



**2017 ANNUAL REPORT
CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND (CSEF) 2016-2018**

**This report is submitted by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) to the
Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Secretariat on 24 April 2018,
and covers the period January – December 2017**

Contents

Executive Summary	ii
1. Introduction and Overview of the CSEF Program 2016-18.....	1
2. Contributions to GPE Objectives and Achievements against CSEF Objectives	2
2.1 Contributions to GPE objectives.....	2
2.2 Summary of 2017 achievements against CSEF annual targets	3
2.3 Outcome 1.1 – Inclusivity and representation.....	6
2.4 Outcome 1.2 – Sector policy engagement.....	9
2.5 Outcome 2.1 – Active public outreach.....	13
2.6 Outcome 2.2 – Research and analyses.....	14
2.7 Outcome 3.1 – Civil society engagement in GPE policy processes	16
2.8 Outcome 3.2 – National-regional-global linkages in SDG 4 implementation	19
3. Grant Agent Management and Oversight of the CSEF Program 2017.....	21
3.1 Parallel external evaluation and Mid-Term Review.....	21
3.2 Broad civil society and GCE membership consultations on future funding scenarios.....	22
3.3 Operational quality controls in two regions	22
3.4 GPE Secretariat mission to Africa.....	23
3.5 Education Replenishment and Financing Campaigns	23
3.6 Other technical and capacity support work.....	24
3.7 Reduced HR for CSEF at the Global Secretariat	24
3.8 Embedding systems capacity for CSEF	24
4. Challenges and Remediation Strategies.....	25
5. Progress towards Sustainability and Diversification of Funding.....	26
5.1 National coalitions	26
5.2 Regional and global level efforts.....	27
6. Financial Report for January to December 2017.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Accompanying Annexures and Supporting Documents¹:

Annexures

- A. Summary of Coalitions’ Key Education Focus Areas and Achievements Jan – Dec 2017
- B. Summary of CSEF Internal Audit Findings 2017
- C. CSEF Financial Report: Budget versus Actuals & Variance Analysis Jan-Dec 2017
- D....Comprehensive Financial Report

Supporting Documents

- E. CSEF 2016 -2018 Mid-Term Review, February 11, 2018
- F. LEG Learning Exchange Brief
- G. Resource Mobilization Capacity of Civil Society Education Coalitions: A review by the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF)
- H. E-Directory of Partners Implementing CSEF, February 2018

¹ Submitted as separate attachments to this report, with exception of item E, which was already shared with the GPE Secretariat in March 2018.

Executive Summary

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a global program, established by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) and mainly funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), and coordinated in close partnership with regional education advocacy networks and agencies.

CSEF supports civil society engagement in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring in 62 countries, 29 of which are also fragile or conflict-affected countries. The third phase of CSEF, launched in 2016 for implementation until end 2018, was designed after two previous phases of implementation that began in 2009. The current phase III is in pursuit of three primary objectives:

1. Effective civil society inclusion, representation and engagement in education sector policy dialogue.
2. Active public outreach and generation/use of research and evidence on quality, equity, financing and system reform.
3. National - regional – global linkages and engagement relating to GPE and SDG 4 implementation

CSEF III is in alignment with GPE's 2020 country-level objectives and efforts to strengthen mutual accountability in the education sector, and to provide infrastructure to build capacity and the strategic scope of civil society to increase government accountability, strengthen the impact of education policy implementation and financing at the local level. This report also demonstrates alignment with the mutual goal of strengthening civil society's responsiveness to education policy for the needs of marginalized groups.

This Annual Report documents 2017 achievements at the outcomes level against the CSEF objectives and contributions towards GPE objectives, as well as challenges to program implementation and gains made in resource mobilization. The Report is complemented by a detailed financial report and a number of supporting documents.

Overall Program Oversight

As the CSEF Global Secretariat, GCE has sustained its global education policy engagement capacity support for national and regional implementing partners during the year, including through the production of resource materials, toolkits and learning documents and through organizing cross-regional learning events and CSEF partners' engagement in various GPE policy and communication processes at international level. A key focus has been the global education replenishment and financing campaigns, the new Financing and Funding Framework (FFF) mechanisms, and advocacy on issues emerging from national coalitions and regions, especially in the framework of global SDG 4 and Education 2030.

Gains made during 2016 in developing, introducing and strengthening operational systems - particularly for financial management and reporting, and the monitoring, evaluation and learning components of CSEF - were maintained and enhanced during 2017, and these were firmly embedded within and across the program by the end of the year.

Achievement of CSEF Outcomes and Objectives, and Contributions to GPE Objectives

All of the three program objectives are currently on track for achievement, a finding recently corroborated by the externally conducted Mid-Term Review of CSEF phase III. 4,687 civil society organisations are actively participating as members of the 62 CSEF-supported coalitions, and there is a fairly even inclusion of specific marginalized groups targeted to be reached by CSEF (including youth, women, people with disabilities as well as parents and teachers). However, CSEF recognizes that having an inclusive membership does not ensure representation of diverse voices in national education policy and strategy engagements, and this report provides many examples of how coalitions

actively leverage the knowledge and experience of their diverse membership to inform their planning, governance and advocacy efforts; in so doing strengthening accountability to the constituencies they represent.

Coalitions have continued to demonstrate substantial efforts at sector policy and government engagement and gained significant buy-in, including by those operating where governments are not open towards or actively restrict civil society participation and voice. 83% of coalitions are engaging with the LEG in their country, albeit with differential levels of frequency and LEG membership status, and 65% coalitions are engaging with relevant parliamentary forums or committees, and more are lobbying parliamentarians for the establishment of such committees in contexts where they do not exist. Whether or not navigating through complex political challenges, coalitions garnered important results during 2017 through the mechanisms and strategies of their policy submissions, engagements in the education policy arena and sector plan implementation, high levels of public outreach and mobilization, and gains in producing and using research. CSEF witnessed significant improvement against the research targets in the second half of the year, and found that 2016 and the first semester of 2017 reporting on the research indicator under Outcome 2.2 has likely been an under-estimate as well as an under-estimate of performance against CSEF Objective 2.

For CSEF Objective 3, 2017 saw a solid and increased proportion of coalitions reporting on improved engagement in, and knowledge of, GPE global governance/board decision-making processes: at the national level, 85% coalitions actively voiced their perspectives in GPE CSO2 constituency meetings and in processes through which GPE policies and/or processes (including ESPIG applications or reviews) were deliberated. Moreover, through CSEF-support and coordination, all CSEF-grant supported coalitions (100%) actively participated in at least one national-level, regional and/or global level engagement on SDG 4 implementation during the year. Two areas critical to the implementation of SDG 4 - financing and accountability - were a key focus of analysis and civil society positions put forward and debated.

Barriers hindering program gains

This Annual Report highlights intensive and extensive administrative, programmatic, thematic and technical advocacy capacity support contributions of both the regional partners and the Global Secretariat in realising CSEF achievements. It further demonstrates how the partnership-centered and action-learning approach of CSEF III has been an important contributing factor in augmenting progress towards achievement of all three CSEF objectives, while adding tangible value to efforts to achieve the GPE 2020 country-level objectives. This has not been achieved without challenges, however; CSEF has continued to face and navigate a number of recurring barriers. These include factors related to political instability and/or fragility, political repression of civil society, and shrinking spaces for civil society engagement in sector policy processes. The program has also experienced operational and programmatic limitations related to staffing, budgets, capacity, and time demands – across all three (national, regional and global) levels, and some specific logistical barriers as well as intensive efforts required to maintain implementation of the risk and quality control protocols of the program in a handful of contexts.

Nonetheless and in spite of such inhibiting conditions, CSEF partners have persevered in pursuit of tangibly contributing to the achievement of SDG 4, and one of the strategies included to this end was the implementation of a multi-pronged approach towards improving the likelihood of sustainability.

1. Introduction and Overview of the CSEF Program 2016-18

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a global program, established by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) and mainly funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). A unique and ambitious program, CSEF supports citizen engagement in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring in more than 60 countries, 29 of which are fragile or conflict-affected countries².

