection with the proposal to establish an Executive Committee, with a number of Board members expressing concern that such a committee might undermine the collective decision making process of the Partnership as envisaged. Its particular role and delegated powers, if any, had to be clarified. In response, it was noted that the proposal was for the Executive Committee to have no pre-set delegated decision-making powers and that all issues would be referred by the Board of Directors to the Executive Committee.

8.8 A few Board members raised concerns about the proposal to split the FAC's duties into two committees. They noted that addressing policy issues separately from the program implementation grant proposal reviews could create overlap of roles and that the FAC's current large workload was temporary, due to the current high volume of proposals for program implementation grants.

8.9 Many Board members also raised concerns about the proposal to include independent members in the committees. Questions were raised about their identification, remuneration and their role, including voting rights. It was also noted that there were other ways to address conflicts of interest, such as recusals from discussions and voting, rather than including independent members in the committees.

8.10 The Chair noted that while there was not sufficient support for the recommendation of the GWG in its entirety, there was agreement for the GWG to continue to develop its proposals, while taking into account the comments made at the meeting.

8.11 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-12 – Revised Board Structure:** The Board of Directors:

- a. requests the Governance Working Group (“GWG”) to return to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013 with a range of options for a revised Board structure, including but not limited to the options for revised Standing Committees presented to the Board of Directors in BOD/2013/05 DOC 06;

- b. in so doing, the GWG takes into account the issues raised at the face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors meeting in May 2013; and
- c. in clarifying these options, the GWG provides full draft Terms of Reference (including objectives, functions and proposed membership) for any proposed Standing Committees or other governance structures.

### **Recommendation 3: Rationalizing the Board of Directors Chair and CEO roles and Launch of Search for the New Chair for 2014**

#### ***Discussion***

8.12 Board members generally supported the recommendations of the GWG in this area. The transition of the Chair role from full-time remunerated to part-time unremunerated role was supported by all constituencies. The representative from UNESCO noted that the Board Chair had already written to the Executive Director of UNESCO informing her of this new arrangement. The Chair will need to send another official correspondence noting the Board of Directors' decision, following which the arrangements for the return of the unused funds for the Chair's budget as of 30 June 2013 will commence.

8.13 The Chair noted that she had enjoyed being hosted by UNESCO and thanked them for playing this role.

8.14 Board members also supported the GWG's recommendation to commence the search for a new Chair. Several members supported the involvement of the current Chair in the search process, while one member noted a concern about the current chair playing a role in the selection of her successor.

8.15 Following a short executive session, the following two decisions were approved:

**BOD/2013/05-13 – Budget for the Chair of the Board of Directors:** The Board of Directors:

- a. acknowledges that the role of the Chair will become an unremunerated position as of 1 July 2013;
- b. requests the Chair and the Secretariat to work with UNESCO to terminate the Chair's current employment contract by 30 June 2013 and return to the GPE Fund all amounts unused by the same date from the budget of the Chair approved in decision BOD/2012/11-13;
- c. approves a budget of up to US\$ 75,000 for the travel and other reasonable expenses of the Chair for the period of 1 July 2013 to 31 December 2013; and

- d. requests the Secretariat to amend the Charter to delete the references to the employment of the Chair by a partner organization.

**BOD/2013/05-14 – Launch of the Search for a New Chair of the Board of Directors:** The Board of Directors requests the Governance Working Group to act on the Board of Directors' behalf as a Search Committee, working with the current Chair, to launch a process for the selection of a new Chair to take on the role as of 1 January 2014 under the terms of reference contained in Annex 7 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 06, and present one or more preferred candidates to the Board of Directors for its approval at its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013.

## **9. LEARNING METRICS TASK FORCE**

9.1 Qian Tang, Assistant Director general of UNESCO, Geeta Rao Gupta, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF (and co-chair of the Learning Metrics Task Force ("LMTF")), Albert Motivans of UNESCO Institute of Statistics, and Rebecca Winthrop of the Centre for Universal Education at the Brookings Institution introduced and provided an overview of the work of the LMTF which has involved to date more than 1,000 people from 84 countries.

9.2 The overarching objective of the LMTF is to make learning a focus of education discussions and ultimately use measurement and global advocacy to improve learning outcomes and opportunities for all children and youth. The LMTF work is based on a large consultation process, led by a high level group of experts representing 30 organizations, and divided in 3 phases. During the two first phases, the task force work focused on the domains of learning (phase 1) and the measurement of learning (phase 2). The third phase is currently running from April through September 2013 in order to understand how measurement of learning improves education quality.

9.3 Board members welcomed the update.

## **10. REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

10.1 Camilla Helgø Fossberg, Chair of the Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) assisted by Pdraig Power, Senior Financial Officer and FAC Liaison in the Secretariat, presented the recommendations from the report of the FAC (BOD/2013/05 DOC 07) noting that information items has been discussed in the information sessions held on the previous day.

