CONSENT AGENDA

For Decision

Please note: Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them. It is understood that constituencies will circulate Board documents among their members prior to the Committee meeting for consultation purposes.

Rev. 1: Revisions have been captured in track change on p. 2/3 and Annex 3 (CSEF Costed Extension)

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to present the Board with a consent agenda for approval. Please refer to the background section for a clarification of the meaning and purpose of a ‘consent agenda.’

2. DECISIONS ON CONSENT AGENDA


BOD/2018/12-XX—Affirmative Vote Procedure: The Board of Directors, in reference to BOD/2017/06-08 and BOD/2017/12-04, extends the use of the Affirmative Vote procedure to Board decisions beyond those related to approval of ESPIG and Multiplier Grants per the Affirmative Vote procedure included in BOD/2018/12 DOC 02 Annex 2.

The Grants and Performance Committee recommends the Board approve the following decision:

BOD/2018/12-XX—Request for Costed Extension of Civil Society Education Fund: The Board of Directors:
1. Delegates authority to the Grants and Performance Committee to review and approve a costed extension not to exceed US$4.4-US$4.5 million from the Global Campaign for Education for the CSEF grant, presently set to expire on December 31, 2018.

2. Reduces the funding available for the Advocacy and Social Accountability mechanism by a corresponding amount from US$60 million to US$55.5 million.

The Grants and Performance Committee recommends the Board approve the following decision:

**BOD/2018/12-XX—Application of Variable Part for Small Multiplier Grants and Combination Grants:** The Board of Directors in reference to BOD/2018/06-08: Reducing Transaction Costs and Improving Efficiency of Applications for ESPIGs:

1. Allows countries applying for a Multiplier grant where the allocation does not exceed US$5 million to choose whether to adopt an ex-post Variable Part.

2. Clarifies that where countries apply for an ESPIG and a Multiplier grant simultaneously and where the combined grant amount exceeds US$5 million, the standard 30% Variable Part applies to the combined grant amount.

**3. BACKGROUND**

3.1 A consent agenda is a meeting practice whereby all routine and non-controversial decision items that do not require deliberation and which are generally deemed to have consensus are packaged as one agenda item without discussion. All the decisions packaged in the consent agenda are passed with a single vote. This allows the Board more time to focus on strategic matters that do require deliberation.

3.2 Should any one Board member feel that a specific item on the consent agenda warrants discussion before decision, they can indicate so prior to the meeting or at the moment when the Consent Agenda is being presented by the Chair for consideration. That specific item is then removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion and decision at a later stage in the meeting.

3.3 At this meeting, the following items are part of the consent agenda:

- **June 12-14, 2018 Board Meeting Report.** This summary of the previous face-to-face Board meeting was sent to the Board on August 31, 2018 and no comments were received.
- **Affirmative Vote Procedure.** The Board of Directors is requested to approve a set of minor adjustments to the Affirmative Vote procedure as well as its expanded use beyond ESPIG and
Multiplier grant approvals.

- **Request for Costed Extension of Civil Society Education Fund.** The Board is requested to approve a delegation to the Grants and Performance Committee to approve a forthcoming costed extension of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) III not to exceed US$4.4-4.5 million to be funded from the funding available for the Advocacy and Social Accountability mechanism.

- **Application of Variable Part for Small Multiplier Grants and Combination Grants**
  The Board is asked to approve recommendations from the Grants and Performance Committee to clarify the application of the 30 percent Variable Part in two instances: 1. Allowing countries submitting an application for a Multiplier grant where the allocation does not exceed US$5 million to choose whether to adopt an ex-poste Variable Part; 2. Where applications include an education sector program implementation grant and a Multiplier grant and the total grant amount exceeds US$5 million, the standard 30% Variable Part is applied to the combined amount.

4. **PLEASE CONTACT:** Padraig Power (ppower@globalpartnership.org) for further information.

5. **ANNEXES:**

   Annex 1: June 12-14, 2018 Board Meeting Report – Page 4


   Annex 3: Request for Costed Extension of Civil Society Education Fund – Page 32

INTRODUCTION

The agenda and documents for the Board meeting can be found on the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) website. A list of participants can be found in Annex 1.

This report presents a high-level summary of key outcomes and decisions made.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2018

The Board Chair, Julia Gillard, called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

1. WELCOME, AGENDA SETTING AND APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

1.1 The Board Chair welcomed meeting participants and extended a special thank you to the European Commission, for its unwavering support to GPE and for hosting the Board meeting. She invited Donor 5 Board member Marjeta Jager, Deputy Director General at the Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development of the European Commission, to make some remarks.

1.2 Ms. Jager welcomed all participants. She noted that the European Commission was delighted to host the Board meeting and that this was yet another signal of the EC's strong commitment to global education. This commitment was reconfirmed in Dakar, through the EC’s continued financial contribution to GPE, as well as its longstanding flagship programs such as Erasmus. She noted that this Board meeting will be decisive for the direction of the partnership and that now, more than ever, all partners must work as one; always keeping in mind GPE’s raison d'être: to give hope and improve the lives of children worldwide.

1.3 The Board Chair welcomed meeting participants including new Board and Alternate Board members:

- Mr. Paul Richard Fife, Director, Department for Global Health and Education, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Board member for Donor 4. Paul Fife is a returning Board member and last served on the GPE Board in 2014.
- Ms. Carol Hannon, Education Policy Lead, Policy Unit, Irish Aid Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Riverstone House, Alternate Board member for Donor 4.
- Mr. Daniel Endres, Director, Division of Resilience and Solutions, UNHCR, Alternate Board member of Multilateral Agency 2 consisting of UNICEF and UNHCR.
• Ms. Haldis Holst, Deputy General Secretary, Education International, Belgium, Alternate Board Member for CSO 3.

• Mr. David Boutcher, Executive Board Member, Global Business Coalition for Education, Board member for the Private Sector and Foundations constituency.

1.4 The Board Chair also welcomed new Board members who were unable to attend the meeting:

• Mr. David Mabumba, Minister of Education, Zambia, Board member for Africa 1. The Minister is a returning Board member.

• The Honorable Aboubakar Assidick Tchoroma, Minister of National Education, Chad, Board member of Africa 2.

• Stefania Giannini, Assistant Director-General, UNESCO, Board member for Multilateral Agency 1 which currently consists of UNESCO.

• His Excellency Mohammad Mirwais Balkhi, Minister of Education, Afghanistan, Board member for the Eastern Europe and Middle East and Central Asia Constituency. Mr. Balkhi is a returning Board member.

1.5 The Board Chair reiterated her welcome to the Vice-Chair and invited Minister Thiam to make some remarks. Minister Thiam thanked the Board for the trust placed in him. He noted that his previous service on the Board (from 2012 to 2014) and as Chair of the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee (GERF) allowed him to gain the insight and experience necessary to carry out the role with full knowledge of GPE’s mission, values and operational practices. Further, as Minister of Education for Senegal, he noted that he is well placed to understand the impact of education but also the challenges faced by countries, as well as the importance of working alongside all actors including national level CSOs, regional organizations, private sector actors and multilaterals. Minister Thiam noted that his vision for the role of Vice-Chair is to continue to build and consolidate the partnership at the national and global level, and he looks forward to working with all GPE partners to achieve this goal and our important mission as a partnership.

Meeting Objectives and Outcomes

1.6 The Board Chair reviewed the agenda and asked for comments, none were received. She reminded the Board that many of the decisions under consideration were the result of the Committee framework which was developed to help lighten the workload of the Board and enable more strategic discussions during meetings.

Approval of Consent Agenda (BOD/2018/06 DOC 02)

1.7 The Board Chair reviewed the items on the consent agenda as set out in DOC 02 and asked for any final objections. No objections were made, and the consent agenda was approved.
The following decisions were approved:

**BOD/2018/06-01 December 5-7, 2017 Board Meeting Report:** The Board of Directors approves the Report of the Meeting of the Board of Directors in Paris, France from December 5-7, 2017 as set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 02 Annex 1.

**BOD/2018/06-02—Trustee Budget:** The Board of Directors approves of the estimated administrative expenses of US$517,000 for trustee services for the period of July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019 as set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 02 Annex 2.