CSEF is founded on a shared understanding among key stakeholders that strong, broad-based and locally-driven civil society participation in policy and planning processes is crucial to delivering on national and international education goals and to holding their governments to account for commitments to education. As such, CSEF supports broad-based, democratic and representative national civil society education coalitions working towards achieving inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning. CSEF facilitates grants to these coalitions to support their policy advocacy activities, provides capacity building and accompaniment support to strengthen planning, implementation and impact, and promotes cross-country learning and networking.

Initiated in 2009, CSEF was developed and is managed by GCE, in close collaboration with regional implementing partners. Coordinated through regional agencies that provide programmatic support to coalitions, CSEF works with the following networks in these regions: the Africa Network Campaign for Education for All (ANCEFA) in Africa; the Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE) in Latin America and the Caribbean; the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) in Asia and the Pacific, and; the Arab Campaign for Education for All (ACEA) in the Middle East and Eastern Europe. Two regional Financial Management Agencies (FMAs) are responsible for fund management and technical capacity building: Oxfam-Ibis (CSEF Africa) and ActionAid Americas (CSEF Latin America and the Caribbean). In addition, the GCE Secretariat acts as an interim FMA for the CSEF Middle East and Eastern Europe region as well as for the Asia and Pacific region³.

While CSEF is primarily funded by GPE, complementary funding for CSEF has also been provided by the GIZ's 'German BACKUP Initiative – Education in Africa'. In October 2015, the former GPE Country Grants and Performance Committee (CGPC)⁴ as the delegated authority by the GPE Board, approved US\$28,769,442 in continued financial support to CSEF for the 2016-2018 period, which marked a third implementation phase for CSEF.

This is the second annual report for CSEF phase III. It documents 2017 achievements against the targets set out in the program's approved Results Framework. It captures national, regional and global achievements at the outcomes level against the CSEF objectives as well as contributions towards GPE objectives. This report follows the biannual report submitted to the GPE Secretariat in November 2017, which documented progress at the outputs level and covered the first six months of 2017.

² Fragile or conflict-affected countries as defined by GPE, the GEMR, and the World Bank Harmonised List of 2017.

³ Until end November 2017, the FMA for the CSEF Asia and Pacific region was Education International.

⁴ Formerly the CGPC until late 2016 when it was restructured and renamed the Grants Performance Committee (GPC).

2. Contributions to GPE Objectives and Achievements against CSEF Objectives

2.1 Contributions to GPE objectives

Whilst deliberately allowing the diversity and complexity of national contexts to drive outcomes, the current phase III of CSEF is mapped towards the international agenda of SDG4 and GPE’s strategic aims⁵. As articulated in GPE’s strategic plan covering the years 2016-2020, the partnership’s vision and mission also aligns with the Global Goals for Sustainable Development.

The CSEF III high-level outcome statement is: *“Better informed national policy dialogue and strengthened uptake by government of CSO recommendations and positions regarding public education policy and resource allocation”*. The three CSEF specific objectives are reproduced in Table 1, along with the GPE 2020 Country-Level Objectives which they support.

Table 1: GPE 2020 Country-level Objectives and CSEF III Objectives

GPE 2020 Strategic Plan Country-level Objectives	CSEF III Objectives
<u>Objective 1:</u> Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation.	<u>Objective 1:</u> To support effective civil society representation and engagement in education sector policy dialogue.
<u>Objective 2:</u> Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring.	<u>Objective 2:</u> To support active public outreach and generation/use of research and evidence on quality, equity, financing and education system reform.
<u>Objective 3:</u> GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning.	<u>Objective 3:</u> To ensure global and regional processes relating to GPE and SDG 4 better inform – and are better informed by – national and local civil society.

CSEF-supported coalitions adapt the CSEF III Theory of Change (TOC) to fit their diverse national needs and contexts. This allows coalitions to work on thematic issues relevant to their national context which may be outside of the areas of focus of CSEF III. At the end of 2016, it became evident that some coalitions were unclear of the full scope of CSEF, and so – along with national-regional-global level partner consultations and follow up documentation shared - the proposal templates for CSEF support in 2017 were amended to require, through a phased-in approach, more explicit articulation of nationally-determined TOCs and how these aligned with the CSEF III TOC. This requirement was then further embedded in the second half of 2017 for the proposal process for 2018 CSEF funding support.

This action-learning approach of CSEF III has been an important contributing factor in achievement of all three CSEF objectives, thus adding tangible value to efforts to achieve the GPE2020 country-level objectives. The 2016 and this current 2017 CSEF Annual Report attest to this assertion. Moreover, the recently completed external MTR of CSEF phase III concluded:

“CSEF is currently on track to meet all three objectives as of the mid-term. Many coalitions remain active in working strategically to expand both membership and the ability of its members to meaningfully engage in the education sector. Coalitions have demonstrated a multitude of efforts at government engagement, and significant local buy-in, including by those operating in states where civic participation is not readily accepted by government...Coalitions have demonstrated gains in producing research...[and]...coalitions are also predominantly successful in achieving targets for outreach and community mobilization. Objective 3 (centered on global and regional processes relating to GPE and SDG4), is similarly on track, and a majority of CSEF participants view progress positively” (CSEF 2016-2018 MTR, p9).

⁵ See findings of the CSEF 2016-2018 MTR, p8.

2.2 Summary of 2017 achievements against CSEF annual targets

The CSEF 2016-2018 program targets include reaching and supporting up to 62 national education coalitions in four regions. During the 2017 year this target was met as summarised in the table below, and has remained consistent with the information documented in the biannual report for the first half of the year. A full list of coalitions, showing explanations for variance as well as comparative data in their CSEF funding and support status between 2016 and 2017 is provided in Annex A. In addition, an accompanying document to this report, titled “*E-Directory of CSEF Implementing Partners*”⁶, provides an accessible, quick reference guide on all the partners implementing the CSEF program 2016-2018.

Table 2: Coalitions reached and supported by CSEF Jan-Dec 2017

Region	Countries where coalitions directly CSEF-grant contracted Jan – Dec 2017 <i>Countries in bold italics, were under RS support in 2016.</i>	Countries where coalitions supported by Regional Secretariats Jan – Dec 2017 ⁷ <i>Countries in bold italics were directly CSEF grant-contracted in 2016 or the first half of 2017.</i>
Africa	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Cote D’Ivoire, DRC, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana , Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somaliland , South Sudan , Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe (29).	Burundi, Lesotho (2) ⁸ . <i>NB: Inaugural engagements in Liberia were also supported by the RS in the second semester of the year. As a coalition is still in conceptual formulation stages, Liberia has not been included in the aggregate number of coalitions reached by CSEF in 2017.</i>
Asia and Pacific	Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam (12).	Afghanistan, PNG , Samoa, Solomon Islands , Tajikistan, Timor-Leste ⁹ and Vanuatu (7).
Latin America and the Caribbean	Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua (5).	Nil.
Middle East & Eastern Europe	Albania, Georgia, Moldova, Palestine, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen (7).	Nil.
Totals	53	9

Targets reported at the outcomes level in this report utilise up to date (2017) data and incorporates a confluence of data sources - biannual and annual reports, monitoring data and supporting evidence

⁶ While editorial work on this publication was completed in Q1 of 2018, it was compiled during the second half of 2017, during which time national coalition profiles were incrementally shared with the GPE Secretariat .

⁷ These coalitions are not directly CSEF grant-contracted. Support to these coalitions is under the CSEF operational budget and plans of the relevant Regional Secretariat, and involves supporting emerging or establishing coalitions (such as Afghanistan, Samoa and Tajikistan), remedial actions for previously CSEF grant-contracted coalitions which may be under quality or risk protocol review (such as Lesotho, PNG, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Vanuatu), or are operating in a context where grant disbursements have been restricted due to political unrest in the country (such as Burundi).

⁸ As documented in the CSEF biannual report for 2017: Djibouti was also reached during the first half of 2016, through RS visits to review the composition and orientation of the coalition (FADE), but the coalition did not stand up to the risk assessments and quality assurance protocols of CSEF, so support in Djibouti was cancelled by mid-2016.