### ***Allocations for Program Implementation Grants***

10.2 The Chair of the FAC had provided a detailed overview of the FAC's deliberations and recommended comments for the LEG on each of the 13 program implementation grant

applications at the information session. The Chair of the FAC noted that two minor corrections would be made in the final comments to the LEG in relation to Senegal. It was noted that the proposed decision was as outlined in Part 2 of the FAC report (BOD/2013/05 DOC 07b).

### ***Discussion***

10.3 A Board member requested clarification as to why Senegal should be approved for an allocation considering that there was still a significant amount of undisbursed funds remaining on its existing grant. The Secretariat explained that the current grant was scheduled to be completed and remaining funds utilized in 2013, prior to the commencement of the proposed new implementation grant and therefore no overlap in funding was expected.

10.4 The following decision was approved

#### **BOD/2013/05-XX – Approval of Allocations for Program Implementation Grants:** The Board of Directors:

1. approves the following allocations from GPE trust funds to be used for program implementation grants as described in the applications submitted for funding in the first round of 2013, subject to availability of funds and the decision BOD/2012/11-04 on commitment of trust funds for program implementation grants:

**a. Benin:**

- i. US\$ 42,300,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 320,250 for an agency fee.

**b. Burkina Faso:**

- i. US\$ 78,200,000 for a three-year implementation period, with Agence Française de Développement serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 300,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 1,639,854 for an agency fee.

**c. Comoros:**

- i. US\$ 4,600,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the UNICEF serving as Managing Entity; and
- ii. US\$ 322,000 for an agency fee.



**d. Madagascar:**

- i. US\$ 85,400,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 1,494,500 for an agency fee.

**e. Mauritania:**

- i. US\$ 12,400,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 217,000 for an agency fee.

**f. Senegal:**

- i. US\$ 46,900,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 120,750 for an agency fee.

**g. Somalia (Puntland):**

- i. US\$ 2,100,000 for a three-year implementation period, with UNICEF acting as Managing Entity; and
- ii. US\$ 147,000 as an agency fee.

**h. Somaliland:**

- i. US\$ 4,200,00 for a three-year implementation period, with UNICEF acting as Managing Entity; and
- ii. US\$ 294,000 for an agency fee.

**i. Tajikistan:**

- i. US\$ 16,300,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the World Bank serving as Supervising Entity;
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation; and
- iii. US\$ 283,500 for an agency fee.

**j. Yemen:**

- i. US\$ 10,000,000 for an emergency component, with UNICEF serving as Managing Entity, plus US\$ 700,000 for an agency fee; and
- ii. US\$ 72,600,000 for the remaining proposal activities over a four-year implementation period, with UNICEF acting as Supervising Entity, plus US\$ 1,000,000 for a supervision allocation and US\$ 726,000 for an agency fee.

**k. Zambia:**

- i. US\$ 35,200,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the United Kingdom Department for International Development serving as Supervising Entity; and
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation.

**l. Zanzibar:**

- i. US\$ 5,200,000 for a three-year implementation period, with the Swedish International Development Agency serving as Supervising Entity; and
- ii. US\$ 400,000 for a supervision allocation.

**m. Zimbabwe:**

- i. US\$ 23,600,000 for a three-year implementation period, with UNICEF serving as Managing Entity; and
  - ii. US\$ 1,652,000 for an agency fee.
2. requests the Secretariat to include in its notification to each of the relevant Local Education Groups of the approval of the allocations, the Financial Advisory Committee's comments on the program set out in BOD/2013/05 DOC 07b.

## ***Guidance Note on Dividing Indicative Allocation for Program Implementation Grants in Federal States***

10.5 The Chair of the FAC noted that the guidance note was an outstanding piece of work on the issue of engaging with developing country partners with federal systems of government previously considered by the Board of Directors in June 2012. It is designed to provide a way forward when countries require guidance in deciding on the indicative allocation to sub-national levels. The Chair noted that the FAC had considered this at an audio conference in January 2013 and subsequently through email communications to finalize the document.

10.6 The proposed approach was to apply the methodology in the needs and performance framework to sub-national levels as far as possible, but that ultimately the LEG would determine whether to accept this calculation or to agree on an alternative division of the indicative allocation. This was recognized by the FAC as a sensible and pragmatic approach, was consistent with the Secretariat's approach to date in these contexts, and respected the principles of country ownership.

10.7 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-08 – Guidance Note on Dividing Indicative Allocations:** The Board of Directors approves the Guidance Note on Dividing Indicative Allocations for Program Implementation Grants in Federal States as outlined in Annex 3 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 07.

## ***Review and Assessment of Supervising and Managing Entities***

10.8 The Chair of the FAC noted that the Board at its November 2012 meeting had endorsed a three-tiered risk-based approach to the review and assessment of existing and new supervising and managing entities, and requested the Secretariat to develop the guidelines for this approach.