**BOD/2018/06-03—GPE Multiplier Maximum Country Allocations:** The Board of Directors approves the list of Maximum Country Allocations from the Multiplier (MCAMs) for the countries in the table below. The MCAs will remain valid for a period of one (1) year unless adjusted, and will be subject to the requirements of the Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the GPE Funding Model (Funding Model). MCAMs are also subject to the requirements of the GPE Multiplier. For countries with an existing Maximum Country Allocation for an Education Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG), the amounts below under 'Multiplier MCA' are additional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>ESPIG MCA</th>
<th>Multiplier MCA</th>
<th>Total MCA</th>
<th>Estimated Additional Co-Financing from Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOD/2018/06-04—Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives for the GPE Funding Model:** The Board of Directors, in reference to BOD/2017/12-10-Resource Commitments by Developing Country Partners for Education Sector Program Implementation Grants approves the revisions to the Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the GPE Funding Model as set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2018/06 DOC 06 including a revised process for monitoring delivery on domestic financing commitments made by governments of developing country partners in fulfilment of the domestic financing requirement of the GPE funding model, and a revised policy for taking appropriate actions when these commitments are not met.

**BOD/2018/06-05—Affirmative Vote and Multiplier Grants:** The Board of Directors, in reference to BOD/2016/06-06-Decision Framework, extends the use of the Affirmative Vote to Multiplier allocations.

**BOD/2018/06-06—Board and Committee Nominations:** The Board of Directors:
1. Endorses the proposed adjustments to the nominations process as set out in DOC 02 Rev.1.
2. Noting the need for knowledge transfer, endorses the proposal to enable the Board Chair to recommend the extension of terms of Committee chairs, in special circumstances, when priority projects extend beyond the current mandate.
3. Noting the need for knowledge transfer, endorses the proposal to enable Committee Chairs to recommend the extension of the term of its member to the relevant constituency category for their consideration.
4. Endorses the proposed timeline of September 15-November 15, 2018 for the call for nominations for the Board and its standing committees.

2. REPORT FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (BOD/2017/12 DOC 03)

2.1 The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Alice Albright, presented her bi-annual report to the Board as set out in DOC 03.

Discussion:

2.2 During the ensuing discussion, the following key points were raised:

- **Congratulations on the outcome of replenishment**: It was agreed that the Board Chair would send out a thank you on behalf of the Board to all those who contributed to this replenishment.

- **GPE response to sexual exploitation in the aid sector**: Appreciation was expressed for the serious consideration given to this important issue. Questions were raised on how the GPE response relates to that of the World Bank, to which the CEO confirmed that GPE is aligned with World Bank policies on the matter. The GPE Secretariat has a zero-tolerance policy and is carrying out training on sexual harassment in the workplace, as well as reviewing GPE’s policies on the issue in coordination with the World Bank.

3. OPTIMIZING GPE’S LEVERS FOR RESULTS (BOD/2018/06 DOC 04/05)

3.1 The Chair of the Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC) and the Secretariat presented the recommendation from the SIC on the Results Report and Management and Partnership Actions as set out in DOC 04 and DOC 05, as well as a brief report back on the other Committee workstreams.

Update on Results Report and Management and Partnership Actions

3.2 The Secretariat presented an update on the Results Report and the Management and Partnership Actions. Details are available in the PowerPoint presentation posted on the GPE website.

Discussion:

3.3 The following key points were raised:

- **Congratulations on report, but concern for milestones not yet reached**: Board members congratulated the Secretariat, noting that it is a crisp report that clearly highlights progress made as well as areas for improvement. Noted that progress made in GPE countries is greater than in non-GPE countries, many also noted some targets have not yet been reached in particular in learning outcomes, out-of-school children and completion rates.

- **Vulnerable populations**: Noted the need for more focus on segments of the population that are still “missing out” namely migrants, and children with disabilities. In addition, noted the need to go beyond gender parity and encouraged GPE to focus on actual barriers that impede girls from attending and remaining in school.
• **Role of teachers:** Welcomed the increased focus on teachers as key to quality education and encouraged GPE to continue to deepen this focus in the coming years. Noted that while the number of teachers is very important so is teacher training, material and capacity development, and encouraged GPE to carry out further analysis in this regard. Noted also that there is a systemic problem in clustering teachers with civil society in the current Board make-up. Moreover, the role of teachers should be seen as going beyond mere monitoring and advocacy. Teachers can in fact contribute to meeting some of the missed milestones presented in the report.

• **Alignment with Effective Partnership Review:** Noted the need for closer alignment and congruence between the Results Report and related Management and Partnership Actions, and the roles and responsibilities outlined in the Effective Partnership Review.

• **Alignment:** Noted the need to unbundle alignment indicators and strive for greater granularity to better understand results. In addition, it was suggested that GPE should take a more active role with grant agents to strengthen progress on alignment.

• **Partnership and relationship management:** Noted that the results report highlights the centrality of the partnership approach and relationships in the attainment of results i.e. where there is a strong, well-functioning partnership, there are strong results. Weak or deficient partnership dynamics may, in that sense, hinder the achievement of targets and results overall. Strengthening key components of the partnership, such as the LEG, for example, should therefore be considered a priority.

**Decision:**

The Board Chair declared consensus on the following decision:

**BOD/2018/06-07 — Management and Partnership Actions in response to the Results Report:** The Board of Directors:

1. Reviews and concurs with the management and partnership actions for improvement outlined in BOD/2018/06-DOC 05
2. Calls upon all partners to work to address key challenges according to their roles and responsibilities as outlined in this report.

**4. EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW:**

4.1 The Effective Partnerships Review was covered in two sessions. Firstly, a presentation by the consultants and initial discussion, followed by a second session outlining the Grants and Performance Committee’s deliberation and Secretariat’s response. For convenience, the summary of the two sessions is listed sequentially below.

**Presentation of Findings by Oxford Policy Management**

4.2 Representatives from Oxford Policy Management presented the findings of the Effective Partnership Review. The overall finding was that the GPE Operational Model is effective but could be further strengthened. Details are available in the PowerPoint presentation posted on the GPE website.
Discussion:

4.3 The following key points were raised:

- **Coordinating agencies.** One Board member noted there is a difference between the coordinating agency’s role coordinating policy dialogue and administering the GPE grant. While this Board member considers its activities as a coordinating agency in relation to policy dialogue as an important contribution at country level, the workload around GPE funding processes is heavy and at times unmanageable. The Board member invited the Board to consider supporting coordinating agencies for some of the functions currently undertaken and different ways to lighten the burden on coordinating agencies, particularly around administrative processes.

- **Fragile and Conflict-Affected States.** While no significant changes to the operational model are required, it was noted that the Board should take a deeper look at some of the issues related to fragile and conflict affected states, in the context of the recommendations arising from the review.

- **Confidentiality.** The lack of complete confidentiality in the interview process was raised as a concern in that it might have impeded candor. OPM responded that a small number of interviewees express concerns on the lack of confidentiality but that in the end this did not inhibit the interview process.

- **Methodology.** A Board member suggested that the number of DCPs and CSOs included in the consultation was not sufficient. OPM noted that it had aimed at a representative sample and more sampling would likely have led to the same result. As part of the review, consultations were conducted with DCP at their pre-Board meeting OPM further noted more generally there was a trade-off between breadth and depth. Another Board member suggested that the methodology could have been more effective if the firm had used local researchers and had engaged DCP focal points in mobilizing interviewees at the highest level.

**GPC Recommendations and Secretariat response**

4.4 The GPC Chair presented the Committee’s recommendation on the Effective Partnership Review report by OPM as set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 07B. She shared some further reflections on the review process including that the timeline had been too constrained for thorough deliberation by the Committee. In addition, there was the challenge of multiple perspectives in the partnership and how to ensure these are reflected in the operational model. The GPC Chair further emphasized the urgency of developing a GPE communications strategy at country level on how the GPE model works and that the ongoing issue of defining accountability would be key to drive results.

4.5 The Secretariat presented its response to the OPM Report, outlining actions relevant to the recommendations in the report that were already underway, including a revised operational framework for operating effectively in fragile and conflict-affected settings; specific opportunities for quick wins, including developing TORs for grant agents, coordinating agencies and Secretariat country leads; and areas that need new strategies, including a clear framework for mutual accountability and reinforcement of country-level capacity.
Discussion:

4.6 The following key points were raised:

- **Interdependencies.** Welcomed the report and thanked OPM for a positive first step in assessing the GPE operational model. Many noted, however, that there needs to be greater alignment between the Effective Partnership Review and the broader analysis related to Institutional Arrangements, the Results Report, and the 2012 partnership review.

