

REVIEW OF GPE GOVERNANCE
For Recommendation

1. PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to support the Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance Committee’s (“GERF”) review of GPE’s global governance systems as mandated in the terms of reference.

1.2 The GERF are asked to consider the findings of the internal governance survey, phone calls with stakeholders, and the key recommendations from the Independent Evaluation, in order to make recommendations to the Board of Directors. This Paper also aims to frame the discussion by the GERF of its review of its terms of reference.

1.3 Based on the deliberations of the GERF, decision language will be crafted for recommendation to the Board. The recommendations may be structured into those that may be adopted by the Board in December, and those that may require further work in order for the Board to make decisions at a later date.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The terms of reference of the GERF specify that: “The GERF shall (...)

- provide advice to the Board and recommend policies, practices, procedures and/or other measures or actions that ensure that the Global Partnership is structured, governed and functioning effectively and ethically at the global level in order to deliver on its mission based on (...) regular “light touch” internal reviews of the Global Partnership’s global governance system;
- Review its terms of reference on an annual basis and recommend any amendments to it to the Board for approval.”

2.2 At its April 2015 meeting, the GERF decided that the objective of this internal review are to review current functioning, composition, decision-making process, Secretariat support to Board and Committees over the period January 2014 – December 2015, and identify gaps and/or overlaps in existing governance arrangements along with options to make GPE

governance more effective and efficient. The GERF agreed to then proceed with a light touch internal review including the following:

- ✓ Overall Functioning: Review of the Committees' Terms of Reference and interrelationship between the Committees and with the Coordinating Committee;
- ✓ Decision-Making Process (Delegation of authority, consultation process with/within constituencies);
- ✓ Secretariat Support (Quality of documentation, planning, communication, workload);
- ✓ Overall Cost of the Governance Reform.

2.3 In parallel to the governance review, an Independent Evaluation of GPE found that Board committees have improved efficiency but lack decision-making authority. The evaluation recommended that the Partnership further clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Board Committees and the Secretariat.

2.4 The Secretariat will share additional information with the GERF Committee during the meeting, including on the Strategy and Policy Committee ("SPC")/Country Grants and Performance Committee ("CGPC")/Coordinating Committee ("CC") self-reviews of their terms of reference and main recommendations, as well as any additional issues arising from the October Board Retreat that might impact the governance review.

2.5 The GERF should note that the current terms for all Committee members expire at the end of 2015 and therefore the GERF will need to make a recommendation on whether the Board should extend the existing terms of members or move straight into a nomination process to replace/re-appoint them.

2.6 For background information on the current governance structure, the following documents should be consulted: Charter, Board and Committee Operating Procedures, Board and Committee Terms of reference (<http://www.globalpartnership.org/governance-documents>).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 All Board/Alternate Members and Committee members that have served between Nov. 2013 and June 2015 were invited to participate in an anonymous survey. 30 respondents from the 6 constituency groups have responded. The Secretariat leadership team also provided comments, while some additional feedback was obtained through phone calls and written submissions.

3.2 An extract of the survey results are disclosed in Annex 1. Some of the comments have been slightly modified to preserve anonymity but the substance has not been modified in any way. The complete survey results are available on the GERF's eteam site.

4. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

4.1 The main goals of the decision to adopt a new governance structure in 2013 were to increase the strategic leadership of the Board over the partnership, strengthen monitoring of financial and programmatic performance and results, increase attention to global education issues and increase efficiency, transparency and voice of developing country partners.

4.2 The feedback received shows there is strong support for the governance reform and recognition of the progress made over the past 18 months. A large majority of respondents stressed that the **Board** has devoted more time to strategic-level discussions than in the past, but continues to retain decision-making over too many operational/routines functions. They noted with appreciation the role of the Board Chair in raising GPE's international profile, although the Board as a whole devoted insufficient attention to positioning GPE within the global debate on education. On grants and performance, respondents recognize the role of the Board to approve grants, but noted that it has poor oversight and some proposed that the grants approval process should be strengthened by using an external review panel. There were calls for the Board to also pay more attention to issues of long-term financial sustainability of GPE while strengthening its focus on risk and financial management.