10.9 For entities currently eligible and interested to be supervising/managing entities, the Secretariat would conduct a review of the entities relevant policies and procedures by 31 December 2013. This review would be performed in conjunction with the analysis of supervision, agency, and direct management costs previously requested by the Board. The cost analysis aspect of this work will be accelerated to ensure that it is completed in time for the FAC's next face-to-face meeting in October 2013 to allow any recommendations arising to be considered at the next face-to-face meeting of the Board in November 2013.

10.10 Should the Board decide to expand eligibility to take on the role of managing entity to non-governmental organizations as envisaged in the Strategic Plan, eligibility to access the smaller grants (e.g. Program Development Grant with a value of up to US\$200,000 to US\$400,000) for these organizations would be based on an institutional capacity assessment. However to access the larger program implementation grants (value of up to US\$100 million), a

detailed grant level capacity assessment tailored to the specific risks would be conducted. The Chair of the FAC noted that detailed assessment forms and tools had been developed by the Secretariat and provided to the FAC, and that these would be refined by the Secretariat prior to implementation.

10.11 There are a number of outstanding issues that need to be considered before the Board can take the decision to expand eligibility to non-governmental organizations. These issues include consideration as to what the scope of the expansion should be, how organizations would be selected, who would conduct the assessments, as well as administrative issues involving changes to governance documents and donor contribution agreements. Therefore it was proposed that the Secretariat should develop an “ME Eligibility Expansion Plan” to address these issues for FAC consideration and recommendation to the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting.

10.12 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-06 – Review and Assessment of Supervising and Managing Entities:** The Board of Directors:

- a. requests that the Secretariat conducts a review of currently eligible entities acting or interested in acting as supervising or managing entity in the future, in line with the approach outlined in Annex 5 of the Report of the Financial Advisory Committee (BOD/2013/05 DOC 07, the “FAC Report”) and deliver a report on the results to the FAC no later than 31 December 2013;
- b. requests that the Secretariat deliver to the FAC by its next face-to-face meeting the “ME Eligibility Expansion Plan” described in paragraphs 3.6 to 3.8 of the FAC Report, for recommendation by the FAC and approval by the Board of Directors at its next face to face meeting; and
- c. endorses the approach used for the guidelines for capacity and grant level assessments as described in paragraphs 3.11 to 3.19 of the FAC Report.

**Comprehensive Funding Guidelines**

10.13 The Chair of the FAC noted that when the Board decided to move to annual commitments for program implementation grants, it also requested the Secretariat to develop and provide the FAC with options for a description of eligible resources available for allocation of GPE trust funds and criteria for prioritization of funds in the event of a shortfall.

10.14 The proposed Comprehensive Funding Guidelines were developed: (1) to provide reasonable assurance that when the Board of Directors approves an allocation, funds will be available when needed to make the commitment; (2) to provide a basis to prioritize approvals if funds are not available; and (3) to provide a basis to prioritize commitments if following approval there was a shortfall in funds available for commitment.

10.15 The Senior Financial Officer outlined the core elements of the guidelines and noted in particular that the guidelines are designed to support the appropriate financial management of the trust funds and are not the primary tool for deciding on corporate priorities in relation to strategic allocation and prioritization of resources – the eligibility review for program implementation grants, the NPF and the indicative allocations are more appropriate for that purpose. It was further noted that if the indicative allocations are established appropriately, then the need to utilize these guidelines will be significantly reduced.

10.16 Under proposed guidelines, there were sufficient funds available for the Board to approve the 13 program implementation grants at its current meeting. It was also noted that the financial forecast for the next six months did not project any shortfall in uncommitted assets or challenges in covering commitments over the same period.

### ***Discussion***

10.17 It was noted that with the current funding situation as disclosed in the session on the financial forecast, that there is a risk that these guidelines will have to be used, and therefore attention was drawn to the importance of the decision on the review of the indicative allocation model (Section 3 of this report).

10.18 The following decision was approved

**BOD/2013/05-07 – Comprehensive Funding Guidelines:** The Board of Directors approves the Comprehensive Funding Guidelines attached as Annex 6 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 07.

### ***FAC Observations on General Trends with Regards to program Implementation grants***

10.19 The Chair of the FAC outlined the observations and general trends identified from their review of the 13 program implementation grant applications in April 2013 and noted in the report of the FAC.

### ***Discussion***

10.20 Board members noted the concerns identified by the FAC and emphasized in particular that being able to monitor and demonstrate results is key to the success of the partnership. Some Board members suggested that the consideration of strong results frameworks should be considered very early in the process for developing GPE funding proposals so that appropriate outcome indicators were identified well before reaching the FAC.

10.21 Board members highlighted the importance of ensuring that FAC comments to the LEGs are monitored by the Secretariat, and noted the Secretariat's assurance that progress on this issue would be reported as part of the annual portfolio review.