⁹ TLCE in Timor-Leste was in receipt of CSEF funds for the first half of 2017, but moved to Regional Secretariat support status during the second half of the year due to CSEF risk profiling and corrective actions being implemented.

of all the 53 coalitions directly CSEF grant-contracted during the 2017 year¹⁰, as well as reports and supporting evidence of the regional structures and the Global Secretariat - to support data triangulation to assess achievements made at aggregate level against the expected outcomes under each objective of the program.

The methodology for assessing achievements against the three composite indicators in the CSEF program Results Framework under objective 1 (indicators 1.1.1 and 1.2.1) and objective 2 (indicator 2.1.1) has remained consistent since the beginning of 2016¹¹.

In line with previous CSEF reports, Table 3 provides a ‘traffic light’ assessment of the quantitative results against targets for 2017. It signals that **all of the three programme objectives are currently on track for achievement, a finding recently corroborated by the externally conducted CSEF Mid-Term Review¹²**. The sections that follow Table 3 provide some brief narrative under each separate indicator and expected outcome. A summary of key education focus areas, progress and achievements during 2017 at the national level is captured in Annex A.

Table 3: Summary of CSEF Results against 2017 targets¹³

Objective 1 – To support effective civil society representation and engagement in education sector policy dialogue.			
Outcome 1.1: Inclusive coalitions that actively engage and represent diverse actors and the most marginalised people.			
Indicators	Year 2 Targets (Dec 2017)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
1.1.1 Number of coalitions achieving strong/adequate (as opposed to weak) inclusivity of civil society (<i>assessed using pre-defined composite indicator methodology</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75% are strong 20% are adequate 	Unsatisfactory progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35.2% (19) are strong [8 coalitions in Africa, 6 in Asia and Pacific, 3 in LA&C, and 2 in the ME&EE region] 53.7% (29) are adequate [16 in Africa, 6 in A&P, 2 in LA&C, and 5 in the ME&EE region] 	Targets partially met <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49% (26) are strong [13 coalitions in Africa, 7 in Asia and Pacific, 2 in LA&C, and 4 in the ME&EE region] 49% (26) are adequate [15 in Africa, 5 in A&P, 3 in LA&C, and 3 in the ME&EE region]
Outcome 1.2: CSEF-supported coalitions actively participate in LEGs and in key sector policy and review processes (including where possible with parliamentary forums).			
Indicators	Year 2 Targets (Dec 2017)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
1.2.1 Number of coalitions achieving strong/adequate (as opposed to weak) engagement in government-led sector dialogue processes (<i>assessed using pre-defined composite indicator methodology</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% are strong 50% are adequate 	Satisfactory progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% (27) are strong [13 coalitions in Africa, 7 in Asia and Pacific, 2 in LA&C, and 5 in the ME&EE region] 24% (13) are adequate [10 in Africa, 1 in A&P, and 2 in LA&C] 	Targets partially met <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49% (26) are strong [14 coalitions in Africa, 6 in Asia and Pacific, 2 in LA&C, and 4 in the ME&EE region] 13% (7) are adequate [6 in Africa, and 1 in A&P]

¹⁰ This excludes data for the Timor-Leste coalition, TLCE, which was in receipt of CSEF funds only in the first half of the year and for which data is included in the CSEF 2017 biannual report.

¹¹ Going forward, lessons emerging from the recently concluded independent MTR on explicitly weighting variables for the composite indicators are under consultative review and consideration for potential application.

¹² The independent MTR was carried out from mid-September 2017 and concluded in mid-February 2018. The final MTR report forms a supporting document to this annual report and, together with GCE’s Management Response, was shared with the GPE Secretariat in March 2018.

¹³ All percentages at December 2017 are calculated out of the total 53 coalitions directly CSEF-grant supported during the year. While data for a 54th CSEF-funded coalition, TLCE in Timor-Leste, was included in the CSEF 2017 biannual report, it is not included in this annual report so as not to skew the data, as CSEF support to TLCE was withdrawn at the end of July 2017.

1.2.2 Proportion of coalitions engaging with relevant parliamentary forums or committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65% of coalitions are engaging 	Moderately satisfactory progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51.9% (28) engaged [15 in Africa, 7 in A&P, 1 in LA&C, and 5 in the ME&EE] 	Target exceeded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 68% (36) engaged [20 in Africa, 9 in A&P, 2 in LA&C, and 5 in ME&EE region]
--	--	--	---

Objective 2 – To support active public outreach and citizen engagement in the generation/use of research and evidence on quality, equity, financing and education system reform.

Outcome 2.1: Coalitions that actively consult with, engage and mobilise the public, including through the use of traditional and social media – on education policies and programmes related to financing, quality & learning, and equity & inclusion in the education system.

Indicators	Year 2 Targets (Dec 2017)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
2.1.1 Number of coalitions achieving strong or adequate public outreach and mobilisation in one or more of the following areas: media (traditional, community or online); community-level consultation; or participatory events – especially around issues of financing, learning or equity in education (<i>assessed using pre-defined composite indicator methodology</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% are strong 50% are adequate 	Satisfactory progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 53.7% (29) are strong [16 coalitions in Africa, 5 in A&P, 4 in LA&C, and 4 in ME&EE] 27.8% (15) are adequate [7 in Africa, 4 in A&P, 1 in LA&C, and 3 in ME&EE] 	Targets mainly met <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 53% (28) are strong [14 coalitions in Africa, 7 in A&P, 3 in LA&C, and 4 in ME&EE] 30% (16) are adequate [8 in Africa, 3 in A&P, 2 in LA&C, and 3 in ME&EE]

Outcome 2.2: Coalitions that produce relevant documentation/analysis and/or engage citizens in original and credible research, data collection and evidence building – to inform sector policy dialogue on one or more of: a) domestic financing for education; b) equity & inclusion in education; c) quality education & learning; d) quality & inclusivity of education sector dialogue processes.

Indicators	Year 2 Targets (Dec 2017)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
2.2.1 Number of coalitions producing civil society analysis, evaluations of government action, documentation of innovation and/or secondary research relating to education quality & learning, equity & inclusion, and/or financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All coalitions to produce 2 per year; at least 50% to produce 2 per quarter 	Unsatisfactory progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 coalitions (13%) commenced or completed such CSEF-supported pieces [3 in Africa, 1 in A&P, 2 in LA&C, and 1 in ME&EE] Of these 3.7% (2 coalitions – Nepal and Dominican Republic) produced at least two such pieces 	Targets not met, although significant improvement and likely under-reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 66% (35 coalitions) commenced or completed 77 such CSEF-supported pieces [18 in Africa, 8 in A&P, 4 in LA&C, and 5 in ME&EE] Of these 38% (20 coalitions) produced at least two such pieces 4 coalitions (7.5%) met the 2 per quarter target: Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Ghana and Zambia
2.2.2 Number of coalitions involving citizens actively in producing credible and original research, data and /or reports tracking education expenditure/ policy/ service delivery with a particular focus on quality & learning, equity & inclusion and/or financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55% of coalitions 	Target met <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55.6% (30) [18 in Africa, 8 in A&P, 2 in LA&C, and 2 in ME&EE] 	Target exceeded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75.5% (40) coalitions [25 in Africa, 9 in A&P, 1 in LA&C, and 5 in ME&EE]

Objective 3 – To ensure global and regional processes relating to GPE and SDG 4 better inform – and are better informed by – national and local civil society.

Outcome 3.1: CSO representatives to the GPE Board and committees that are well informed by and actively represent the views of the CSO2 constituency.

Indicators	Year 2 Targets (2017/18)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
3.1.1 Number of GPE Board meetings & committee meetings at which consensus (or national, where relevant) CSO2 positions and recommendations are presented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consensus recommendations are presented at <u>all</u> GPE Board meetings and committee meetings 	<p>Satisfactory progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see narrative in Section 3.7 of the CSEF 2017 biannual report 	<p>Target met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see narrative in Section 3.5 of this report

Outcome 3.2: Stronger links between national, regional and global CSO voices (inc S-S) in key regional & global debates & events on implementation of SDG 4.