4.3 The **overall performance of Committees** is positive, although, there is an imbalance between the workloads and responsibilities of the various committees and overlap. The CGPC and the GERF have a much heavier workload than the SPC - which will need to be addressed either by reworking the mandates or changing the structure. If GERF/CGPC terms of reference need to be clarified, it seems that the focus should rather be on implementation of roles than material revisions. However the role of the SPC and the CC is still somewhat vague, with overlapping responsibilities and mandates (especially regarding the current strategic planning process). During its October 2nd discussion, the SPC also noted that new issues and the functions of the Secretariat, as well as key recommendations from the Independent Evaluation should be reflected in the terms of reference of relevant Committees. Some respondents noted that the Board and its Committees have not been effective as it was necessary to set up reference groups to handle the strategic planning. Some respondents noted that this has undermined the Committee structure and work.

4.4 Some consider that the risk that the Board doesn't have time to focus on strategic issues might be effectively tackled by **reinforcing Committee structure and overall accountability to the Board**. The fundamental question to address here is whether Committees should be representative of the Board (stronger delegation of authority) or should primarily make recommendations (that the Board will generally trust) or act primarily in an advisory role based on technical skills to better inform Board decision. Some respondents echoed some recommendations from the Independent Evaluation and suggested more structural changes to rationalize the decision making process, which could include:

- ✓ to restructure the CC in a representative and legitimate “bureau” or “executive committee” that represents the Board and can legitimately work with the Chair to provide advice, guidance, direction and take decisions between board meetings.
- ✓ increase representativeness of Committees to be able to engage their constituency grouping in more transparent decision making process
- ✓ consider the merge of SPC and the CC
- ✓ revise Committees nomination process, terms and timeline of upcoming nominations

On the other hand, some respondents specifically noted that significant efforts have been made in recent years in improving the governance structure and sometimes at a rapid pace. In view of the issues including the implementation of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan, some respondents recommend to slow the pace of reform of the governance structure, observe and assess the impact of the changes and make necessary adjustments but not fundamental changes at this time.

4.5 Overall respondents are satisfied with the deliberative process within their constituency and noted that it has improved considerably. However some constituencies (DCP, CSO) face difficulties to fully engage.

4.6 The Secretariat support has been effective, but could be further strengthened in terms of transparency, preparation of a forward looking Board/Committee agenda, timely delivery of documents, quality of documentation (shorter paper/rationale for proposed decision), support to pre-Board/pre-Committee consultations, information sharing and monitoring of conflict of interest.

4.7 Other issues arising included the partnership membership criteria, and the definition of requirements to be nominated by a constituency as Board members are directly related to the definition of the mandate of the Global Partnership. Discussion of those issues should take into consideration the ongoing consultations on the new Strategic Plan to be approved by the Board at the December meeting.

5. OTHER COMMENTS

5.1 Some respondents have made proposals to strengthen the governance at country level, especially regarding management of conflict of interest. They stressed that at the local level, the Partnership must ensure proper ownership of the governance by stakeholders and partners and address multiple conflicts of interest (selection of consultants for Education Sector Plan drafting, Joint Sector Review, selection of SE/ME).

5.2 Some respondent also mentioned the need to develop a mutual accountability framework that sets out accountabilities for the overall results. These comments are beyond the scope of this work which focuses on global governance arrangements, however the work on the Operational Model presented to the Board at its October retreat deals with many of these same issues.

6. INPUTS REQUESTED AND POTENTIAL DECISION AREAS

Based on the survey findings and Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC) recommendations, the GERF is requested to:

- Review its **own terms of reference and suggested revisions to terms of reference of other committees** and **make recommendations to the Board accordingly** (Annex 1)
- Make recommendation on upcoming **Committee call for nomination process**. As Committee terms end in Dec. 2015, the GERF should examine the process/timeline to replace actual Committees. Currently the Committee term is 2 years. Given that the learning curve is high due to the complexity and scope of discussions, committees might benefit longer from experienced committee members. In addition, the finalization and early implementation of the new Strategic Plan is likely to include several tasks for the technical committees in the first half of 2016, which would benefit from keeping committee membership the same for now.