- **Framing and Fundamental Challenges.** Noted that while the presentation highlighted the key issues, the report is itself a missed opportunity both in terms of framing and the lack of granularity of its recommendations. The review should be considered as more than an assessment of whether GPE is “fit for purpose” (the decision language should be revised in this respect), as it posits fundamental challenges to the way GPE operates, including in the areas of mutual accountability, transparency of grant agents, and capacity-building of DCP governments to take on more functions.

- **Governance issue.** Noted the underlying issue of governance and the need to align resources and responsibilities in terms of accountability, authority, and risk (who does what, who has the authority to make decisions and who is accountable for those decisions). It was noted that governance issues hinder co-financing opportunities and that the risk of comingling funds with GPE processes reduces the appetite for joint decision-making which in turn forms an obstacle to greater alignment.

- **Areas of support.** Noted their support for the suggested quick wins; for developing options to support coordinating agency activities depending on context, noting there were mixed views on this are of support; and for a review of the terms of references of key actors including the grant agent. One suggestion was to fund the development of a case study that would highlight country-level examples of what is working well and what should be improved in order to inform the drafting of terms of references for the role of coordinating agency. In addition, one Board member emphasized that local education groups also require strengthening, including in terms of inclusion of civil society, and that the existing workstream to address this, in particular the development of guidance, proves challenging.

- **Next Steps.** Agreement with the step-by-step approach and the need to avoid a phase 2 review. There was a suggestion for GPC to develop an action plan by the end of July, and for setting out a time table for the existing work streams, including additional work to be commissioned on coordinating agencies, mutual accountability for results, and modalities for GPE partners involvement. It was noted that, in identifying solutions, the development of further guidance and processes that lead to increased transaction costs should be avoided.

4.7 The Chair concluded from the discussion that decision point 2 required revision and specification and that there was an appetite to identify quick wins with due attention to the operationalization. She noted consensus on there not being a second phase of the study and that ongoing work needs to be transparent to the Board with a clear view of how the various work streams align. The Chair reiterated the point that ultimately the issues identified will only be resolved by determining to who takes action, how decisions are made, who bears accountability and who holds the risk. She noted the suggestion for a GPC-led action plan, and the importance of capacity-building and other issues which will require long term solutions. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the decision language accordingly for Board review the following day.
4.8 The Chair later declared consensus on the following decision, as revised:

**BOD/2018/06-09—Effective Partnership Review:** The Board of Directors:

1. Appreciates the report from Oxford Policy Management set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 07A and agrees that a second phase of this study is not needed.

2. Agrees that specific actions are needed to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the GPE Operational Model at country level, including in particular the need to adapt better to country context and improve the approach to capacity-building of developing country partners.

3. Notes the Grants and Performance Committee’s (GPC) conclusions on the draft report set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 07B, including recognition that some of the recommendations are addressed in ongoing workstreams led by the GPC, the Finance and Risk Committee and the Strategy and Impact Committee. Requests the Secretariat to provide for the Board retreat in November 2018 an update on the relevant workstreams which are related to improving efficiency, effectiveness and reducing transaction costs.

4. Requests the GPC to develop a costed action plan by end July 2018 with clear actions and a timetable for Board approval, including:

   a. In order to strengthen mutual accountability, a proposal to review and clarify roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risks at country level, resulting in revised terms of reference for key actors including Developing Country Partners, Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies and the Secretariat Country Leads.

   b. A communication strategy to ensure GPE’s goals, objectives, operating model and associated roles, responsibilities and accountabilities are well understood by all partners.

   c. Actions that need to be taken forward following the institutional arrangements decision in December 2018.

5. Requests that the costed action plan clearly reflect how members of the Board, relevant committees, and their constituencies will be responsible for its implementation.

**5. DELIVERING AT THE COUNTRY LEVEL**

**Update on GPC Work**

5.1 The Chair of the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) presented an update on the work of the Committee since the last Board meeting, including approval of decisions delegated by the Board. Specifically, the GPC had approved a revised budget proposal from the grant agent for Cambodia’s fixed part ESPIG for the cost of the grant agent in supporting the program. The GPC had also approved revisions to ESPIGs from Eritrea, Rwanda, Guinea, Liberia, Malawi, Puntland, Sudan, and had approved requests for an ex-ante approach to the variable part of the ESPIGs from Comoros, Somalia and Somaliland.

5.2 The GPC Chair next invited the Secretariat to provide an update on the Alignment work stream. The Secretariat briefed the Board on activities in support of the work stream and presented the work plan on Alignment.
Reducing Transaction Cost for ESPIG Approval Processes (BOD/2018/06 DOC 06)

5.3 The GPC Chair presented the Committee proposal to reduce transaction costs related to grants including: the introduction of costed restructurings to process upwardly revised maximum country allocations; an adjusted quality assurance process for costed restructurings; delegation to the GPC of approval of grants in its mandate up to US$10 million; and giving countries with an MCA of US$5 million and below a choice as to whether they want a variable part to their ESPIG. Details are available in BOD/2018/06 DOC 06 and the PowerPoint presentation posted on the GPE website.

Discussion:

5.4 The following key points were raised:

- **Top-ups**: Indicated that the term “top-up” might be construed/understood as a bonus rather than a recalculation of the MCA.

- **Eligibility**: Enquired on whether the size of the grant was the only criteria considered and suggested that the Operational Risk Framework could also help guide which grants could be delegated for approval. Other Board members enquired whether options for reducing transaction costs could also be explored for countries with new MCAs of less than 10 million.

- **Variable Part**: Noted that the proposed decision language with regard to the Variable Part could be construed that small grants would not be as result-focused. It was agreed to refine the decision point accordingly and encourage countries with ESPIG applications or costed restructurings of US$5 mill or less to adopt a strong focus on results and also to choose whether to adopt an ex-post variable part.

- **Board Oversight**: Agreed that any Board member prior to GPC discussion of a grant proposal for its approval could request that the proposal be deferred to the Board for the final decision.

- **Secretariat workload**: Welcomed the initiative to lower transaction costs but expressed concern that these delegations, including those related to the Multiplier, would go some way but would not sufficiently reduce transaction cost at country level or alleviate an overburdened Secretariat, and that further work to reduce transaction costs is needed.

Decision:

The Board Chair declared consensus on the following decision:

**BOD/2018/06-08: Reducing Transaction Costs and Improving Efficiency of Applications for ESPIGs:** *The Board of Directors:*

1. Notes the importance of efficient processes and lowering transaction costs, particularly in the context of an anticipated significant increase in the number of grant applications.

2. Approves the approach proposed by the GPC for processing applications and approving allocations as set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 06, including:
a. Allowing countries with a revised maximum country allocation resulting in an increase in grant funding to apply for the additional funds by submitting a proposal for a costed restructuring of the existing ESPIG.

b. Delegating authority to the Grants and Performance Committee to approve new ESPIGs and Costed Restructurings of up to US$10 million.

c. Encouraging countries with applications for ESPIGs or Costed Restructurings of US$5 million or less to adopt a strong focus on results but allowing them to choose whether to adopt an ex-poste variable part.

6. MANAGING GPE FUNDS AND STEWARDSHIP

6.1 The Chair of the Finance and Risk Committee (FRC) and the Secretariat presented the Financial Forecast as set out in DOC 08, the GPE Multiplier: Options for Scaling up, Eligibility, Allocation Model, and Improving Operations (as set out in DOC 09) as well as an update on Misuse of Funds and other FRC topics.

Financial Forecast

6.2 The Secretariat presented an overview of the current financial position of GPE and the semi-annual financial forecast including recommendations for maximum country allocations for ESPIGs, financing options for the Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) and Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA) funding mechanisms, as well as the GPE Multiplier. In addition, the Secretariat presented the introduction of the Euro as a Second Holding Currency, Euro Grant Allocations, updates on currency hedging and a Euro Fund and changes to GPE Fund Investment Portfolio.

Discussion:

6.3 The following key points were raised:

- **Financial Forecast**: Congratulated the FRC and Secretariat for the quick turnaround from Dakar in announcing maximum country allocations.