Indicators	Year 2 Targets (2017/18)	Progress Status June 2017	December 2017 Status
3.2.1 Number of regional and global analysis/position papers/events on SDG 4 implementation & achievement, informed by findings and perspectives (on financing, quality and learning or equity) of national CSEF-supported coalitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least one global analysis paper & one per region each year at least one global event & one event in each region per year in which <i>national</i> CSEF representatives present civil society findings 	<p>Moderately satisfactory progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see narrative in Section 3.8 of the CSEF 2017 biannual report 	<p>Targets met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see narrative in Section 3.6 of this report

2.3 Outcome 1.1 – Inclusivity and representation

Inclusive coalitions that actively engage and represent diverse actors and the most marginalised people.

Indicator 1.1.1 - Coalitions achieving inclusivity of civil society

The total number of civil society organisations actively participating as members of CSEF-supported coalitions by the end of December 2017 is 4,687, representing an increase of 487 members in the six months since June 2017. This total *includes* 162 members from amongst the nine coalitions supported by Regional Secretariats and not directly CSEF grant contracted for all or part of 2017. Table 4 shows regional disaggregation by some target group types which are specifically tracked and measured under composite indicator 1.1.1¹⁴.

Table 4: CSEF-supported coalition membership June and December 2017¹⁵

Region	Total members		Members targeting women		Members targeting youth		Members targeting PWDs		Parents Associations		Teachers Organisations		Grassroots members	
	June	Dec	June	Dec	June	Dec	June	Dec	June	Dec	June	Dec	June	Dec
Africa	2,089	2,333	864	925	932	1,124	605	658	592	729	500	579	410	607
Asia & Pacific	1,614	1,847	742	829	813	927	293	366	561	617	479	535	355	464
LA&C	193	202	87	85	127	119	43	36	75	63	87	78	64	71
ME&EE	304	305	78	73	160	153	109	105	57	56	32	33	42	81
Totals	4,200	4,687	1,771	1,912	2,032	2,323	1,050	1,165	1,285	1,465	1,098	1,225	906	1,223

¹⁴ Numbers of disaggregated target groups do not add up to the total number of members per region because some members target more than one specific group.

¹⁵ Data for members targeting PWDs at end June as documented in the 2017 biannual report was later corrected and communicated to the GPE Secretariat on 13 December 2017, and the same corrected data is presented in Table 3 above.

As can be seen in Table 3, there is fairly even inclusion of each specified target group type as a proportion of both the global and regionally disaggregated CSEF membership. The overall membership increase between June and December 2017 is partly attributable to coalitions expanding their membership in 10 countries in the Africa region (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, and Rwanda); five in the Asia and Pacific region (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Mongolia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka); two in Latin America and the Caribbean (Haiti and the Dominican Republic); and Georgia in the ME&EE region. Other key contributing factors where some slight fluctuations are observed are i) coalitions' improved engagement with the CSEF online MEL platform, and 'filling' or 'cleaning' previous membership data gaps and anomalies – particularly following partners reaching a more common conceptual understanding of 'what counts' as an active coalition member (as discussed in the CSEF biannual report for 2017) and; ii) some coalitions conducting internal membership audits and reviews (e.g. Dominican Republic, Sudan, Swaziland and Togo).

While the majority of coalitions remained active in working to strategically expand and diversify membership during 2017 - for example, ensuring representation from the transgender community in Pakistan - fluctuation is inevitable over time. In addition to the factors mentioned above, fluctuation can be the result of: the number of CSEF-grant supported coalitions during any one semester, expulsion of non-membership fee paying entities, the demise of some CSO members, and expulsion due to activities or conflict of interest that may compromise the perceived legitimacy of the coalition. For example, in Vietnam during the second half of 2017, the coalition expelled four members identified to be in conflict with the coalition's policy position on privatization of education.

Notwithstanding, for indicator 1.1.1, ***the 2017 target for 95% of coalitions to be classified as strong or adequate was exceeded with a total of 98%***. While the more specific targets for the proportion of coalitions classified as strong (75%) fell short by 26%, it is significant that ***11 of the 15 coalitions assessed as adequate were on the margin - by 0.7 of a point - for being classified as strong***¹⁶. In addition, only one coalition (representing 2%) in Guinea Bissau was classified as 'weak', which is mainly attributed to the limited engagement of a proportion of members in the planning, decision-making and advocacy activities of the coalition (RECEPT-GB), and which the coalition aims to address during its General Assembly scheduled for 2018.

Key factors influencing the marked improvement between the mid-year and end year results against indicator 1.1.1 are:

- i. the fact that the majority of coalitions operated at a higher level of activity (including member consultation) momentum during the second half of the year in accordance with their projected plans;
- ii. the intense level of membership consultations in preparing and planning for the replenishment and education financing campaigns, the parallel CSEF evaluation exercises, and the future funding scenarios for CSEF (as discussed earlier in section 2), and;
- iii. corrective actions and targeted support by the regional and global secretariats, informed by ongoing monitoring efforts and lessons emerging from the biannual reporting analysis and progress findings.

CSEF recognizes that having an inclusive membership does not ensure representation of diverse voices in national education policy and strategy engagements. Composite indicator 1.1.1 not only measures coalition membership diversity, but also measures the extent to which (frequency and mechanisms) coalitions actively leverage the knowledge and experience of their diverse membership base to inform their planning, governance and advocacy efforts; in so doing strengthening accountability to the

¹⁶ Of the 11 coalitions 'on the margin' of being classified as strong; 5 are in Africa, 3 in Asia and Pacific, 2 in LA&C, and 1 in the ME&EE region.

constituencies they represent. Box 1 provides just a few ‘snapshot’ examples of practice to demonstrate this area of interest and assessment rigour within CSEF.

Box 1: Snapshot examples of how membership diversity has contributed to coalitions’ plans, governance and advocacy work in 2017

The activities of the **Benin coalition (CBO-EPT)** are implemented throughout the country with the input of a coordination team, which is comprised of regional and district level coalition CSO members, elected by the membership. In 2017, new CSO representatives to the coordination team brought innovative ideas to the coalition at the regional level. For example, the coalition’s program for the promotion of equal and inclusive education (funded by the Belgian Development Cooperation and Plan Belgique), focuses on keeping girls in school. The coalition membership suggested the establishment of 20 assemblies comprising school girls and boys, and the positions and priorities emerging from these assemblies inform the equal and inclusive education plans and advocacy efforts of the coalition.

During the last 6 months of 2017, the **Albanian coalition (ACCE)** organised 6 face-to-face and one virtual meeting with coalition members having expertise, experience, knowledge and an interest in inclusive education. The meetings were facilitated to discuss, agree and formulate positions and plans for the coalition’s work on this strategic priority. Coalition members participating in the consultative meetings are CSOs experienced in the protection of PWDs’ rights, youth-led CSOs, child rights organisations, CSOs with budget analysis expertise, and a child and youth advocacy group.

During the Asia Pacific Education Coalitions’ Consultation Meeting held October 9-11, 2017 in Hanoi, Vietnam, hosted by the **Vietnam Association for Education for All (VAEFA)**, participants from marginalised sectors who are members of VAEFA consisting of people with a disability (deaf, blind, persons who use a wheelchair) attended and joined the discussions. A joint presentation was also made by the VAEFA National Coordinator and the President of Hanoi Association for the Deaf (HAD) to share the education context of Vietnam. The President of HAD, who is also deaf, presented in sign language and highlighted the challenges and barriers faced by the deaf community in accessing education in Vietnam and how they were able to strengthen their advocacy for genuine inclusive education by being a member of the VAEFA coalition.

In Honduras, the **Forum Dakar Honduras** held several workshops in the second semester of 2017 with teachers, secondary school students, the Pedagogues’ Association and indigenous peoples’ CSOs, from which the coalition was able to develop position papers representing the demands of these groups regarding educational policies, which were presented to the Local Education Group (LEG) in the framework of the development of the new Education Sector Plan.

Regional Secretariats supported the work of national coalitions to diversify membership through capacity and technical support. Regional partners’ programme staff across the four regions facilitated 14 learning exchange collaborations between coalitions, 49 coalition support visits, and 26 workshops/training/ other capacity support activities. While not all these initiatives were exclusively focused on supporting coalitions to strengthen membership inclusivity and representation, opportunities were capitalized to engage coalitions in this regard. Some of the Global Secretariat support is mentioned earlier in section 2, and some examples of practice at the regional level follow in Box 2.