The GERF could explore the following options:

- extension of some/all Committees for 6 months (expertise needed to implement some recommendations of the new Strategic Plan) or 1 year (if overall support to recommend as a principle that committee terms is 3 years)
- rotation of some members (to benefit from institutional memory)

The GERF might also consider making a recommendation on

- representativeness and nomination process of Committee members
- Review other findings and areas for improvement and make recommendations on how/when to tackle these issues (Annex 2), focusing on:
 - how to streamline the decision-making processes
 - how to strengthen the deliberative process
 - periodic review of constituency grouping and overall composition of the Board
 - the Partnership Membership Criteria
 - requirements to become a Board Member
- Review proposed actions to strengthen **Secretariat support** and make further recommendations as needed.

7. NEXT STEPS

7.1 The GERF will report to the Board at the December 2015 Board meeting on the findings of the survey and any recommendation for minor amendments to existing governance arrangements.

7.2 Should the GERF identify the need for any major amendments to existing governance arrangements, the GERF will seek Board endorsement of a process for designing options for reform.

8. RISK

8.1 With the substantial work in progress on finalizing the Strategic Plan and implementing key actions required to strengthen the operational model, there is a risk that significant changes to GPE's governance arrangements in the short term might have a negative impact on GPE's ability to deliver on these critical tasks.

9. ANNEXES AND ATTACHMENT

Annex 1: Review of Committees' terms of reference

Annex 2: Summary of key findings/issues/options identified by respondents to the survey

Annex 3: Extract of the Independent Interim Evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education, Results for Development/Universalia, September 2015

Attachment 1: Key findings from the online survey

ANNEX 1 - REVIEW OF COMMITTEES TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. REVIEW OF GERF TERMS OF REFERENCE (“TOR”)

Proposed questions to consider:

- ✓ Which responsibilities in the Committee’s terms of reference have been undertaken successfully, which ones haven’t been, and why?
 - ✓ Are you satisfied with the actual composition of and skills present on the Committees?
 - ✓ Are there any overlaps and/or gaps in mandate and functions of the Committees? If so, what should be done to address this?
 - ✓ What, if any, changes to the Committee’s terms of reference are desirable?
-

Summary of findings from the Governance Survey (Questions 28, 32-35)

Areas of responsibility to be clarified:

- Clarify GERF mandate to “oversee budgets and costs including: developing and monitoring the implementation of policies on Supervising and Managing Entity roles and responsibilities and associated fees and costs for grants; and providing guidance to the Secretariat on the operating expenses budgets”: further work on oversight of SE/ME policies and assessment of fees/costs for grants. Need to clarify what the GERF is being asked to monitor.
- Clarification needed on the area of “GPE Funding framework” (overlap with SPC)
- Clarify role on issue of misuse of funds, as this reported by the Secretariat.

Areas for improvement:

- Increase monitoring of implementation of policies (conflict of interest, risks)
- Additional work on the finance, due to the current situation; Explore further a “graduation strategy” for prioritizing resources
- More work on risk, including tracking of risk across GPE’s grants and assurances to mitigate them

Scope of revisions – Secretariat analysis based on responses to the survey:

- TOR need to be clarified, but the focus should rather be on implementation of roles than material revisions.
- TOR could mention that Committee Member skills in finance and/or audit are desired or even mandatory.
- Secretariat/Chair of the GERF could discuss further with other Committee Chairs the implementation of the Conflict of interest policy to ensure greater transparency and consistency in implementation during Technical Committee and Board meetings, especially the possibility given to the Chair to decide whether a Party who has disclosed a Conflict of Interest might stay in the room during the discussion and contribute to the discussion in a limited manner (e.g., to provide clarification upon request).