- **Euro Fund**: Enquired on the source of the request for Euro Grant Allocations. The Secretariat noted that around 36% of pledges from Dakar were made in Euro and that there was confirmed interest from DCPs to have an option to allow them to receive allocations denominated in either US dollars or Euros. In addition, given risks around currency exposure, it was noted there may be benefits of offering euro grant allocations as these could potentially reduce the significant mismatch between the currency of donor contributions and the currency of GPE expenditure from approximately 85% to 75% if about 10% of grants were made in euros. The Secretariat further noted the fact that a Euro facility will have some administrative implications that will need to be monitored and presents some issues for UN Grant Agents given their use of dollars as the basis of their accounting. The Secretariat noted that the choice of grant currency will only be made after Grant Agent selection to mitigate this concern.

- **KIX and ASA allocation**: Noted their agreement to support the KIX and ASA but indicated that any future decision to increase the allocations beyond the initial amounts would require further discussion at Board level. The immediate priority, however, should be on developing the different mechanisms.
Decision:

6.4 The Chair declared consensus on the following decisions:

BOD/2018/06-10—Financing Options: The Board of Directors:

1. Requests the World Bank as Trustee to make the appropriate arrangements to introduce the Euro as a second Holding Currency of the GPE Fund, and agrees to provide euro grant allocations in addition to US dollars and further:

   a. Notes there will be an increase in Trustee fees to be incorporated within the annual trustee budget request.

   b. Delegates authority to the Secretariat in consultation with the Trustee to approve the necessary administrative changes to GPE’s governance documents, donor contribution agreements, and financial procedures agreements to facilitate this approach.

   c. Delegates authority to the Secretariat to instruct the Trustee as to which currency donor contributions should be held in/converted to and to authorize currency conversion from euro to dollar and vice versa to facilitate liquidity management.

   d. Determines that the us dollar maximum country allocations or grant ceilings may be converted to euros upon request to the Secretariat, provided the notification has been received prior to submission of the grant application and with the agreement of the grant agent.

   e. Agrees that the exchange rate used to determine the euro equivalent of a us dollar maximum country allocation or grant ceiling shall be the official World Bank exchange rate in effect on the date the request is received by the Secretariat.

2. Agrees that in addition to investing GPE Funds in the existing model portfolios, that the Trustee is also authorized to invest GPE Funds in Model Portfolio 4 as outlined in BOD/2018/06 DOC 08 which includes investments in equities, based on the current practice of liquidity projections provided by the GPE Secretariat as part of quarterly trust fund rebalancing exercises.

3. Approves the new and/or revised maximum country allocations for education sector program implementation grants as set out in Annex 3. The allocation for these countries will remain valid through the final application round of 2020 unless otherwise adjusted by the Board, and will be subject to the requirements of the GPE funding model.

BOD/2018/06-11—Financing Options- KIX: The Board of Directors:

1. Confirms that the initial allocation of US$60 million for the Knowledge and Innovation Exchange Mechanism be maintained over the period of 2018-2021. Given that targeted financing pledges of US $1 million have been made to date, $59 million will be made available from unrestricted funds.

2. Determines that it will consider an increase in the level of funding of approximately $20 million based on a recommendation from SIC by June 2019 or as soon as possible thereafter to factor in initial progress with the implementation of KIX, demand for the mechanism, and confirmation from the FRC through the semi-annual financial forecast that there continues to be sufficient unallocated funds available to facilitate any increase.
3. Notes that the allocations for KIX are to facilitate the financing of 6 themes over three years, the Learning Exchange, the costs of the grant agent for the management of the thematic funding, and any related Secretariat administrative costs for the overall management of KIX (including the US1.5 million already approved).

4. Notes that the initial allocation for KIX is below the aspiration of reaching 5-6% of GPE’s overall portfolio to support Knowledge and Innovation Exchange. The Secretariat is strongly encouraged to proactively seek to raise targeted financing that could be additional to bring overall financing for KIX closer to 5% of overall expenditures.

**BOD/2018/06-12—Financing Options- ASA:**

The Board of Directors:

1. Confirms that the initial allocations of US$60 million for the Advocacy and Social Accountability Mechanism be maintained over the period of 2018-2021.

2. Determines that it will consider an increase in the level of funding of approximately $10 million based on a recommendation from SIC by June 2019 or as soon as possible thereafter to factor in initial progress with the implementation of ASA, demand for the mechanism, and confirmation from the FRC through the semi-annual financial forecast that there continues to be sufficient unallocated funds available to facilitate any increase.

3. Notes that the allocations for ASA is to facilitate the financing of the three operational components of ASA; as well as the administrative costs of grant agent management of ASA funding and the costs of learning partners that are contracted to support ASA grantees.

**Multiplier: Options for Scaling up, Eligibility, Allocation Model, and Improving Operations**

**Discussion:**

6.5 Several Board members welcomed the progress made in rolling out the Multiplier. The following key points were raised by a number of Board members:

- **Additionality:** More analysis on tracking of additionality, and an amendment to the proposed decision language to reflect this point.

- **Debt sustainability:** Actions taken to analyze and mitigate risks related to debt sustainability and inclusion of these actions in the GPE Risk Matrix.

- It was agreed that the Secretariat would report on additionality, tracking of funds and risk mitigation as standing items in the FRC report back to the Board.

**Decision:**

6.6 The Chair declared consensus on the following decision, as revised:

**BOD/2018/06-13- GPE Multiplier: Options for Scaling Up, Eligibility, Allocation Model, and Improving Operations. The Board of Directors decides to:**

1. Scale up the GPE Multiplier’s resources in accordance with Option 2 set out in Section 6
of BOD/2018/06 DOC 09 and enable countries to apply throughout the 2018-2020 period.

2. Adjust eligibility to access the GPE Multiplier to those countries included as per Option 1 set out in Section 8 of BOD/2018/06 DOC 09 and adjust Maximum Country Allocations from the GPE Multiplier to match those in Model B set out in Section 8.

3. Integrate the proposed process modifications into its operations as set out in Section 9 to improve efficiency and effectiveness, including delegating authority to the Grants and Performance Committee to approve Maximum Country Allocations for the Multiplier based on Board-approved eligibility criteria and allocation model.

4. Regularly update the FRC and Board regarding progress operationalizing the Multiplier including information on additionality, and drawdown of resources.

**Update on other FRC topics**

6.7 The Secretariat provided an update on the Education Sector Investment Case (ESIC). Details are available in the PowerPoint presentation posted on the GPE website.

**Update on Misuse of Funds**

6.8 The Secretariat provided an update on current cases of Misuse of Funds. It was requested that the Secretariat report back to at the next meeting of the Board on lessons learned from the cases to date.

**THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 2018**

7. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

7.1 The Executive Session covered the following topics: (1) the next course of action in relation to GPE Institutional Arrangements, (2) the Secretariat Strategic Plan Implementation Plan and Operating Expenses Budget FY 18-19, (3) Extension of the Board Chair Term, (4) Report back on the CEO performance for 2017-2018, (5) the GPE CEO Priorities for 2018-2019.

**Decisions:**

7.2 The Board approved the following decisions:

**BOD/2018/06-14 - Charter Amendment.** The Board of Director approves the following amendment to clause 4.3.3 of the Charter as follows:

*The Chair is selected by the Board through an open competitive process. Ordinarily, the Board will appoint the Chair for an initial three-year term and would maintain the option of extending for a second three-year term following a performance review process. In exceptional circumstances, the Board may extend for a third term of up to three years if it so determines that doing so is in the best interests of GPE.*

**BOD/2018/06-15 - Term of GPE Board Chair:**

In accordance with BOD/2018/06-14 (Charter Amendment), the Board elects to a further extension of the Chair, Julia Gillard, from March 1, 2019 to February 28, 2021, noting the exceptional circumstances relating to the critical nature of the Board’s consideration of GPE’s long
– term institutional arrangements and the importance of ensuring continuity of leadership and support as the Board prepares for the next strategic plan and replenishment. The Board also notes the exceptional performance of the Chair during the successive terms of service.

**BOD/2018/06-16—2018-2019 GPE Priorities for CEO Performance Feedback: The Board of Directors:**

1. Endorses the proposed GPE Priorities as attached in BOD/2018/06 DOC 10 Annex 1 as the basis for the CEO feedback in 2018-19.

**BOD/2018/06-17 – Strategic Plan Implementation Plan and Secretariat Work Plan and Budget: July 2018 – June 2019. The Board of Directors:**

1. Endorses the Implementation Plan detailing work underway or to be completed to deliver on GPE 2020 and beyond as set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2018/06/DOC 11.

2. Notes that the Implementation Plan will continue to be updated annually as informed by progress toward the goals and objectives in GPE’s Strategic Plan and Results Report.