Box 2: Case examples of how Regional Secretariats support and collaborate with coalitions to strengthen membership inclusivity and representation

In the **Asia and Pacific region**, to strengthen the engagement of their youth constituency, ASPBAE provided in-country trainings (solicited by coalitions) and a regional meeting on using youth-led action research (YAR) to national education coalitions in Nepal, Indonesia, Mongolia, the Philippines (to members in Mindanao), Myanmar and select organizations from India. The YAR is a strategy to engage and build capacities for local research and advocacy of marginalised youth in the community and school. In the regional meeting, the national education coalitions shared their insights and experiences on how appreciative frameworks can be used to mobilise marginalised youth in their constituency. In addition, by organising study exchanges in India for Afghanistan and Mongolia (requested by coalitions), the national education coalitions interacted with and learned how education advocates (NCE-India) and adult education practitioners in India are working together towards lifelong learning. ASPBAE facilitated the interaction of the national education coalitions with the adult education practitioner members of ASPBAE through the in-country national consultations on youth and adult education and lifelong learning. These national consultations provided an avenue for the coalitions to

share their experiences of inclusive youth and adult education advocacy with other ASPBAE members/CSOs working on education but who are not yet members of the coalition. Also, in Sri Lanka and Indonesia, ASPBAE staff strategised with the respective coalition Boards and Secretariats on how to expand their membership - giving attention to the comments of the Regional Funding Committee to diversify members, as well as based on the priority policy targets of the coalitions.

In **Africa**, during support visits to coalitions, ANCEFA shared experiences and lessons from the coalition in Benin around establishing diverse and inclusive membership mechanisms (see Box 1). The ANCEFA secretariat also worked with the coalitions in Zambia and Zimbabwe to ensure that their Thematic Committees for membership hold regular and inclusive engagement meetings for developing positions for presentation to the LEG and other policy engagement fora. In addition, in Zimbabwe with support and input from ANCEFA, the coalition (ECOZI) hosted an inclusive education indaba which was planned and facilitated with their member CSOs having expertise in inclusive education. ANCEFA also worked with CSEC Malawi to ensure that their research on barriers to Special Needs Education actively involved citizens and member CSOs led by and/or targeting people with disabilities.

In the **Latin America and Caribbean region**, the Regional Funding Committee recommended for national coalitions to seek to articulate with social movements beyond the education sector, as well as with organizations / movements of young people and women, and to strengthen the gender perspective in their daily activities and political advocacy actions. Informed by these recommendations, CLADE supported the coalition in the Dominican Republic to develop an internal gender policy, which is scheduled to be concluded in 2018. In addition, both virtually and during face-to-face support visits, CLADE shared with all five CSEF-supported national coalitions in the region progress made in relation to each of CSEF's global objectives, which allowed them to identify and develop strategies around their weaknesses and strengths in terms of representivity and inclusiveness. These stimuli presented (and continue to present) results such as the inclusion of young people in the Nicaraguan coalition's membership, and the approach of the Honduras coalition with high school students and the University Student Movement during the local conflict with the Autonomous University of Honduras. In addition, the coalition in Haiti (REPT) incorporated youth, women and peasant organizations into its membership and, similarly for the case of the Bolivian coalition (CBDE), is in dialogue with organizations led by and/or working with people with disabilities to integrate them into their membership.

2.4 Outcome 1.2 – Sector policy engagement

CSEF-supported coalitions actively participate in LEGs and in key sector policy and review processes (including where possible with parliamentary forums).

Indicator 1.2.1 - Engagement in government-led sector dialogue processes

The 2017 annual targets under this indicator were for 40% of coalitions to be classified as achieving strong and 50% adequate engagement. The **targets were partially met**; while important gains were made with the strong classification target exceeded at 49%, coalitions achieving adequate classification stood at 13%, signaling a shortfall of 37%. It is noteworthy, however, that **one coalition¹⁷ is just 1 point short of being assessed as strong against indicator 1.2.1, and three coalitions¹⁸ are a very marginal 0.1 of a point short of being assessed as adequate** (as opposed to the current classification of 'weak').

The externally conducted Mid-Term Review noted that a weak classification is not synonymous with no engagement in sector policy dialogue and processes, and that "an inability to meet all [indicator 1.2.1] targets does not suggest an inability to achieve objective 1" (CSEF 2016-2018 MTR report, p47).

CSEF has also previously identified and reported a number of external factors which have limited the extent to which coalitions have been able to meaningfully participate in government-led sector engagement processes. Some governments are not universally open towards civil society participation, and some actively restrict their participation and voice (such as in Mongolia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Sri Lanka). Local Education Groups (LEGs) in some countries may not be a

¹⁷ The DRC.

¹⁸ Kenya, Honduras and Somalia.

formal structure, or one that is open to civil society participation, and some states struggle to establish or maintain a LEG, especially when substantive education sector decision-making is made outside of LEGs (the cases of Albania, Ethiopia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania and Rwanda have often-times been cited). During 2017, the Global Secretariat established a Task Team to review the CSEF-supported coalitions' experiences of LEGs and to document these to serve as a valuable tool for horizontal and vertical lesson learning and knowledge exchange. The final product validated by the end of the year, titled '*Learning Exchange Brief – A view from the CSEF's engagement in local education sector planning groups*' forms a supporting document to this report.

For LEG engagement throughout the year under review, the picture has remained largely consistent. As at December 2017, of the 53 CSEF-funded coalitions, 44 (83%) were engaging with the LEG in their country, albeit with differential levels of frequency and LEG membership status. There still remain four coalitions which report they have not yet been successful in securing space in the LEG (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Rwanda and Myanmar), and a further nine which maintain a functioning LEG or its equivalent does not (yet) exist in their country (largely non-GPE countries).

It is important to be mindful that a "not actively engaged" status does not signify that coalitions are not working to engage with the LEG or its equivalent in their country. For example, in Rwanda, the coalition (REFAC) has held negotiations to join the Joint Education Sector Review group (JRES) which the Ministry of Education identifies as the LEG equivalent. This situation in Rwanda confirms that, in order for civil society voice to be considered legitimate by government, civil society must be a legally constituted entity, and previous CSEF reports have documented some of the many slow and obstacle-laced experiences REFAC have been navigating for some years now to formally register the coalition in the country. This said, REFAC finally successfully concluded the legal registration processes for the coalition in January 2018, and so a change in LEG engagement status is anticipated soon. In Mauritania, COMEDUC is pursuing a two-pronged approach; the coalition is seeking to attract the National Federation of Parents' Association into its membership, which is desired not only in terms of a relevant and potential effective partnership, but also strategic because the Association is a member of the LEG. At the same time, COMEDUC has held (so far unyielding) meetings with the Ministry of Higher Education to lobby for the participation of COMEDUC in the LEG. The case of Haiti has been previously reported: the LEG is not yet constituted as a structure, despite the steps taken by the institutions responsible for setting up this structure, and during 2017 the coalition (REPT), along with support from CLADE (see Box 4), continued its efforts with UNESCO and Ministry of Education officials on this issue. In Mongolia, the coalition is taking steps to push the government to establish a LEG-like structure in the education sector through different platforms, such as UNICEF Mongolia, the ADB, WB, embassies, and development agencies. During 2017, the newly-appointed Education Minister expressed her interest to promote multilateral engagement in the education system including with CSOs, professional institutions, and academia.

Additionally, the MTR process revealed that relevant assumptions articulated in the program Theory of Change (TOC) are formulated as 'desirable factors for success', rather than ecological 'pre-conditions for program implementation'. As noted in the MTR, "the current articulation of assumptions undermines the achievement of coalitions in challenging environments, where they may actually be yielding results according to the program objectives, despite defying the assumptions" (CSEF 2016-2018 MTR report, p75). This, along with other lessons learned, are already informing intense review dialogue amongst CSEF oversight and management partners around re-defining the assumptions in the program TOC going forward.