2. REVIEW OF OTHER TECHNICAL COMMITTEES TERMS OF REFERENCE (CGPC, SPC, CC) AND INTERRELATIONS¹

Proposed questions to consider:

- ✓ Scope of the revision of Committees T.O.R
 - ✓ IEC recommendations and more structural changes (Annex 3)
 - ✓ Prioritization of revisions needed and timeline (noting that the Board might request Technical Committees to work on additional topics in line with the Strategic Plan)
-

Country Grants and performance Committee (“CGPC”)

Areas of responsibility to be clarified/reinforced (based on findings from the Governance Survey, questions 36-39):

- Clarify work related to country-level policies, including the analyze of the functioning of Local Education Groups
- Excellent job of analyzing grant applications but needs more strength to “say no” - Examine the opportunity to create an external review panel to strengthen the grant approval process
- Clarify responsibilities vis a vis non country-grants (e.g. GRA and CSEF)
- Develop standard reporting format for all SE (follow up on WS 1 recommendation)
- Develop mechanism to improve performance at country level/ ensure minimum standard in the country level process and in following through after grant approval / share results reporting with the Board (follow up on WS 1 recommendation)
- Strengthen Secretariat support on implementation of new funding model requirements
- Strengthen assessment and monitoring of risks at country level
- Offer possibility to CGPC Member to accompany the Secretariat on country missions

Scope of revisions – Secretariat analysis based on responses to the survey:

- TOR need to be clarified, but the focus should be on implementation of roles rather than material revisions.
 - Recommendations on Operational Model address some of those issues.
-

Strategy and Policy Committee (“SPC”） –

Areas of responsibility to be clarified (based on findings from the Governance Survey, questions 40-44):

- Clarify responsibilities for CSEF, GRA, innovative financing and Funding Framework

¹ Based on the results of the survey (Annex 2), other Committees self-review of their terms of reference, IEC recommendations (Annex 3)

- Clarify work on global education policy
- Define the scope of Internal policy work
- Oversee and track progress against GPE results framework and implementation plan

Scope of revisions – Secretariat analysis based on responses to the survey:

- TOR need to be revised given current overlaps with the Coordinating Committee, CGPC and GERF.
 - Recommendation should be made after the adoption of the new strategic plan and definition of scope of the work in global education policy.
-

Coordinating Committee (“CC”)

Areas for improvement (based on findings from the Governance Survey, questions 45-48):

- Be more *transparent* and report to the Board
- Focus CC calls on strategic issues/decisions rather than on updates
- Facilitate developing country *partner* engagement
- Improve the coordination of Committee work and deal with overlap issues

Some respondents proposed structural change to increase effectiveness, including:

- CC should be representative of the Board and accountable to those it represents
- CC should have a broader mandate around strategic planning and direction for the partnership (include the current mandate of the SPC)
- CC should have delegated authority to make decisions on urgent matters between Board meetings

Independent Evaluation Recommendations (See Annex 3)

- Create an Executive Management Committee or “Bureau”
- Delegate more authority to the current Coordinating Committee and/or other Committees

Scope of revisions – Secretariat analysis based on responses to the survey

- Revisions may be relatively minor or could involve significant change depending on approach taken to some of the recommendations from the evaluation and survey.

ANNEX 2 –EXTRACT OF FINDINGS/ISSUES/OPTIONS FROM THE ONLINE SURVEY

1. Committee Members Nomination

References: Attachment 1, Questions 10; 12, 13, 22, 26, Annex 3 Independent Evaluation

Key issues arising:

- The duration of Committee members terms
- How to ensure a more formal, transparent Committee nomination process.
- How to increase the capacity to engage with and represent wider constituency groupings. Consider whether Committee members should represent only their constituency or a constituency grouping and whether they should all be Board members representatives.
- Consider defining requirements to strengthen the level of expertise of Committees including the use of external expertise.