10.22 Board members noted and welcomed the comments from the FAC that identified signs of increased civil society participation in the current round of proposals. The importance of civil society involvement and engagement in LEGs was further emphasized, as was a greater role for and participation of the private sector and teacher representatives.

10.23 Board members noted the importance of clarifying issues of eligibility to apply for funds in cases where there is already an active grant to avoid overlapping grants.

10.24 Board members discussed the issue raised by FAC in relation to the burden of costs on families. The issues of escalating costs of education and growing inequalities were raised during the discussion. One Board member noted that the Global Partnership should restate its existing commitment to supporting universal free primary education.

10.25 Board members noted the importance of the role of the LEG and the Secretariat's Quality Assurance Review process in relation to the observation that the priorities of individual managing or supervising entities are becoming more evident in grant proposals.

## **11. OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK IN FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED STATES**

11.1 Paul Coustère, Coordinator of the Country Support Team in the Secretariat presented BOD/2013/05 DOC 08 seeking approval of an operational framework for effective support in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS).

11.2 A first proposal on GPE intervention in FCAS came to the last face-to-face meeting of the Board in Paris in November 2012. The Board approved the proposal in part (the possibility of accelerated funding in FCAS) but requested the establishment of a reference group, comprising representatives from various constituencies from the Board as well as representatives from the Secretariat, to improve the proposal in order to resubmit it at this meeting. The proposal under discussion included contributions from the reference group and feedback received from Board members.

11.3 The Secretariat also informed the Board that the version of the Operational Framework submitted for approval during this session included some last minute amendments which were not in the paper that was sent prior to the meeting. The Chair noted that these amendments were agreed upon by the Board reference group in charge of developing the Operational Framework. The amendments were:

- Deletion of the last paragraph of section 3.1 and minor edits of paragraph 3.2(i) (considered as being too proscriptive for using the managing entity model in FCAS when in some cases the supervising entity model may be entirely appropriate); and
- Inclusion of a specific reference to the International Dialogue on Peace Building and State Building ("New Deal") at the end of paragraph 2.1 and in so doing the Board of Directors indicates its support of the "New Deal".

11.4 The Operational Framework emphasized the rise in the number of GPE developing country partners categorized as fragile (22 out of 58). As a result, there has been a growing need for a framework to help LEGs adapt their approaches in these challenging environments. The proposed Operational Framework is the result of years of experience from GPE partners at the global and local level and has been included as part of the GPE Implementation Plan.

11.5 The Proposed Operational Framework:

- defines situations when adapted modalities and processes are needed;
- provides basic principles for working in FCAS;
- offers options, justifications and special considerations for the selection of modalities; and
- sets out a step-by-step process for program revisions in situations where a context changes from stable to fragile.

11.6 At the core of the proposed Operational Framework is guidance on the appropriate modality that should be used to supervise and implement programs in FCAS. The Operational Framework reviews and formulates options for the use of the managing and supervising entity models. It also specifically adds a “dual” (mixed supervising and managing entity) modality as an option.

### ***Discussion***

11.7 Board members were supportive of the Operational Framework, including the proposed amendments. One Board member noted that involving local communities in the program implementation in FCAS supports greater ownership and attainment of objectives, while others underscored the importance of including technical assistance and specific guidelines in these situations. The Secretariat was also guided to view a state of conflict as transitory that should revert to non-fragile once stability was restored.

11.8 The explicit linkage to international initiatives and agreements in the Operational Framework, including the “New Deal” was also seen as important.

11.9 At the end of the discussion, the following decision was approved which included the amendments referred to in paragraph 11.3 above:

**BOD/2013/05-10 – Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States:** The Board of Directors approves the Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States set out in Annex 1 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 08.

## **12. SECRETARIAT BUDGET**

12.1 The CEO presented BOD/2013/05 DOC 09, seeking the approval of a supplemental amount of US\$940,000 for the Secretariat budget from July 2012 to December 2013.

12.2 The CEO outlined the Secretariat budget performance from July 2012 to date – citing a slight under-spend relative to expectations. This was due largely to slowed hiring at the direction of the CEO upon her arrival.

12.3 On an annualized basis, the supplementary budget represents a 20% annualized increase to the Secretariat budget compared to the budget approved by the Board in September 2012. The Secretariat budget document under consideration had been prepared in order to provide the Board with greater transparency and information. It was important that the Board was fully informed of the implications of any decision.

12.4 In the context of a restructured Secretariat, the CEO noted that the top priority for additional staffing would be the Country Support Team, which would, through additional headcount, be able to better meet developing country partners' needs. Each of the strategic objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan will have a senior technical cluster lead within the Country Support Team.

12.5 Relations with stakeholders and resource mobilization would be handled by an expanded and dedicated team. The team will deal with donor relations and fundraising functions, CSO strategy and outreach, engagement with the private sector and private foundations, development banks, support to the constituencies for developing country partners, as well as undertaking advocacy for global education. Communications will be merged into this new team.