Indicator 1.2.2 - Engagement with parliamentary forums or committees

The planned 2017 target for this indicator was for 65% of coalitions engaging with relevant parliamentary forums or committees. The **target was slightly exceeded with 68% (36) coalitions reporting such engagements**, representing an upward trend between the two reporting periods of

the year. Some illustrative examples of how coalitions have engaged with parliamentarians, and to what end, are shared in Box 3, and many more are captured in the CSEF online MEL system repository¹⁹.

Through the representation, participation, and lobbying for inclusion of coalitions in official education sector fora and parliamentary spaces, during the year, 47 (88.7%) coalitions made 61 oral and 146 written submissions to these policy fora. Data disaggregated by region is shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Number of oral and written submissions made by coalitions, by region January - December 2017

Region	Type of Submission		
	Oral	Written	Total
Africa (27 of 29 coalitions made submissions)	15	61	76
Asia and the Pacific (12 of 12 coalitions made submissions)	39	65	104
Latin America and the Caribbean (4 of 5 coalitions made submissions)	4	9	13
Middle East and Eastern Europe (4 of 7 coalitions made submissions)	3	11	14
Total	61	146	207

External factors limiting the remaining coalitions from engaging with relevant parliamentary spaces have remained consistent since 2016. These reflect pervasive contextual features characterized by: *i) political exclusion*, (in the cases of Myanmar and Nicaragua); *ii) political transition, fragility or conflict* (e.g. in Cameroon, Côte D'Ivoire, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya and Yemen), *and; iii) parliamentary inertia or latency* (for instance in Benin, Georgia, Sri Lanka and Togo). These factors reinforce the aforementioned lessons learned around the formulation of the assumptions in the program TOC.

Whether or not navigating through complex political challenges outlined under Outcome 1.2, coalitions have continued to garner significant results during 2017 through the mechanisms and strategies of their policy submissions and engagements in education sector dialogue and sector plan implementation in GPE developing countries. The following examples in Box 3 are illustrative of coalition performances under Objective 1. Of note here is how these examples also demonstrate some of the intersections between achievements under both objective 1 and objective 2.

Box 3: Examples of coalitions' engagement in government-led sector dialogue processes and contributions to the achievement of objective 1

Burkina Faso – This example is illustrative of how civil society engagement in local government-led sector planning and budgeting processes has empowered local communities to claim education services for which sector duty bearers are accountable:

Some of the submissions of the coalition sub-branch advocacy groups have been successfully taken up at the level of municipal and regional councils. For example, in Seytenga (a department of Séno province), through the advocacy group, local CSO members made a submission for the construction of a third school, as well as for the City Council to ensure the provision of school supplies and teaching materials timeously. The submission was taken up by the Municipal Council and work on a third school is underway, and the Secretary General of the City Council publically confirmed that the process of improving the delivery of school teaching and learning materials has commenced. Similarly, the Eastern Regional Council (which administratively covers five provinces) took up the sub-branch advocacy group's submission (which was informed by the group's budget and expenditure monitoring) for the construction of 73 learning complexes and 79 classrooms, and the construction is currently in progress. Additionally, in Fada N'gourma (capital of the Gourma province), the sub-branch advocacy group participates in City Council meetings as an observer and has used this opportunity to make oral submissions related to localized SDG4 implementation and monitoring with municipal councillors.

The Gambia – A policy target of the coalition for 2016 – 2017 has been the enactment of the national Disability Bill. Through a targeted and sustained process of engaging with parliamentarians to ensure their

¹⁹ The invitation in the CSEF biannual report of 2017 extended to the GPE Secretariat, including to Country Leads, to view the repositories in the CSEF online MEL system remains open.

understanding of the importance of the Bill being approved, the coalition gained some ground in 2017 when legislators pledged to pass the Bill without hesitation when the Disability Bill is tabled in parliament.

Swaziland – During the year, the coalition made positive strides in terms of building relations with the Swaziland Parliamentary Education and Training Portfolio Committee. In the framework of GAWE 2017, The coalition (SWANCEFA) urged the Portfolio Committee to collaborate with SWANCEFA to build the capacity of the select committee on education policies. As a result of this engagement, in cooperation with the Coordination Assembly for Non-Governmental Organizations (CANGO) in Swaziland, the coalition held a forum with the Portfolio Committee and representatives from the Speakers Office. Subsequently, the coalition made a policy submission to the Committee on young girls’ access to education and the formulation of a policy to address girls dropping out of school due to pregnancy.

Mozambique – One of the coalition’s policy targets is to influence the Government to increase the education sector budget through the mobilization of internal resources, in order to contribute to a better quality education in Mozambique. During 2017 the coalition (alongside other sector actors) continued to advocate to this end, through multiple engagements with the Ministries of Education and Finance, and positive results emerged in the year, evidenced by a Government submission of a proposal to revise fiscal/tax laws to the National Assembly, for consideration and approval. The proposed revision of laws provides for the amendment of laws on tax exemptions from which multinational corporations in the natural resources and mineral sectors benefit. With this revision the Government seeks to guarantee a greater tax collection and consequent financial independence of the country. This is a positive step towards the coalition’s policy target, which will remain relevant and pursued by the coalition to track and ensure that the education sector proportionately and adequately benefits from gains made through increasing internal resources.

India – In the absence of a LEG in the country, in consultation with academics on implementation and monitoring of the RTE Act, the coalition (NCE) reviewed and submitted a Charter of Demand to the Ministry of Human Resource Development and the Prime Minister regarding revision of the National Education Policy. The Charter of Demand was signed by seven Members of Parliament, who pledged to ensure the Charter of Demand was tabled in the next budget hearing in 2018.

Pakistan - The coalition PCE has consistently lobbied for the formation of LEGs at the provincial level. In the latter half of 2017, utilized the opportunity of its Annual Convention (which engaged representatives from the government particularly from the provincial education departments, high level officials from the Ministry of Education, key CSO stakeholders and coalition members, UN agencies, private sector as well as research institutions) to give space for official representatives from the Balochistan and Sindh education departments to share their experiences with reference to LEG processes with their counterparts from Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Subsequently, education officials in Punjab agreed to the coalition’s provincial LEG establishment advocacy demands and informed PCE that a group of experts will be formed shortly, which will include CSOs from the province working in the education sector. PCE will conduct further follow up meetings in the coming months of 2018.

Honduras - The coalition actively participated in the LEG meetings during the elaboration of the Education Sector Plan, presenting in writing and orally the positions and demands developed during the coalitions consultations with the educational community and its indigenous organizations membership. Although some members of the Forum officially participate in the LEG, the coalition opted to participate as a guest - and not as an official member - to guarantee its political autonomy. The situation of the country is still adverse for citizen participation, with persecution of protesters who questioned the results of the presidential elections of November 2017. Regardless, the coalition managed to hold a breakfast meeting with parliamentary candidates, who signed a letter of commitment for the fulfillment of the right to education and to lobby for an increase in domestic financing for education.

Republic of Yemen – informed by coalition members’ monitoring efforts, the coalition continued during 2017 to prepare and publish monthly reports on education in emergency, particularly in the Sana’a and Hodeida provinces, and presented the findings and recommendations during LEG meetings.

Throughout 2017, Regional Secretariats have continued to fulfil a critical role in supporting coalitions to engage meaningfully in LEGs and other key sector policy and review processes. In addition to ongoing communications, information sharing, planning, monitoring, reporting and advocacy mentoring support with all coalitions in their respective regions, some specific examples of these sustained efforts during 2017 are illustrated in Box 4.

Box 4: Some specific case examples of regional support for the achievement of objective 1
(NB: examples provided earlier in Box 2 have also contributed to performance against objective 1).

ANCEFA in the Africa region – Targeted technical learning support was provided to the coalitions in Mauritania and Rwanda to increase these coalition’s understanding of the LEG constituency and how to engage in effective dialogue with government and key government-led sector planning and review fora. This included, *inter alia*, how to develop a sound understanding of their respective national ESP and government priorities and strategies for education, and sharing relevant lessons from examples of good practice from the coalitions in Benin, Mali and Togo. Similar technical guidance was provided to the coalitions in Cameroon, the DRC, Niger and Senegal around accountability strategies to lobby for LEG meetings to be resumed, held regularly, and/or to more consistently adhere to agreements around CSO participation.