3. Approves an incremental amount of US$37,166,000 to fund the FY19 Operating Expenses Budget as set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 11 for the period July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019 including US$2,251,000 for the third-year budget of the Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy.

4. Authorizes the GPE Secretariat to carryover any unspent FY18 funds related to the second-year budget of the Monitoring & Evaluation Strategy (M&E) into FY19.

5. Noting that there would be no increase in the overall headcount from the current Board approved levels agrees that:

   o based on the analysis of the lessons learned from the replenishment campaign that four existing term limited positions previously approved as part of the replenishment surge be integrated into the ongoing regular headcount of the Secretariat to continue advocacy and resource mobilization efforts as part of the current replenishment period and to prepare for the next replenishment campaign.

   o based on the decision to integrate the Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange initiatives on learning assessments, early learning, and gender through related themes under the Knowledge and Innovation Exchange mechanism, the three existing staff positions previously approved under those initiatives and financed through targeted contributions may be integrated into the regular headcount of the Secretariat once targeted funding for those positions has been fully utilized.

**BOD/2018/06-18- Institutional Arrangements: The Board of Directors:**

1. Expresses its appreciation to the World Bank for the role it has and continues to play as Trustee, Grant Agent, and administrative host to the Secretariat during a period of significant growth and change for GPE.

2. Recognizes that GPE’s current institutional arrangements must be considered in the context of ensuring GPE has the operational capability it needs to meet the ambition of GPE2020 and beyond. Therefore, with a view to making a decision by December 2018 requests:
a. The Board Chair to convene an ad hoc group comprised of the Board Vice-Chair, and one Board or Alternate member representing each of the Donor, Civil Society/PS/PF, and Developing Country Partner constituency categories.
b. The ad hoc group with the support of a suitably qualified expert and taking into account the offer from the World Bank to submit a proposal clarifying hosting parameters for GPE will:
   • convey to the World Bank, GPE’s potential future directions, required capabilities, and desired governance arrangements to enable the World Bank to produce a fully informed best offer regarding GPE’s continued hosting arrangement.
   • liaise with the World Bank to explore the potential for any hybrid model that could include establishing a separate legal entity for GPE while retaining some or all of the hosting relationship.
   • provide an analysis of the World Bank’s best offer to the Board
   • provide an analysis of the alternative option to establish a separate legal personality for GPE, and to transition the Secretariat’s hosting relationship with the World Bank to one that is directly accountable to the GPE Board.

3. The Board suggests that the funding, procurement, and contract management of the above work be provided by a GPE partner to maximize independence. In the event that an external funding source is not identified by 30th June 2018, or the procurement process is not feasible within the desired November 2018 deadline, the Board Chair may authorize the GPE Secretariat to facilitate the procurement process and fund it from the operating expenses budget.

4. The Secretariat to contract a suitably qualified external firm(s) to develop and submit a detailed assessment of required actions and costs for the Board’s consideration in the event that the Board takes a decision to establish a separate legal entity.

5. The TORs and timelines of both studies should be agreed by the ad hoc group, and communicated to the Board to allow for a short period of consultation.

6. The findings of the studies should be communicated to the Board simultaneously and in time for the November 2018 Board retreat.

8. REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

The donor 1 representative on the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) presented an update on the work of the Committee including key findings of the Board and Committee Self-Assessments, the GPE Response to Sexual Exploitation in the Aid Sector and the Committee workplan for the remainder of 2018. Details are available in the PowerPoint presentation posted on the GPE website.

9. MANAGING RISK AND RISK POLICY

This session is a continuation of the update from the Finance and Risk Committee and focuses on items specifically related to risk including the Operational Risk Framework, the Risk Management Report, and the Risk Policy review that was undertaken by the consultancy firm Oliver Wyman. Representatives from the Secretariat and from the consultancy firm presented on these topics. Details are available in the PowerPoint presentations posted on the GPE website.
Discussion:

9.1 The following key points were raised:

- **Domestic resources risk:** Raised the narrow framing of the risk associated with the monitoring of domestic finance commitments in terms of share rather than size of budget. Other Board members also raised the question of indicator 10 and timeline for review.

- **IFFED and ECW:** Questioned the rationale behind the level of risk assigned to IFFED and ECW given that these funds present clear opportunities to strengthen country-level support. One member raised a concern as to whether the GPE Board needs to take a formal position on IFFED as it had on ECW. The FRC Chair noted that it was premature for the Board to take a formal position on IFFED given its current stage of development. The Secretariat noted that the formulation of the risk has now changed, and that it welcomes participation on IFFED and continuing the ongoing work with ECW in particular to strengthen country level processes.

- **Grant agents:** Noted that the risk related to finding suitable grant agents should also note the lack of options in this regard. The fact that only a handful of organizations sign up for the role of grant agent should be reflected in the risk and related mitigation measures.

9.2 Board members noted the proposed findings of the external risk review, and the roadmap discussed by the FRC for taking forward the recommendations outlined in it.

Decision:

9.3 The Chair declared consensus on the following decision:

**BOD/2018/06-19—Risk Management Report:** The Board of Directors:

1. Endorses the changes to the Risk Matrix, including update on current mitigations actions and addition of future mitigation actions, revisions to the overall score of some risks, and update on risk wording, as presented in BOD/2018/6 DOC 13.

2. Requests the Secretariat to commence implementation of the recommendations arising from the external review of risk management based on existing resources and capacity and to report to the FRC on progress at its next meeting.

10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**Private Sector Constituency**

10.1 The Board Chair noted that this session is a continuation of the May 30 Board Audio-Call where the recommendation to split the Private Sector/Private Foundations seat was considered. The call was marred with technical difficulties which made the discussion and decision-making challenging. She noted that a number of comments and suggested amendments to the decision language were received after the call which gave rise to the recommended decision presented at this meeting.

Discussion:

10.2 The following key points were raised:
• **Concerns with process and due diligence**: Expressed concern with the process noting that the creation of private sector seat carries with it implications for governance including with regard to decision-making, the composition of Committees and the need for GEC procedural review. It was also noted that important issues like this require more structured consultation prior to Board consideration, and a face-to-face discussion rather than an audio call, with due consideration for placing the item high on the agenda.

• **Signal to the private sector**: Noted the positive engagement their organization has had with the private sector. They further expressed concern that delaying the establishment of a seat would send a negative message to the private sector and result in missed opportunities. Board members also noted that delaying the establishment of a private sector seat might have unintended consequences and could hinder its future engagement.

• **Criteria of eligibility**: Suggested developing eligibility criteria for private sector participation at the Board that would include human rights record, tax transparency and stronger conflict of interest disclosures. It was also noted, however, that establishing such criteria would place a higher bar on the private sector compared to other constituencies, and contravenes the GPE Charter.

**Decision:**

10.3 The Board adopted the following decision:

**BOD/2018/06-20—Splitting of the PS/PF Seat: The Board of Directors:**

1. Recognizes and values the role the Private Sector has played in the GPE partnership and can continue to play.

2. Requests the GEC to:
   a. Further explore the addition of a Private Sector constituency as the 20th constituency to the GPE Board of Directors, comprised of a Board Member and Alternate Board Member, with an effective date of January 1, 2019.
   b. Identify the implications of a proposed addition of a Private Sector constituency on Board and Committee structures and consequential changes to relevant policies and procedures, including constituency categories and Committee composition, in order to successfully incorporate a Private Sector constituency into GPE governance while maintaining the Partnership’s balanced decision-making structures and processes.
   c. In coordination with the development of the Private Sector Engagement Strategy, develop expectations of Private Sector representatives, including elements such as financial or in-kind contributions to GPE, and criteria of eligibility of inclusion in a potential Private Sector constituency.
   d. Report their recommendations on these matters back to the Board for decision in December 2018, with an effective date of January 1, 2019.

3. Requests the Secretariat to update the procedures for the upcoming nomination and election of Board Members, Committee Chairs, and Committee Members to include the potential addition of a Private Sector constituency.

4. Notes that a comprehensive and open constituency review will be completed in time for the 2020-21 Board and Committee terms and that this review should consider a broad range of options to further strengthen the partnership.
Next Board Meetings:

10.4 The Board Chair confirmed the dates of the Board retreat and Board meetings for the remainder of the year:

- November 6-7, 2018 – Board retreat in Washington, D.C
- December 6-7, 2018 – Board meeting in Dublin, Ireland (confirmed ex-post)

Appreciation Karen Mundy

10.5 The Chair and the CEO informed the Board that this would be the last Board meeting that Karen Mundy, Chief Technical Officer at GPE, would attend. The Board thanked her for her invaluable contribution, leadership and service during her time as CTO.