Potential Recommendations

Issue	Option	Considerations	Process	Timeline
Committee Term	<p>Option 1: (Status Quo) – Retain the current 2 year mandate and call for nominations for the Committees and Chairs immediately (Committee members remain in place until replacements are appointed)</p> <p>Option 2: extend some/all committee terms to 3 years (this could be one time considering Strategic Plan or a more permanent change)</p> <p>Option 3: Consider rolling 2/3 year terms for committee member to ensure some continuity</p>	<p>Option 1 -Risk of a loss of institutional memory at a time of critical work with the Strategic Plan and could be a loss of productivity as new committee members need to find a way of working effectively</p> <p>Option 2 – May improve prospects of delivering on strategic plan/operational model issues</p>	Revision to Board/Committee Operating Procedures	GERF recommendation, Nov. 2015. Board decision, Dec. 2016

		Option 3 – Strikes a good balance between ensuring fresh perspectives from new members while ensuring continuity.		
Nomination process	<p>Option 1 (Status Quo) - Retain the current approach of call for nominations with Board Chair to make recommendations to Board based on nominations received.</p> <p>Option 2 - Consult current Committee Chair on nominations received before final selection of candidate for Board approval</p> <p>Option 3: Establish a screening process to check nominations against specific requirements that the Board could establish such as qualifications and time commitment. If no suitable candidate received, the vacancy remains open</p>	<p>Issues of transparency may not be improved</p> <p>More inclusive process and may improve consideration of issues like complementary skills sets to be considered</p> <p>May lead to stronger technical committees but may result in less representativeness as Constituencies with limited human resources available for GPE may not have access to sufficient expertise.</p>	<p>Revision to Board/Committee Operating Procedures and T.O.R</p> <p>Secretariat to reinforce communication on the process, skills set required (including information on the time and travel commitments necessary)</p>	<p>GERF recommendation, Nov. 2015.</p> <p>Board decision, Dec. 2016</p>
Representativeness of Committee members	<p>Option 1: (Status Quo Plus) Committee members are nominated by the Constituency but act in their individual capacity as a member of a Committee. The nomination should be endorsed by both the Board and Alternate member from the Constituency</p> <p>Option 2: Committee members are required to</p>	<p>Allows for more efficient decision making at the Committees but less ownership of those decisions at the Board</p> <p>Would allow greater</p>	<p>Revision to Board/Committee Operating Procedures</p>	<p>To be decided before the next call for nomination.</p>

	<p>consult with their constituency colleagues and reflect the views of the constituency in their work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer mandate of a Committee member to represent a constituency grouping. • Accountability between the Board and the Committees increases mutual engagement and understanding of technical issues at Board level. <p>Option 3: Committee members are required to consult with their constituency grouping (e.g. All DCP constituencies, or Donors as appropriate) and reflect the views in their work.</p>	<p>ownership at Board level and promote understanding of Committee work, but places extra pressure to share information, consolidate feedback, and deal with conflicting positions</p> <p>Allows constituencies not represented on the Committee to be consulted but the challenges are greater in terms of achieving a consensus position for members to reflect in their work</p>		
Experts	<p>Committee Chairs could look at the circumstances in which specific external expertise could be added to the Committees either on a recurrent basis as non-voting members or on a case by case basis to advise on specific issues.</p> <p>Due attention would need to be paid to the costs of such an approach, the impact on Committee operations, and to issues of conflict of interest, and performance management.</p>	<p>May strengthen the technical capacity of the Committees and thus improve confidence in them at Board level.</p> <p>Due attention would need to be paid to the costs of such an approach, the impact on Committee operations, and to issues of conflict of interest, and performance management.</p>	<p>Revision to Board/Committee Operating Procedures – if recurrent non-voting member option adopted</p>	<p>GERF recommendation, Nov. 2015.</p> <p>Board decision, Dec. 2016</p>

2. Streamlined decision-making processes

References: Attachment 1 Questions, 27, 28, 30 and Annex 2, Independent Evaluation