ASPBAE in the Asia and Pacific region – With the LEG in Kyrgyzstan not being functional in 2017, ASPBAE supported the coalition to access information and follow up on implementation of the GPE support at the national level. Particularly intensive support was also provided to the reformed coalitions in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu to rejuvenate and/or establish their relations with their respective relevant Ministries/Departments of Education and LEGs. The ASPBAE CSA Adviser also met the Education Standing Committee in the Solomon Islands to gather their perspectives on how the coalition (COESI) can better influence parliamentary processes in the country. In addition, during the regional CSEF meeting held in Hanoi in October 2017, a dedicated session on engaging with LEGs and education sector planning and review highlighted important lessons on how to effectively engage with LEGs and other education sector policy mechanisms.

CLADE in Latin America and the Caribbean – During the GPE Board meeting held in Paris, CLADE took the opportunity to have side meetings with the Minister of Education and Inspector General of Haiti and member of the GPE Ethics and Governance Committee to discuss the coalition’s efforts to lobby for the establishment of a LEG in the country. Likewise, CLADE met with the Director General of Planning and Educational Programming of the Ministry of Education in Nicaragua, highlighting how the coalition has been invited to participate in the elaboration of the national ESP and in the LEG yet its dialogue with the government remains limited. Post the Paris meeting, FEDH-IPN contacted the Director General, who responded to their email, but the expansion of civil society participation spaces in Nicaragua remains restricted. Similar direct interventions were carried out by CLADE (in response to coalition requests) with relevant government officials in Bolivia, Honduras and the Dominican Republic.

2.5 Outcome 2.1 – Active public outreach

Coalitions that actively consult with, engage and mobilise the public, including through the use of traditional and social media - on education policies and programmes related to financing, quality & learning, and equity & inclusion in the education system.

Indicator 2.1.1 - Coalitions achieving effective public outreach and mobilisation

CSEF upholds that evidence-informed advocacy (on equity, quality, education financing and system reform) will not only legitimize civil society policy initiatives, but also contribute to a more effective public-led dialogue on education access and outcomes. As articulated in the MTR report “[t]he rationale [for outcome 2.1] is that through public consultations, coalitions will be better informed of, and in turn better outwardly inform, the public agenda. This also helps to sense-check that their advocacy agenda is best in line with the public interest, namely for marginalised groups” (CSEF 2016-2018 MTR, p52).

CSEF-supported coalitions have consistently maintained a solid track record in this regard, and the 2017 results against indicator 2.1.1 are no exception. The 2017 target of 40% of coalitions achieving ‘strong’ public outreach and mobilisation was already exceeded at mid-year. The combined target of 90% of coalitions achieving a strong or adequate classification was nearly met at 83%. CSEF is confident that the higher targets for 2018 remain valid and within reach.

At the aggregate level, coalitions organized 821 national, regional and community-level consultations, forums, social and traditional media etc. activities and initiatives during 2017 to support the

achievement of their national level policy influencing targets. Quantitatively, there was virtually an equal level of activity within indicator 2.1.1 between the first and second semesters of the year, with 413 such activities detailed and documented for the January – June period, and 408 for the July – December period.

Through these activities widespread debate, perspectives and publicity was generated, particularly on issues related to i) *accountability for SDG 4 and citizen participation*; ii) *education financing*, with a focus on domestic financing and transparent accountability; iii) *inclusive education*, with a focus on strengthening education access and quality for learners with a disability; iv) *girls' education*, particularly in terms of access, retention and completion; v) *privatization in and of education*, with a focus on low-fee private schools (LFPSs), and; vi) *sector policy and legislation*, especially around contextual priorities for system review and reform.

2.6 Outcome 2.2 – Research and analyses

Coalitions that produce relevant documentation/analysis and/or engage citizens in original and credible research, data collection and evidence building – to inform sector policy dialogue on one or more of: a) domestic financing for education; b) equity and inclusion in education; c) quality education & learning; d) quality & inclusivity of education sector dialogue processes.

Indicator 2.2.1 - Coalitions producing relevant research/analysis/evaluations

Indicator 2.2.1 is concerned with the number of coalitions producing civil society analyses, evaluations of government action, documentation of innovation and/or secondary research relating to education quality & learning, equity & inclusion, and/or financing. In 2017, the planned targets for this indicator **were not fully met, although the program witnessed significant improvement against the targets in the second half of the year**, with 35 (66%) coalitions reporting and sharing information on research commenced or completed in the year, and an upward shift from two (3.7%) to 20 (38%) coalitions providing evidence of generating at least two research pieces by end December 2017.

The increased output in the second half of the year, as well as the factors contributing to or hindering progress, reflect a virtual repeat occurrence of the 2016 CSEF reports for this indicator 2.2.1. These factors include increased research capacity building and technical support, collaboration, and challenges in securing funds for costed research. However, as highlighted in the 2017 Biannual Report, the Global Secretariat surfaced a trend of coalitions likely under-reporting against indicator 2.2.1 due to different understandings of what kinds of products are applicable. More recently, the external MTR of CSEF phase III endorsed this hypothesis, finding that **reporting on indicator Outcome 2.2 is likely an under-estimate as well as an under-estimate of performance against CSEF Objective 2**. This is concluded by the MTR because the focus on reporting coalition-produced research and its quality “do[es] not capture the ways in which the coalitions use secondary data to increase their understanding or advocate towards relevant policy issues” (CSEF 2016-2018 MTR, p53).

To get this important program learning agenda back on track, the Global Secretariat will commission external support for the second quarter of 2018 to produce case studies which can better ‘tell the story’ of how, and to what end, coalitions have *both* produced research *and* used secondary data to inform their education policy advocacy work. Additional anecdotal evidence of coalitions’ research influencing the national policy agenda is illuminated in Box 5.

Indicator 2.2.2 - Coalitions involving citizens in producing credible research

The annual target for 2017 was exceeded; 40 coalitions (75.5%), shared supported information on ways in which they have engaged citizens in generating original research and analyses.

Performance against the target for indicator 2.2.2 is measured by the extent to which coalitions initiated training events and/or produced any toolkits to actively support members to engage in civil society analyses, evaluations/reviews/ assessments, research etc.

Going forward, CSEF will build on this success and focus attention on strengthening qualitative reporting within outcome 2.2, focussing on the depth of member engagement in civil society analyses etc, as well as on the ways the analyses are used and to what end.

Box 5: Illustrative examples of use of research for policy advocacy

Some of the examples provided earlier in Box 2 have also contributed to performance against objective 2. For example, in the case of **NCE-India**; in order to articulate the Charter of Demand, the coalition was informed by the findings from their research and analyses on Education Financing, Low-fee Private Schools, the Status of District Institutes for Education and Training (DIETs), School Readiness for Girls' Education and the Functionality Status of School Management Committees (SMC)s.

Malawi – The coalition (CSEC) used the findings of its research study on *'Challenges Affecting Special Needs Education'* to inform the development of the coalition's position paper on SNE priorities and costs, which were subsequently reflected in the Malawi Special Needs Education Strategy.

Indonesia – The coalition (NEW Indonesia) used the findings and recommendations emerging from their (2016-17) research on the *'12 Years of Compulsory Education National Policy'* and *'Review of 20 District Education Budget Allocations'*, which assessed both public and private schools, to engage with two parliamentary commissions as well as with parliamentarians at the local and district levels. The results of the research submitted by the coalition reportedly caused alarm amongst the parliamentarians - they were not aware of the extent of the multiple challenges, especially around regulatory support at the local level and budget allocations to support the national commitments to 12 years compulsory education. Subsequently, during parliamentary hearings in 2017 in which the Ministers of Education were present, Parliament members asked critical questions which confirmed NEW Indonesia's analysis that the national level does not have the power to mandate local government to implement the national compulsory education for 12 years policy. As a result NEW Indonesia has gained traction in legitimizing its advocacy targeting provincial and district level governments.