12.6 The Secretariat's operational areas will be merged into a single team under the leadership of a Chief Operating Officer. This area will include Board Operations, Finance and Administration, Legal and Human Resources. This team will manage GPE's grant-making operations.

12.7 A Monitoring and Evaluation Unit has also been established. Further, the Secretariat would continue to maintain its technical focus through a Chief Technical Officer. This person will have a close relationship with the technical focal points now embedded in the enlarged Country Support Team.

12.8 The three broad clusters – Country Support, External Relations, and Operations -- would be led by three senior managers who, with the CEO, would comprise the Senior Management Team.

12.9 Finally, the CEO asked the Board for approval to allow the World Bank to enter into a three year lease for additional office space for the Secretariat in the building where it is currently housed in Washington, DC. The new space would allow for growth in an already constrained office space.



## ***Discussion***

12.10 While Board members supported the proposal, they underlined that this was done with some caution and deliberation, in the context of ensuring that the new CEO had adequate resources to deliver on a challenging agenda. The broader context of budget cuts and austerity was highlighted by many. One Board member noted that his constituency would have to abstain from the budget decision due to internal institutional policy considerations on increased administrative budgets of multilateral organizations.

12.11 The CEO was commended for a clear paper and presentation and thanked for the increased transparency in this and other Board papers prepared for these meetings. Board members requested the Secretariat to provide a work plan of its revised activities to accompany the staffing and budget increases as soon as possible for the period to December 2013.

12.12 The following decisions were approved:

### **BOD/2013/05-11 – Secretariat Budget: The Board of Directors:**

- a. notes the full-year effect of the staffing numbers on the 18-month budget for July 2012 to December 2013 approved in decision BOD/2012/09-02;
- b. notes the restructuring and reallocation of Secretariat resources towards Partnership priorities;
- c. approves a supplemental amount of US\$ 940,000, representing 12 additional staff positions impacting the 6-month period from 1 July – 31 December 2013;
- d. approves the request to permit the World Bank to enter into a lease agreement on the Global Partnership for Education's behalf for additional office space at a cost of US\$ 366,000 for three years starting on 1 July 2013 and notes that a portion of this sum (1 July – 31 December 2013) is included in this budget request; and
- e. notes one-off costs for the upcoming replenishment campaign of US\$ 516,000 as presented in BOD/2013/05 DOC 04 and notes that additional short-term consultancy costs associated with the campaign prior to December 2013 will be absorbed within this budget request.

## **13. GLOBAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES PROGRAM CONCEPT NOTES**

13.1 The CEO and Louis Crouch of the Secretariat presented BOD/2013/05 DOC 10 seeking approval for allocations for a second round of applications under the Global and Regional Activities ("GRA") program.

13.2 The Secretariat had received 18 concept notes and having completed a detailed analysis for each request in accordance with the GRA Operational Manual; five concept notes had been recommended for approval with a total value of US\$16,786,086. However, after informal Board

Member consultations prior to the Board meeting and further internal consideration, the Secretariat recommended that the GRA program be closed after this second round and that efforts commence to develop some form of innovation facility that was more fit for purpose. The Secretariat recognized that the GRA program had limitations and was no longer necessarily well aligned with the priorities and directions of the Partnership. The Secretariat presented two of the concept notes for consideration, but also discussed the alternatives of whether none or all five of the items should be approved. The Secretariat welcomed an honest discussion with the Board about the best way forward.

### ***Discussion***

13.3 The World Bank and UNESCO noted their interest in the concept notes and recused themselves from any decisions related to specific funding proposals under this agenda item.

13.4 Board members agreed that the current batch of concept notes should be the last to be approved under the GRA program. There was no appetite to continue with the GRA in its current form and there was broad agreement that it was not fit for purpose. The honesty and transparency of the Secretariat's presentation were welcomed, although Board members were displeased that the change in recommendations was introduced with no written forewarning.

13.5 The lack of detail in the document around the proposed review ratings was also a concern, as was the lack of information over how the new concept notes related to the first round of approved proposals in February 2013. The Board felt it did not have sufficient information to make an informed decision over whether any, some or all of the new concept notes should be approved and requested the Secretariat to come back with a revised paper. Some concepts were raised that could help inform final decision-making: i) alignment with the GPE Strategic Plan, including its Implementation Plan; ii) diversity of partners supported; iii) diversity of geographic focus; and iv) support to those high quality activities that otherwise would be unable to attract alternative funding.

13.6 There was a discussion around the merits of a new approach to innovation, which was broadly supported, provided it was not seen as simply meaning technology. Board members also asked that any new approach should include thinking on how the Global Partnership could support knowledge sharing and approaches to regional programs. A particular request was made that innovation include the wealth of ideas and approaches now being explored by GPE developing country partners.