Option	Advantages	Risk associated	Process	Timeline
Establish a process to propose amendments to proposed decision language by Committees or the Secretariat in advance of the Board meeting.	More time to discuss, deliberate on key issues. Avoid critical issues being rushed or ultimately weak/unspecific Board decisions are made out of the need for compromise/not really being about coming to a decision but needing to move forward.	Issues discussed at the Committee level might be more often reopened which slows down the decision. Constituencies with dedicated resources may be more active in these discussions compared to those without thereby creating inequities.	Revision to Board/Committee operating procedures	GERF recommendation, Nov. 2015 Board Decision, Dec. 2015
State as a principle that no major decision will be taken by audio conference	Clarity on the scope of decisions to be taken by audio-call	Urgent decisions would be taken via no-objection, which has a much higher risk of not being approved as one Board member can block the decision.	Revision to Board/Committee Operating Procedures	GERF recommendation, Nov. 2015 Board Decision, Dec. 2015

3. Deliberative and participatory process

Reference: Attachment 1 Questions 15 and 16

The overall question is to define how to strengthen a deliberative and participatory process at the Board and Committee level, focusing on Board/Committee members' ability to act on a fully informed basis, in good faith, with due diligence and care and in the best interest of the Global Partnership for Education. Improvements in this area will have human resources implication at the Secretariat level which could be addressed by restructuring current functions of support Board/Committees and of engagement with constituencies.

Actions	Pro	Process	Timeline
Strengthen dialogue ahead of Board meetings and encourage cross-constituency consultation (either virtually or in person)	<p>During Pre-Board meetings increase time for discussion of documents and draft decisions</p> <p>Increase networking opportunities</p> <p>Reinforce the role of constituency Communication Focal Points</p>	<p>Organize one day pre Board meeting for all constituencies (to be discussed).</p> <p>CSO support included in the CSEF proposal.</p> <p>Continued financial support for Pre-Board DCP constituencies meeting</p>	<p>Board Decision, Dec. 2015 (DCP constituencies meeting support).</p> <p>Before June 2016 Board meeting</p>
Increase support to Committee Members and develop engagement process for interested non-committee members (including communication focal point, advisors, etc.)	<p>Increase level of information and engagement to reduce the risk that some constituencies are better informed than others.</p> <p>Offer an opportunity to engage and raise questions before any deliberative process (Committee/Board meetings).</p> <p>Secretariat to support open, transparent and inclusive consultations.</p>	<p>Secretariat to organize Pre-Committee meeting webinars as needed. Participation could be extended to all constituencies.</p> <p>Secretariat to provide orientations for new committee members and additional information sessions as needed.</p>	First quarter 2016

4. GPE constituency groupings

Reference: Attachment 1 Question 25

Some Board respondents feel that there is currently an unbalanced Board composition in which certain categories of constituencies are over-represented. It is recommended to establish a periodic review of constituency grouping either after each replenishment or adoption of a new strategic plan. Some respondents mentioned that the review shouldn't be linked to Board terms/nomination process to avoid unnecessary confusion or instability.

Option: Review constituency grouping and overall composition and balance of the Board.	Process	Timeline
<p>Opportunity to address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ DCP are supportive of restructuring their constituency now (focus on common language)✓ Proposition to add seats for DCPs.✓ Absence of constituency for affected populations (youth/parents) or for downstream implementing partners.✓ Some overlap between constituencies (foundations who are now donors, several donors and CSOs are also SE/ME, etc.)✓ Criticism of strong influence of multilateral agencies (some respondents consider that they should be ex officio members without voting rights. They see a contradiction in being an implementation partners and being part of the decision-making process)✓ Move to geographic groupings instead of donors versus recipients✓ Diversity of interest among a same constituency (CSO and teachers; private sector and foundations)✓ Constituency for potential new members (such as other UN agencies)	GERF recommendation to establish a periodic review of constituency grouping.	GERF recommendation in Nov. 2015. Board Decision December 2015 Review of constituency grouping in June 2016.