The Board Chair adjourned the meeting.

11. ANNEX

Annex 1: Participants List
## ANNEX 1 : PARTICIPANTS’ LIST *(in alphabetical order)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last, First Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adlide, Geoff</td>
<td>Manager, Advocacy and Communications</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadi, M Farooq</td>
<td>GPE Programme Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmat, Youssouf Tahir</td>
<td>Directeur général de l’agence pour la promotion des initiatives communautaires en éducation, Tchad</td>
<td>Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de la promotion civique</td>
<td>Chad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akstein, Natalie</td>
<td>Networks Engagement Coordinator</td>
<td>Global Campaign for Education</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alam, Md. Monsurul</td>
<td>Deputy Chief</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary and Mass Education</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright, Alice</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, David</td>
<td>Head of Public Services</td>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asif-us-Zaman, Mohammad</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary and Mass Education</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubry, Sylvain</td>
<td>Legal and Research Advisor</td>
<td>Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Tony</td>
<td>Tony Baker</td>
<td>RESULTS Educational Fund</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balde, Mamadou</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benveniste, Luis</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boe, Kira</td>
<td>Senior education advocacy advisor</td>
<td>Oxfam IBIS</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne, Josephine</td>
<td>Associate Director, Education</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucher, David</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Reed Smith</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody, Raphaëlle</td>
<td>education advisor</td>
<td>Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brüning, Marie</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlier, Valérie</td>
<td>Education advisor</td>
<td>FPS Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherevatova, Natalia</td>
<td>Operations Officer</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, Tae sang</td>
<td>Senior Project Coordinator</td>
<td>GBC-Education</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabu, Maria Helen</td>
<td>Deputy Coordinator</td>
<td>ASPBAE - Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Ceuster, Jan</td>
<td>Coordinator Education, Training and Employment</td>
<td>Enabel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Vozzo, Donatella</td>
<td>Education Economist</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diop, Sabine</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>German BACKUP Initiative Education in Africa - GIZ</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diouck, Mamadou</td>
<td>Conseiller technique</td>
<td>Ministère Education nationale du Sénégal</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dommartin, Anne-Charlotte</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Human Development Unit</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Europe et des Affaires étrangères</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducos, Regine</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>German BACKUP Initiative Education, GIZ</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekirapa, Martha</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Education</td>
<td>Ministry of education</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Barhami, Dalila</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>Education International</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks, Phil</td>
<td>Education Adviser</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endres, Daniel</td>
<td>Director of the Division of Resilience and Solutions</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engwall, Paula</td>
<td>Senior Policy Specialist</td>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essefiani, Rajae</td>
<td>Conseillère auprès de la Secrétaire générale de la Francophonie</td>
<td>Organisation internationale de la Francophonie</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife, Paul Richard</td>
<td>Director, Global Health and Education</td>
<td>Norad</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floren, Annica</td>
<td>Acting Head of Unit</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focas Licht, Margarita</td>
<td>Country Support Team Manager</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracchia, Alice</td>
<td>International Cooperation Officer</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruman, Cecile Audrey</td>
<td>Sr. Manager</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear, Sally</td>
<td>Head of Profession for Education</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger, Henriette</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giannechini, Laura</td>
<td>CLADE's Institutional Development Coordinator and CSEF LAC Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillard, Julia</td>
<td>GPE Board Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godana, Tekaligine</td>
<td>Senior programme manager</td>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden, April</td>
<td>Donor Relations Officer: Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudiaby, Gisèle</td>
<td>Operations Analyst</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Lewis, Suzanne</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>UNESCO IIEP</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves, Sue</td>
<td>Director, Health and Education Funds</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grob, Randa</td>
<td>Special Advisor</td>
<td>Porticus</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannon, Carol Maria</td>
<td>Policy Lead - Education</td>
<td>IrishAid / Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henfry, Sally-Anne</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Staff and Adviser to the Board Chair</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert, Alicia</td>
<td>Head of Children, Youth and Education Department</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjarrand, Jessica R</td>
<td>Senior Analyst and Foundations Constituency Focal Point</td>
<td>Porticus</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holst, Haldis</td>
<td>Deputy General Secretary</td>
<td>Education International</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, Rudolf</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jager, Marjeta</td>
<td>Deputy Director-General</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabore, Ibrahima</td>
<td>Secrétaire Permanent du PDSEB</td>
<td>Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Timothy</td>
<td>Special Assistant</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khattri, Nidhi</td>
<td>Lead Evaluation Officer</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibesaki, Aya</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsztajn, Ilana</td>
<td>Governance Officer</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konita, Naohisa</td>
<td>Senior Operations Officer</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazic, Maja</td>
<td>Senior Education Officer</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lervåg, Astrid</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
<td>Norad</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leumer, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Head of CSEF Programme</td>
<td>Global Campaign for Education</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovegrove, Bernard</td>
<td>Asia Pacific CSEF Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>ASPBAE</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabiala, Ma-Umba</td>
<td>Directeur de l’éducation et de la jeunesse</td>
<td>Organisation internationale de la Francophonie</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macpherson, Ian Robert Georges</td>
<td>Education Specialist for Global, Regional and Thematic Initiatives</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magni, Loredana</td>
<td>Senior Development Cooperation Adviser</td>
<td>Directorate General for Development Cooperation - MOFA</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez, Raphaeille</td>
<td>Sr Education Specialist - Team Lead</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesen, Michelle</td>
<td>Sr. Partnerships Officer - Team Lead</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mettille, Jeff</td>
<td>Policy Adviser</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moussy, Hugues</td>
<td>Head of Research and Development</td>
<td>IIEP-UNESCO</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundy, Karen Elizabeth</td>
<td>Chief Technical Officer</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwansa, Louis</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ministry of General Education</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naidoo, Jordan Perumal</td>
<td>Director, Education 2030</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoe Epsa Akpo-Gna, Koumbon Solange</td>
<td>Capacity Building Manager</td>
<td>ANCEFA</td>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicod, Chantal</td>
<td>Chied of West African Division and Education</td>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuriddin, H.E. Said</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okagaki, Satomi</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olavarria Perez, Maria Jose</td>
<td>Board Operations Officer</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostermann, Thomas</td>
<td>Head of Education</td>
<td>Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouaro, Stanislas</td>
<td>Ministre</td>
<td>Ministère de l'éducation Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacios, Alejandro Jose</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascual, Jay</td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power, Padraig</td>
<td>Chief Finance and Operations Officer</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafique, Atif</td>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawle, Georgina</td>
<td>Principal Consultant Economist</td>
<td>Oxford Policy Management</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razafindralambo, Prisca H. Hamintsoa</td>
<td>focal point of GPE for Madagascar, Director of Training and Inspection of Secondary Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez-Perez, Evelyn</td>
<td>Director, Office of Education</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosendahl, Anna</td>
<td>Head of Unit for Global Social Development</td>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxburgh, Rose</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Health and Education Funds</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddle, Nicola</td>
<td>Education Consultant</td>
<td>Oxford Policy Management</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroh, Karen</td>
<td>Head of Donor Relations</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinwari, H.E. Ibrahim</td>
<td>Deputy Minister - General Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth, Nancy</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Global Affairs Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumerfield, Douglas</td>
<td>Senior Operations Officer</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svihlrik, Jan</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot, Theodore</td>
<td>Senior Financial Officer / GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapp, Charles William Nicolas</td>
<td>Manager, External Relations</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terlecki, Sabine Bettina</td>
<td>Partnership Specialist</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiam, H.E. Serigne Mbaye</td>
<td>Minister, Vice-chair</td>
<td>GPE Vice Chair</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomassen, Stine</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrez Mendoza, Johana Elena</td>
<td>Pedagoga</td>
<td>Ministerio de Educación</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyke, Johanna</td>
<td>Board Operations Officer</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagshal, Julie</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajega, Juliet Sasagah</td>
<td>Deputy General Secretary</td>
<td>Uganda National Teachers’ Union (UNATU)</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wane, Michelle Keza</td>
<td>Senior Board Operations Assistant</td>
<td>GPE Secretariat</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, Angela</td>
<td>Senior Financial Officer</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yai, H.E. Deng Hoc</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of General Education and Instruction</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshida, Kazuhiro</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Hiroshima University</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zehra, Kaneez</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
<td>Education and Initiative of Access to Quality Education</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuvaidualloev, Mukhibullo</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>International Presidential School</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVISIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE VOTE PROCEDURE- REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

For Decision

**Please note:** Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them at the Board meeting. It is understood that Committees will circulate Board documents among their members prior to the Board meeting for consultation purposes.