13.7 The following decision was approved:

**BOD/2013/05-15 – Global and Regional Activities:** The Board of Directors requests the Secretariat to:

a. further analyze the GRA's second batch of concept notes and provide recommendations to the Board of Directors for consideration by 15 July 2013; and

- b. prepare options for dealing with innovation, knowledge gaps, regional issues and similar matters, for consideration by the Board of Directors at its next face-to-face meeting in November 2013.

## **14. MONITORING & EVALUATION**

14.1 Jean Marc Bernard, Coordinator of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit in the Secretariat outlined the approach being taken by the Secretariat to establish a fully functional Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. The presentation was for information only.

14.2 The Board was informed that three key areas were being considered: (i) monitoring of education results (Results for Learning Report, open data project); (ii) monitoring of grant performance (Grant Performance Report); and (iii) Evaluation (independent evaluation of the Global Partnership and evaluation studies done by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit).

14.3 The concept note for the independent evaluation of GPE, the term of reference of the Independent Steering Committee, and the biographies of the proposed members of this committee, would be circulated in mid-June 2013 for the Board's written comments. The documents would then be finalized and proposed for Board's approval and the formal appointment of the members of the Independent Steering Committee would follow thereafter. The Board was also informed that the cost of the independent evaluation was estimated at US\$3 million, similar to the cost of the previous evaluation conducted in 2009/10.

### ***Discussion***

14.3 Some Board members noted that GPE Secretariat should build on the current sources of data, and particularly the data provided by UNESCO Institute of Statistics, in order to ensure consistency and avoid duplication.

14.4 The cost of US\$3 million for the independent evaluation was discussed, and it was mentioned that this cost needed to be justified by a clear added value for the Global Partnership. The Secretariat confirmed that the draft concept note of the evaluation will provide as additional information to the Board, and also give Board members the opportunity to provide comments. It was also made clear that the biographies of the temporary committee members would be sent to the Board, and the final choice of the independent steering committee members would be approved by the Board.

## **15. Update on Post-2015**

15.1 Discussion of this agenda item was deferred due to a lack of time. The Chair highlighted briefly the active engagement of the Secretariat and the Chair in global deliberations to date and contributing to the work of the High Level Panel.

## **16. Other Business**

16.1 The Chair informed the meeting that Ethiopia had offered to host the next face to face meeting of the Board of Directors which would be held from the 17-19 November 2013 in Addis Ababa Ethiopia. It was anticipated that the meeting of the Board of Directors would be held on the 18-19 November, preceded on the 17 November by a replenishment results meeting and a short Board information session.

16.2 The CEO warmly thanked Board members for their strong support, generous welcome and active engagement, and also encouraged an open dialogue on all issues, including areas where members felt that the Secretariat needed to improve its performance.

16.3 The Chair closed the meeting with thanks to Luis Crouch from the Secretariat who is leaving after over two years of impressive contribution to the Partnership, and also to Simon Bland, Board Member for the Donor 3 constituency, who was leaving the UK Department for International Development, for his leadership, judgment and wisdom. The Chair wished them both all good wishes on behalf of the Board in their new endeavors.

## ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANTS' LIST

	<b>Full Name (Last, First)</b>	<b>Job Title</b>	<b>Institution/Organization</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Constituency</b>
1	Aheto-Tsegah, Charles	Deputy Director-General	Ghana Education Service	Ghana	Board Member, Africa 3
2	Albright, Alice	CEO	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
3	Ambühl, Hansjürg	Head of West Africa Division	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Alternate Board Member, Donor 1
4	Andersen, Jesper	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Donor 4
5	Archer, David	Head of Programs	ActionAid	United Kingdom	Board Member, CSO 1 (International / Northern)
6	Balducci, Giuseppe	Program Manager	European Commission	Belgium	Donor 5
7	Beardmore, Sarah	Program Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
8	Bellamy, Carol	Chair of GPE BoD	GPE Chair	United States	Chair
9	Benito Canelhas, Jose Luis	Adviser	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Asia & The Pacific
10	Benveniste, Luis	Sector Manager	The World Bank	United States	Multilateral and Regional Banks (Multilateral Agency 3)
11	Bernard, Jean-Marc	senior education specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
12	Besier, Averil	Policy Manager	Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)	Australia	Donor 2
13	Biney, Francis	Coordinator	Ministry of Education	Ivory Coast	Africa 2

14	Bland, Simon	Head, Global Funds Department	UK Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Board Member, Donor 3
15	Blumör, Rüdiger	Education Adviser	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Germany	Observer
16	Shiferaw, Solomon	Director	Ministry of Education	Ethiopia	Representing Alternate Board Member, Africa 3
17	Boly-Barry, H.E. Koumba	Minister	Ministry of Education	Burkina Faso	Africa 2
18	Bouapao, H.E. Lytou	Minister	Ministry of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Alternate Board Member, Asia & The Pacific
19	Bourne, Jo	Associate Director, Education	UNICEF	United States	Alternate Board Member, UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
20	Bridges, David	Program Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
21	Brinkhaus, Michaela	Officer for Primary Education	Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Germany	Donor 5
22	Camara, H.E. Kandia	Minister	Ministry of Education	Ivory Coast	Alternate Board Member, Africa 2
23	Carroué, Claude	Communications Officer	Education International	Belgium	CSO 3 (Teaching profession)
24	Cauldwell, Jonathan	Senior Adviser	UNICEF	United States	UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
25	Cherevatova, Natalia	Operations Officer	World Bank	United States	Multilateral and Regional Banks (Multilateral Agency 3)
26	Colenso, Peter	Director	Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)	United Kingdom	Private Sector/Private Foundations
27	Corbafo, Fulgencio	First Secretary	Embassy of Timor-Leste in Belgium	Timor-Leste	Asia & The Pacific