5. Board composition – requirements to become a Board Member

Reference: Attachment 1, question 9, 10, 21

The question of defining restricted criteria to become Board members relates to the philosophy of the Partnership (either it's inclusive or restricted to those who are directly implicated in the Partnership's work) and the mutual accountability framework to be defined through the Strategic Plan. A majority of respondents are in favor of defining minimum requirements and noted that this issue concerns all constituency grouping and shouldn't be addressed only for one specific group. Among those who are against the establishment of requirements, some mentioned that all constituencies would have to apply these criteria in their selection process, which would undermine the principle of self-governance of the constituencies.

Option: Define requirements to become Board Members	Process	Timeline
<p>Proposed requirements by respondents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Donors (either that there is a contribution to the GPE Fund in the current replenishment period or that disbursements of the previous replenishment period continue during the Board term. Threshold mentioned are between US\$5-10 million.)- DCP (active grant with the requirements from the New Funding Model or proposed GPE grant or to have an effective LEG)- Private Sector, Foundation: financial/collaborative support- CSO: pledges to GPE principles, processes and roles, number of countries they are active in	GERF recommendation to endorse a set of criteria to be precisely defined in May 2016.	Board decision June 2016 to be implemented for the next Board call for nomination (Dec. 2016)

6. GPE Membership criteria for countries

References: Attachment 1 Question23, GERF/2014/10 DOC 06

A majority of respondents recognized that the Partnership would be well served by enabling all interested countries to be formally associated with GPE (information, documentation, resources sharing from the education sector). Nevertheless, this question needs further reflection and information on what is the potential country pool (countries eligible for ESPD grants, MICs/emerging economies) on what are the implications of being a member (facilitation of South-South exchange, etc.) and what would be the implication in term of support from Secretariat). Any recommendation to clarify the membership criteria and implications will need to be reflected into the Charter.

Option 1: Clarify that membership is not attached to Education sector plan endorsement but to the **principles of collaboration around the education sector** and define **criteria**

Principles

- ✓ Distinction between GPE's core role as a funder of education, with appropriate fiduciary controls, and any role as a mechanism and forum for dialogue/ technical information sharing and coordination more broadly
- ✓ Membership would always be on constituency basis. Membership does not entail automatic inclusion on the Board
- ✓ Countries that are only eligible for the Education Sector Plan Development Grant have much to gain from the GPE as we move into more systematic work around sector planning and data, and many of them have good experiences to share as well.

Proposed criteria

- ✓ Offer technical Expertise/collaboration
- ✓ Hosting of Board/Committee meetings
- ✓ Commitment to increase domestic financing to education (pluri-annual commitment and mention in the Finance Law).
- ✓ Participation in other GPE processes - sector planning, LEGs etc
- ✓ lower middle income countries should all be eligible and middle income countries with extremes of educational inequality
- ✓ Commitment to high quality education sector planning and to partnership in advancing education sector goals.
- ✓ eligibility for other grants, engagement in global education debates, and pledges/commitments to GPE principles (e.g. the New Funding Model requirements around increased domestic financing and data collection, and improved focus on equity, efficiency and learning)

Option 2: Create a “**Provisional Member**” status (cf GERF/2014/10 DOC 06)

Option 3: Create an ‘**associate partner**’ category for all interested potential partners (donors, developing countries and other)

- ✓ Associate partners should be able to observe Board meetings but should not be eligible to become Board members or Alternates.