1. **STRATEGIC PURPOSE**

1.1 The purpose of this paper is for the Board of Directors to approve a set of minor adjustments to the Affirmative Vote procedure as well as its expanded use beyond ESPIG and Multiplier grant approvals.

**Summary of Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) Deliberations**

- The Committee recognized the value of the Affirmative Vote procedure as an effective Board decision-making mechanism;

- The Committee noted, however, that the introduction of the procedure has not yet yielded its intended outcome namely to protect Board time for more strategic deliberations;

- Committee members were generally in agreement of extending the procedure to non-grant decisions but requested that the determination of which non-grant decisions will be presented for Affirmative Vote be made by the Board Chair in consultation with the Coordinating Committee;

- In addition, the GEC requested that the principle of consultation with Board constituencies be upheld for all decisions brought forward for Affirmative Vote that are not related to ESPIG and Multiplier Grants.
2. REQUESTED RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Governance and Ethics Committee recommends the following decision to the Board:

BOD/2018/12-XX—Affirmative Vote Procedure: The Board of Directors in reference to BOD/2017/06-08 and BOD/2017/12-04, extends the use of the Affirmative Vote procedure to Board decisions beyond those related to approval of ESPIG and Multiplier Grants per the Affirmative Vote procedure included in Annex 1.

3. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 At the December 2016 Board meeting, the Board approved to increase the annual funding rounds for education sector program implementation grants (ESPIGs) from two to four to better accommodate the diverse country planning cycles. In June 2017, as part of the Decision Framework and as a means of enabling timely approvals of grant applications, the Board approved the Affirmative Vote procedure (BOD/2017/06-08). In the Affirmative Vote procedure, a decision is considered approved if a majority of constituencies including at least three out of the four constituency groupings provide their express approval, on condition that any objection received is dealt with prior to the end of the voting period. In December 2017 (BOD/2017/12-04), the Board agreed to minor adjustments to the procedure in light of lessons learned from initial trials and, in June 2018 (BOD/2018/06-05), it expanded its use to Multiplier grants. To date, thirteen grant allocations have been approved through the Affirmative Vote procedure, during four distinct rounds.

3.2 In addition to the Affirmative Vote procedure, the Board has other decision-making procedures at its disposal namely:

Consensus-based decisions during face-to-face meetings: This is the preferred procedure as it allows the Board to thoroughly discuss issues over the course of a meeting.

Voting during face-to-face meetings. While not preferred and rarely used, a decision may be approved by the Board via a vote if there is quorum and a majority of Board members present vote in favor of the decision, provided that such majority includes at least one Board member representing each of the following: (i) developing countries; (ii) donor countries; (iii) CSOs or the private sector/private foundations; and (iv) a multilateral agency.

Consensus-based decisions during Board audio calls. This procedure allows for timely decision-making and real-time engagement, but its effectiveness is often marred by technical
difficulties including connection and interpretation issues. The limited time available for Board audio-calls is also restrictive.

**Non-objection decisions via email.** With this procedure, a proposal that relates to administrative or procedural issues and is not material is sent to the Board or a Committee via email for decision. The proposal is automatically approved unless any objections are received. This procedure, too, allows for timely decision-making. However, it has several drawbacks. First, it is only applicable to routine, non-controversial items. Second, it is a passive form of decision-making as no action is required from Board members to state approval. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that Board or Committee members have adequately taken note of the non-objection communication.

3.3 By providing a platform for Board decision-making in between meetings, the Affirmative Vote procedure has proven useful for ensuring that time-sensitive grant decisions are made on a rolling basis throughout the year, thus freeing up the Board’s time for discussion and decision on critical agenda items during its biannual meetings. The increased use of the consent agenda for face-to-face meetings has also proven useful in for protecting Board time for strategic discussions.

3.4 While the Affirmative Vote procedure does have in-built limitations such as a lack of a facility for real-time engagement and discussion, experience has shown that it is an adequate tool for active decision-making by the Board on matters that do not require additional discussion in person or on a call, beyond those that took place at the Committee level and gave rise to the recommendation in the first instance.

3.5 Currently, there is no such mechanism for Board decision-making on matters other than grant approvals. The non-objection procedure, the other remote decision-making process at the Board’s disposal in between meetings, is limited to administrative and procedural matters that are not material in addition to being, as noted prior, a passive form of decision-making.

3.6 Given the success of the Affirmative Vote procedure, and with view of continuing to protect Board time for more strategic discussions during its face-to-face meetings, the Governance and Ethics Committee is recommending an expansion of the procedure to other types of decisions beyond those strictly related to the approval of ESPIG or Multiplier grants. In this case, the Board Chair, in consultation with the Coordinating Committee, may decide to bring recommendations beyond those related to ESPIG and Multiplier grants for Board decision via Affirmative Vote provided that these (1) have been discussed at the committee level and have therefore been consulted with Board constituencies as per usual committee practice, and (2) the Board Chair and the Coordinating Committee do not anticipate a need for additional discussion. Decisions for recommendation via
Affirmative Vote could include, for example, the approval of the travel policy which would have been discussed prior to recommendation by both the GEC and the FRC (who would formally recommend). The Affirmative Vote procedure could also be used for approval of grant allocations that are already permitted such as KIX and ASA.

3.7 In as much as it is the Board Chair’s discretion to submit decisions to the Board for its approval via Affirmative Vote, so is the ability to pull a decision from the Affirmative Vote platform should the Chair consider that there is a need for further Board discussion on the matter.

3.8 In addition to an expansion of the use of the Affirmative Vote procedures, the Governance and Ethics Committee is also requesting that voting modalities be clarified to include the option of submitting a vote via email. While experience has shown that most of the constituencies do not encounter issues in accessing the eTeam site, for those who do face technical challenges in casting their vote, the option of submitting their vote via email should be allowed and explicitly stated as such in the procedure. As per past practice, email votes are to be submitted to the Governance Team by the Board member, Alternate Board member, or an individual authorized by the constituency to vote with copy to the Board and Alternate Board members.

4. **NEXT STEPS**

4.1 Should the Board approve the recommendation, the Affirmative Vote will be updated to reflect recommended changes.

5. **PLEASE CONTACT** Padraig Power ([ppower@globalpartnership.org](mailto:ppower@globalpartnership.org)) or Maria Jose Olavarria ([molavarriaperez@globalpartnership.org](mailto:molavarriaperez@globalpartnership.org)) for further information.

6. **ANNEXES**

Annex 1 – Revised Affirmative Vote Procedure
Annex 1: Revised Affirmative Vote Procedure

Decision-Making

a. Decisions at Meetings; Exception. All decisions by the Board shall be taken at a meeting held in accordance with the provisions of these operating procedures (including notice and quorum), except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Board Chair. In such circumstances and provided that the decision relates to administrative or procedural issues and is not material, the Board may be requested to approve a decision by email using a non-objection procedure in lieu of a meeting. Board members shall be provided with sufficient background materials and proposed decision text in such requests. Board members shall be provided with no less than ten (10) calendar days to state an objection. Should an objection be received from any Board member that is not retracted before the deadline for objections, the decision will not be considered approved. Decisions on allocations for Education Sector Program Implementation and Multiplier Grants are preferably decided by Affirmative Vote. In addition, the Board Chair in consultation with the Coordinating Committee may decide to make use of the Affirmative Vote procedure for decisions beyond those related to ESPIG and Multiplier Grants, on a case-by-case, provided these decisions have been discussed at the committee level and therefore consulted prior, and for which there is a determination that no additional discussion is warranted. Constituencies cast their vote on the dedicated Affirmative Vote platform. However, votes received by email are also allowed provided that the vote is cast by the Board or Alternate Board member (or an authorized representative) within the specified deadline. An Affirmative Vote decision is considered approved if a majority of constituencies including at least three out of the four constituency groupings give their express approval, provided that any objection received is dealt with prior to the end of the voting period.
DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN RELATION TO COSTED EXTENSION REQUEST CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND III: REPORT FROM THE GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

For Decision

Please note: Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them. It is understood that constituencies will circulate Board documents among their members prior to the Committee meeting for consultation purposes.