28	Coustère, Paul	Lead Education Specialist	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
29	Crouch, Luis	Team Coordinator	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
30	da Silva Costa Belo, Dirce	National Adviser	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Asia & The Pacific
31	De Greve, Hans	Research and Advocacy Adviser	Plan Belgium	Belgium	Observer
32	De Koning, Mireille	Coordinator Research	Education International	Belgium	CSO 3 (Teaching profession)
33	DeMarcken, Natasha	Director, Office of Education	United States Agency for International Development(USAID)	United States	Board Member, Donor 6
34	Diouf, Djibril Ndiaye	Director of Planification and Reform of Education	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Africa 2
35	Dusepulchre, Nadine	Senior Expert	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Belgium	Donor 1
36	Edwards, David	Deputy General Secretary	Education International	Belgium	Alternate Board Member, CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
37	Feinberg, Nathalia	Head of Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Denmark	Alternate Board Member, Donor 4
38	Fordham, Elizabeth	Education Specialist	UNESCO	France	UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
39	Fossberg, Camilla	Head of Education Section	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Representing Board Member, Donor 4
40	Freitas, H.E. Bedito	Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Board Member, Asia & The Pacific
41	Gantenbein, Nicole	Education Program Officer	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Switzerland	Donor 1
42	Gardiner, Amanda	Head of International Affairs	Pearson	United States	Alternate Board Member, Private Sector/Private

					Foundations
43	Gazagne, Fanny	Education Policy Officer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	France	Donor 5
44	Gear, Sally	Senior Education Adviser	UK Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Donor 3
45	Goudiaby, Gisele	Board Logistics	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
46	Grant Lewis, Suzanne	Deputy Director	UNESCO-IIEP	France	UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
47	Grigt, Sonia	Program Officer	Education International	Belgium	CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
48	Gutierrez, Francisco	Head of Education Division	Spanish Agency for international development cooperation and for humanitarian assistance (AECID)	Spain	Alternate Board member, Donor 2
49	Habibyar, Mohammad Shakir	Assistant to the Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
50	Hoelzer, Ronja	Program- Manager, German BACKUP Initiative Education in Africa	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Germany	Observer
51	Ingvoldstad, Chie	Financial Analyst	World Bank	United States	Trustee
52	Kaboré, Ibrahima	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Education	Burkina Faso	Africa 2
53	Kakule, John	Expert	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States -ACP Secretariat	Belgium	Observer
54	Karjalainen, Marja	Deputy Head of Unit	European Commission	Belgium	Alternate Board Member, Donor 5
55	King, Elizabeth	Education Director	World Bank	United States	Board Member, Multilateral and Regional Banks



					(Multilateral Agency 3)
56	Koziol, Margaret	Policy Adviser	United States Agency for International Development (USAID)	United States	Donor 6
57	Kyo, Yuka	Economic Development Researcher	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Japan	Donor 6
59	Lefebvre, Francois	Senior Financial Officer	World Bank	United States	Trustee
60	Legault McGill, Ryan	Analyst	Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	Canada	Alternate Board Member, Donor 3
61	Manickchand, H.E. Priya	Minister	Ministry of Education	Guyana	Board Member, Latin America & The Caribbean
62	Mbow, Cheikh	National Coordinator	Coalition of Organizations in Synergy for the Defense of Public Education (COSYDEP / SENEGAL)	Senegal	Board Member, CSO 2 (Developing Country)
63	Mesen, Michelle	Board of Directors Liaison	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
64	Mosothoane, H.E. Makabelo	Minister	Ministry of Education	Lesotho	Trustee
65	Motivans, Albert	Chief of Section	UNESCO Institute for Statistics	Canada	Observer
66	Mowe, Kjersti	CSEF Communication and Learning Manager	Global Campaign for Education	Norway	CSO 1 (International / Northern)
67	Naidoo, Jordan	Senior Adviser	UNICEF	United States	UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
68	Nazami, Ahmad	First Secretary of Afghan Embassy and mission to the Kingdom of Belgium	Embassy of Afghanistan	Belgium	Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
69	Ncube, Natasha	Communications Focal Point	Inspiris Ltd	United Kingdom	Private Sector/Private Foundation
70	Nielander, Tim	Counselor	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat

71	Nkaada, Daniel	Commissioner for Basic Education	Ministry of Education	Uganda	Alternate Board Member, Africa 1
72	Onyancha, Ruth	Senior Board Relations Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
73	O'Reilly, Joseph	Head of Education	Save the Children	United Kingdom	Alternate Board Member, CSO 1 (International / Northern)
74	Oulebsir, Naima	Program Assistant	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
75	Pascual, Jay	Counsel	World Bank	United States	Trustee
76	Paxton, Will	Head of Education Policy	Save the Children	United Kingdom	CSO 1 (International / Northern)
77	Pearce, Caroline	Acting Global Coordinator & Head of Policy	Global Campaign for Education (GCE)	South Africa	CSO 1 (International / Northern)
78	Pessi, Jefferson	Coordinator	Education International	Belgium	CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
79	Power, Padraig	Senior Financial Officer	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
80	Rao Gupta, Geeta	Deputy Executive Director	UNICEF	United States	Board Member, UNICEF (Multilateral Agency 2)
81	Reiplinger, Lena	Desk Officer	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development	Germany	Donor 5
82	Ricoveri, Alessandro	Education Manager	European Commission	Belgium	Donor 5
83	Saidov, H.E. Nuriddin	Minister	Ministry of Education	Tajikistan	Alternate Board Member, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia

84	Sakho, Marieme	General Secretary	Sypros	Senegal	Board Member, CSO 3 (Teaching Profession)
85	Samba, Madiana	Board Member EFA SL	Education For All Sierra Leone Coalition	Sierra Leone	Alternate Board Member, CSO 2 (Developing Country)
86	Sánchez, Sandra	Vice Minister of Education	Ministry of Education	Honduras	Alternate Board Member, Latin America & The Caribbean
87	Santos, Lucrecia	Personal Assistant	Ministry of Education	Timor-Leste	Asia & The Pacific
88	Santos, Nelson	Ambassador to the EU Belgium	Embassy of Timor-Leste	Timor-Leste	Asia & The Pacific
89	Sarvi, Jouko	Practice Leader for Education & Chair, Education CoP	Asian Development Bank	Philippines	Alternate Board Member, Multilateral & Regional Banks (Multilateral Agency 3)
90	Schmidt, Caroline	Education Adviser	GIZ BACKUP Initiative	Germany	Observer
91	Schroh, Karen	Head of EU Office	Plan International	Belgium	Observer
92	Seim, Olav	Director	UNESCO	France	Alternate Board Member, UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
93	Shambiev, Alinazar	Translator	Ministry of Education	Tajikistan	Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia
94	Shokirov, Imomali	Head of Unit	Ministry of Education	Tajikistan	Eastern Europe, Middle East and Central Asia
95	Siebes, Ronald	Deputy Head Education Division	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands	Donor 1

96	Smith, Alan	Professor	University of Ulster	United Kingdom	Observer
97	Sow, François	Head of Human Development Unit	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	France	Donor 5
98	Stockill, Jennifer	Policy and Program Officer	UK Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Donor 3
100	Tanaka, Shinichiro	Senior Adviser	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Japan	Donor 6
101	Tang, Qian	Assistant Director General for Education	UNESCO	France	Board Member, UNESCO (Multilateral Agency 1)
102	Tapp, Charles	Senior Replenishment Adviser	Global Partnership for Education	United States	GPE Secretariat
103	Terlecki, Sabine	Head of Policy	Concord	Belgium	Observer
104	Thabana, Keratile	Principal Secretary	Ministry of Education and Training	Lesotho	Board Member, Africa 1
105	Thiam, H.E. Serigne Mbaye	Minister	Ministry of Education	Senegal	Board Member, Africa 2
106	Thyness, Hilde	Senior Adviser	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)	Norway	Donor 4
107	Tinning, Chris	Minister-Counselor	Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)	Australia	Board Member, Donor 2
108	Touré, Kaffouba	Director of Finances	Ministry of Education	Ivory Coast	Africa 2
110	Vilsack, Christie	Senior Adviser for International Education	United States Agency for International Development (USAID)	United States	Donor 6
111	Waples, Sally	Program and Policy Manager	UK Department for International Development (DFID)	United Kingdom	Donor 3

112	Wardak, H.E. Farooq	Minister	Ministry of Education	Afghanistan	Board Member, Eastern Europe Middle East & Central Asia
113	Wilmshurst, Euan	Director	Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF)	United Kingdom	Board Member, Private Sector/Private Foundations
114	Winthrop, Rebecca	Director and Senior Fellow	The Brookings Institution	United States	Observer
115	Xaymouny, Bounpanh	Deputy Director General	Ministry of Education	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Asia & The Pacific
116	Yabo, Mondon	Diplomat	Embassy of Ivory Coast	Belgium	Africa 2
117	Yoshida, Kazuhiro	Professor	Hiroshima University	Japan	Donor 6