7. Secretariat Support

Reference: Attachment 1 Questions, 18, 19, 20:

Overall progress have been made, but some areas for improvement have been identified:

Issues	Proposed actions
Timely distribution of documents to enable consultation process, easier access to documents, streamlined communication (especially for the CC and CGPC)	Secretariat will launch as soon as possible a new Platform with all Board/Committee documents accessible to all constituency members upon request. Secretariat will explore further connectivity issues to enable Partners to connect to webinars.
Format of Board documents: paper need to be shorter, more visual and diagrammatic, clearer message, sharper analysis, include an executive summary.	The governance quality assurance function will be reinforced within the Board Service Team. Additional attention will be given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Focus on strategic issues and clarity of proposed decision language- Better analysis of the impact of decision (in terms of financial/human resources, country ownership)- Terminology and clearly defined concept in English to enable better translation to other languages.
Board – Committee workplan	The Board Support Team will develop and update: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A Board Dashboard to support Board members' work and share a forward Board agenda- Annual Committee workplans- Monitoring of implementation of all Board Decisions
Upfront information sharing	Secretariat will endeavor to organize thematic webinars to present Board/Committee Papers prior to face to face meetings. More attention will be given to the structure and focus of those sessions.

ANNEX 3: EXTRACTS FROM THE INDEPENDENT INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION, Results for Development/Universalia, September 2015

Conclusion 3: Changes in GPE governance have had positive effects on the legitimacy and efficiency of the Board.

Based on findings 6, 7

Since 2010 the GPE Board has become more representative, most notably in the participation of developing country partners. There is room for improvement in ensuring the participation of Southern civil society organizations, and in clarifying the rationale for involving private sector representatives and defining related selection criteria.

The four newly created Board committees have had some positive effects on Board efficiency, but could be used more effectively if they had some operational decision-making authority, which would allow the Board to focus more on strategic rather than operational matters.

Conclusion 4: The GPE Board has insufficiently defined what it means to operate as a global partnership, and has not fully translated the principle of mutual accountability into practice.

Based on findings 4, 5, 9, 11, 12

The GPE Compact (2013) broadly defined the roles and responsibilities of different types of partners but it is not clear how the Partnership will leverage the strengths of individual partners. A Mutual Accountability Matrix was drafted in 2011 but never formally adopted or implemented.

The current partnership framework has not been used consistently to monitor partner compliance with non-financial commitments (such as harmonizing procedures) and, until recently, did not include any negative consequences for partners who did not honour their commitments. The new GPE Funding Model does stipulate consequences of non-compliance with financial commitments, but only for developing country partners.

Recommendation 3: The Global Partnership should further clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Board Committees and the Secretariat.

Based on conclusions 2 and 3; Priority: Desirable

Recommendation 3.1: The GPE Board should assign clearly defined decision-making powers to either the Coordinating Committee or to all of the other three Committees (in which case it should dissolve the Coordinating Committee). This would allow operational decisions to be made in between biannual meetings of the full Board, and would permit the Board to focus primarily on strategic issues.

The expected benefits and potential drawbacks of different options related to this recommendation are outlined in the table below.

Exhibit 7.2 Benefits and drawbacks of assigning decision making powers to Board Committees

Option	Benefits	Drawbacks
Status quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Board members are able to contribute to most Board decisions regardless of their participation in any of the Committees. CGPC has authority to approve material revisions to grants and requests for accelerated funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board spends time on operational decisions and does not consistently pay attention to strategic issues. Some Board members and Secretariat staff question the raison d'être of the Coordinating Committee Risk of perceived imbalance among Committees if only CGPC has decision making authority
Assign decision making authority to the Coordinating Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frees full Board to focus on strategic issues Clarifies role and responsibilities of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different CC members may not be equally informed about issues put forward by the three other sub-committees
Assign (additional) decision making authority to the SPC, GERF and CGPC and dissolve CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frees full Board to focus on strategic issues Allows all three Committees to take selected decisions in a timely fashion Efficient use of talents and expertise among Board members Leaner structure with 3 instead of 4 Committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk of CC (and CGPC, provided that its recently granted decision making authority is not revoked) being perceived as exercising too much authority with respect to Board's and Partnership's direction Not all decisions taken by all Board members, leading risk of disagreement in larger Board. Defining reasonable boundaries of decision making responsibilities of each Committee may be challenging Absence of Coordinating Committee may make it more difficult for the Board Chair to interact with Committee Chairs in between Board meetings