Rev. 1: Revisions have been captured in redline and are based on the submission of a revised estimate from the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) on December 4, 2018 on the cost of a nine-month extension.

STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to request the Board to approve a delegation to the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) to approve a forthcoming request from the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) for a costed extension of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) III. GCE serves as Grant Agent for the CSEF.

Summary of Committee Deliberations

The Grants and Performance Committee discussed the proposal to recommend the Board delegate authority to either the Committee or the Secretariat to approve the request for a costed extension of the CSEF. The GPC agreed that if the grant extension was in the range of US$1.4 million to US$2.8 million (based on a three to six-month scenarios) that the Secretariat might be delegated authority. However, given the amount of the costed extension is to be approximately US$4.5 million, for nine months, the Grants and Performance Committee is requesting that the Committee itself review the costed extension and be delegated authority for its approval.

2. RECOMMENDED DECISION

2.1 The Grants and Performance Committee recommends the Board approve the following decision:

BOD/2018/12-XX—Request for Costed Extension of Civil Society Education Fund: The Board of Directors:
1. Delegates authority to the Grants and Performance Committee to review and approve a costed extension not to exceed US$4.4 million from the Global Campaign for Education for the CSEF grant, presently set to expire on December 31, 2018.

2. Reduces the funding available for the Advocacy and Social Accountability mechanism by a corresponding amount from US$60 million to US$55.5 million.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 GPE has been supporting national education coalitions through CSEF since 2009. The third phase of CSEF was originally expected to be implemented between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2018. In March 2017, the Board adopted the Financing and Funding Framework, which makes provision for a successor to the CSEF in the new Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA) funding mechanism. There has been significant progress towards operationalizing ASA in 2018: the blueprint for the ASA mechanism was approved by the Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC) on September 20, Oxfam IBIS was nominated as the Grant Agent on September 6 by the SIC and accredited by the Finance and Risk Committee (FRC) on October 2. Oxfam IBIS is currently developing the ASA Portfolio Proposal which is now scheduled to be reviewed by the SIC in January 2019. Once it assesses the proposal as ready, the SIC will recommend it to the Board for approval. Oxfam IBIS will only operationalize all of the components of the ASA funding mechanism once this approval from the Board has been secured.

3.2 GCE has already submitted a request to the Secretariat’s Grant Applications Review Committee (GARC), for a no cost extension for CSEF which will allow national education coalitions to continue their activities until March 31, 2019. A no cost extension would also extend the period of reporting to allow GCE as the Grant Agent to close the books by June 30, 2019. This request has been approved by the GARC.

3.3 Based on discussions with Oxfam IBIS, it may take approximately eight months to operationalize the ASA mechanism and complete a call for proposals from national education coalitions, once the ASA Portfolio Proposal is approved by the Board. In such a scenario, the no cost extension will not be sufficient to bridge the gap between CSEF and the ASA implementation period. The GCE prepared a calculation for the costed extension which was reviewed by the GPE Secretariat. It includes three scenarios of three, six and nine months extension, with the budget ranging from US$1.4 million (for three months covering the period April – June 2019), US$2.8 million (for six months covering the period April – September 2019) to US$4.1 million (for nine months covering the period April – December 2019). Under the current circumstances and following the submission...
of a revised estimate from GCE on December 4, 2018, GCE is likely to submit a costed extension request for nine months, requiring US$4.4-US$4.5 million.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR SECRETARIAT RESOURCES AND RISK ANALYSIS

4.1 The current GPE risk framework reviewed by the Finance and Risk Committee identifies the potential risks associated with the ASA mechanism; notably the risk that uncertainty undermines the continuity of civil society engagement while designing the new mechanisms. The risk and its probable mitigation measure were flagged in ASA Board Paper in 2017 (BOD/2017/12 DOC 10) - if delays in the start of the ASA program cannot be mitigated to minimize disruption, the Board may need to consider providing a costed extension to the current CSEF III in the early 2019 period.

4.2 Considering the aforementioned risk from the discontinuity of support to a key GPE constituency, the Secretariat recommends that the provision of the costed extension for CSEF be considered as an appropriate mitigation measure. Given the expected end of CSEF III activities in March 2019, a decision on such a costed extension would need to take place before the end of the first quarter of 2019.

4.3 Should the Grants and Performance Committee (if delegated) approve the provision of the costed extension, the necessary resources will be obtained from the earmarked funding for ASA, and the resource envelope for ASA will be adjusted accordingly. Following the current proposal for a nine month extension of US$4.4-US$4.5 million, the ASA Portfolio proposal from the Grant Agent should budget for US$55.9-US$55.5 million, instead of US$60 million as per the original allocation.

5. NEXT STEPS

5.1 Should the Board approve the recommendation, the Grants and Performance Committee in its delegated authority will assess the request once received and process the request accordingly.

6. PLEASE CONTACT: Tanvir Muntasim at mtanvir@globalpartnership.org for further information.
APPLICATION OF VARIABLE PART FOR SMALL MULTIPLIER GRANTS, ESPiG-MULTIPLIER COMBINATION GRANTS: REPORT FROM THE GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

For Decision

Please note: Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them at the Board meeting. It is understood that constituencies will circulate Board documents among their members prior to the Board meeting for consultation purposes.

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to ask the Board to approve recommendations from the Grants and Performance Committee to clarify the application of the 30 percent Variable Part in two instances: 1. Allowing countries submitting an application for a Multiplier grant where the allocation does not exceed US$5 million to choose whether to adopt an ex-post Variable Part; 2. Where applications include an education sector program implementation grant and a Multiplier grant and the total grant amount exceeds US$5 million, the standard 30% Variable Part is applied to the combined amount.

2. RECOMMENDED DECISION

2.1 The Grants and Performance Committee recommends the Board approve the following decision:

**BOD/2018/12-XX—Application of Variable Part for Small Multiplier Grants and Combination Grants:** The Board of Directors in reference to BOD/2018/06-08: Reducing Transaction Costs and Improving Efficiency of Applications for ESPIGs:

1. Allows countries applying for a Multiplier grant where the allocation does not exceed US$5 million to choose whether to adopt an ex-post Variable Part.

2. Clarifies that where countries apply for an ESPIG and a Multiplier grant simultaneously and where the combined grant amount exceeds US$5 million, the standard 30% Variable Part applies to the combined grant amount.
2. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

**Multiplier grants of US$5 million and below**

2.1 At the June Board meeting, in the context of reducing transaction costs related to ESPIG approval processes, the Board approved the GPC recommendation to allow countries with ESPIG applications up to US$5 million to choose whether to adopt an ex-post Variable Part. The rationale for the decision considered transaction costs related to designing and processing an application for the Variable Part compared to the value of the Variable Part of smaller-sized grants. The decision was explicitly not applicable to Multiplier grants because the original Board decision on the Multiplier seemed to implicitly impose results-based financing in all cases (for example, Multiplier MCAs are not eligible for an ex-ante approach to the Variable Part, whereby the transfer of the variable tranche is not linked to actual achievement of agreed results). However, the rationale behind giving small ESPIGs the choice of a Variable Part is equally applicable for multiplier grants. The Committee therefore recommends equally applying the Variable Part to stand-alone Multiplier grants up to US$5 million and provide countries with the choice of having a Variable Part.

**ESPIG-Multiplier combination grants of US$5 million and higher**

2.2 Should the Board approve the recommendation above, Multiplier applications of US$5 million and below (in addition to ESPIG applications of US$5 million and below) may choose whether to include an ex-post Variable Part in the grant application. However, this could lead to situations where a country submits an application to access both an ESPIG and a Multiplier maximum country allocation (MCA), each US$5 million or below, and chooses not to have a Variable Part on either. In one scenario, this could mean a US$10 million grant without a Variable Part component where the rationale for providing an optional Variable Part no longer fully holds. The Committee therefore recommends clarifying that in the case of an ESPIG-Multiplier combination with a total grant value over US$5 million, there is a Variable Part on the combined grant allocation.

3. **PLEASE CONTACT**: Margarita Focas Licht (mlicht@globalpartnership.org) for further information.

4. **REFERENCES**

BOD/2018/06-DOC 06 – Reducing Transaction Costs and Improving Efficiency of ESPIG Approval Processes