Nicaragua – One of the FEDH-IPN coalition's policy targets is to ensure that the Human Right to Education and the national implementation of SDG4 is firmly positioned in the Public Agenda. In the context of an electoral year, the coalition worked to lobby politicians to ensure relevant proposals for the national education agenda were included in their manifestos and plans. As part of informing and providing an evidence base for these advocacy efforts, the coalition conducted two key studies, both of which actively involved citizens. The first, titled *'Normative Frameworks and Educational Policies in Nicaragua Aimed at Fulfilling the Commitments and Targets of SDG 4 of the 2030 Agenda'* is a critical and proactive analysis from civil society, which emphasizes the need to have educational policies developed with the participation of the educational community (especially parents and teachers). The study also provides a critical description of the sector policies, plans and program instruments in Nicaragua. The second study, titled *'Perspectives of Teachers and Parents on Early Childhood Education in the Municipalities of Matagalpa, San Ramón and Matiguás: An approach to the paradigms of early rural education'* highlights that there is little or no progress in the implementation of national early childhood policies, especially in rural areas. The study presents perceptions from pre-and primary school teachers and parents (mothers and/or fathers) of children in the pre-school age group, about the importance and scope of pre-school and primary education. In addition, an analysis of the status (availability, accessibility, quality etc) of pre-school education centres in the targeted rural areas is documented. Both of these studies saw a lot of media coverage and sparked widespread public debate, which has served to bolster the lobbying efforts of the coalition.

Sudan – To inform the SCEFA coalition's education financing and quality education campaign work, in 2017 the coalition commissioned research titled *'A Study on the Cost and Financing of Education in the Kassala & River Nile States'*. Key results of the study found that, in real terms, the actual proportion of national GDP for basic education financing is 1.3% (4.2% for Kassala State and 8.3% for River Nile State) and 11.3% of the national education budget (5.3% for Kassala, 8.7 % for River Nile). While official administration authorities in Kassala State validated the findings and confirmed their commitment to the recommendations for increased domestic financing to support improvements in education quality, the coalition awaits the same from the River Nile State before submitting the study for approval of the national government. In the meantime, the coalition is using the findings from the study as reference to inform their policy engagements and public interfacing interventions.

2.7 Outcome 3.1 – Civil society engagement in GPE policy processes

CSO representatives to the GPE Board and committees that are well informed by and actively represent the views of the CSO2 constituency.

Indicator 3.1.1 - CSO2 positions presented at GPE meetings

The achievement of the indicator 3.1.1. target under outcome 3.1 is measured by the number of Board and committee meetings that the GPE convenes where the CSO2 constituency positions and recommendations are presented. This **target was met in 2017** with CSO2 policy positions developed as input into all three GPE board meetings.

Moreover, 2017 saw a solid and increased proportion of coalitions reporting on improved engagement in GPE global governance/board decision-making processes: at the national level, 86.8% (46) coalitions reported they actively voiced their perspectives in GPE CSO2 constituency meetings (virtual or face-to-face) facilitated by either the global or regional secretariats within the year, and in processes through which GPE policies and/or processes (including ESPIG applications or reviews) were deliberated.

Circumstances constraining the remaining seven coalitions from engaging related to i) the relative infancy of the coalition (Kyrgyzstan), ii) technical or logistical barriers, such as poor internet connectivity, electricity shortage, time-zone or interpretation challenges (Dominican Republic, the DRC and Yemen), and iii) coalitions either unaware of, or becoming aware of the opportunities to engage too late (Cape Verde, Kenya, and Palestine²⁰).

As part of the ongoing program of support to the CSO2 Board representatives, in close collaboration with regional partners, the Global Secretariat supported an intensive process of strengthening CSO2 Board and constituency engagement. For example:

CSO2 communication and engagement plan development and regular review:

A 'CSO2 Communications and Engagement Plan' was developed in March 2017. This plan serves to better articulate the ways of working and support within and across the coordination group members. Reviews and updates were made during 2017 within the framework of CSO2 pre-Board meetings to ensure relevance and adaptation to changing dynamics. A constituency-wide consultation was planned for 2018 to elicit feedback and inputs on how to further strengthen existing communication and engagement.

Focused support to CSO2 GPE Board engagement:

During 2017 the Global Secretariat supported a process of deepening the engagement of elected CSO2 Board representatives. This has included the preparation, coordination, and follow up involved with the organization of CSO2 pre-Board meetings ahead of GPE Board meetings in Feb/March, June and December.

At the Washington D.C. pre-Board meeting, CSO2 inputs to the GPE Board agenda were developed, focusing on the new Financing and Funding Framework (FFF). The CSO2 pre-Board meeting provided a key moment for face-to-face interaction between old and new CSO2 GPE Board members, as well as serving as an induction for the new CSO2 GPE Board member into GPE processes and learning from those with past experience engaging with the GPE Board.

In June, the CSO2 pre-Board meeting was focused on agreeing the CSO2 positions on agenda items pertaining to IFFeD and the issue of aid fragmentation, GPE's Multiplier Fund, operational risk framework, FFF implementation, disaster risk financing options and ESPIG approvals. These positions informed CSO2 GPE Board representatives' interventions during the GPE Board meeting.

²⁰ Some of these coalitions report they did not receive an invitation to engage. Although this does not correlate with evidence of relevant CSO2/GPE policy consultation information and invitations being shared with all CSEF-supported coalitions around the same time, it is very difficult to validate if there were technical difficulties in information shared virtually actually reaching the intended recipients.

In December the CSO2 pre-Board meeting was expanded to allow for a joint CSO-DCP discussion on key GPE Board agenda issues. In addition, a joint CSO position paper on GPE Board agenda items was developed prior to the meeting, informed by constituency consultation calls and finalized by CSO1, 2, and 3 GPE Board representatives and CSO2 focal points. GPE Board agenda items discussed included the Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA) and Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) mechanisms, the Private Foundations Strategy, Risk Management Report, Results Framework Indicator 10 on domestic financing, the GPE Multiplier Fund, and ESPIG approvals. Following these meetings, CSOs (CSO1, 2, and 3) agreed to focus and engage on the following issues going forward:

- CSOs would engage and be represented in large numbers at the GPE Replenishment Conference;
- CSOs would continue to monitor the development of the private sector engagement strategy;
- CSOs would continue to follow developments of the domestic financing indicator and support GPE aligning itself with the indicator used by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS);
- Start working on a concept note for the next CSEF phase (under ASA) to inform the decision-making discussion for the design phase and related work of the GPE Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC).

Support to strengthen CSO2-DCP engagement and communication:

As mentioned above, a key focus of CSO2 work has been to continue strengthening the communication and engagement with the DCP constituency begun in 2016.

In February/March 2017, an informal lunch meeting took place on the sidelines of the GPE Board meeting between CSO2 Board representatives and a number of African Developing Country Partner (DCP) representatives. The meeting focused on agreeing a way forward to ensure a stronger relationship between CSOs and DCPs. As a result of this discussion, DCPs invited CSO2 representatives to observe their next DCP pre-Board meeting in Accra (23-25 May 2017), which was subsequently attended by a small CSO2 delegation of observers.

At the CSO2 pre-Board meeting which took place from the 3-4 of June 2017, DCP representatives were invited to a joint discussion with CSO2 GPE Board representatives and focal points on key GPE Board agenda items (including ASA and KIX, Multiplier Maximum Country Allocations, and GPE Indicator 10) as well as sharing the CSO2 constituency's ways of working, which contributed to strengthening linkages with DCP representatives. As a result of this meeting it was deemed important for CSO2 representatives to continue attending DCP meetings, as well as inviting DCP representatives to the next CSO2 pre-Board meetings.

The DCP meeting that took place in Paris from 29 November to 1 December 2017, was a key moment where a significantly larger CSO2 delegation (composed of various CSO2 regional focal points, the CSO2 GPE Board representative, and the Head of the CSEF program) was present not only as observers, but also invited to participate in the DCP's discussions. In particular, CSO2 contributed thoughts on risk reduction, IFFED, KIX, ASA, private sector constituency, foundations strategy, domestic resource mobilization, Multiplier Fund, and GPE's institutional arrangements. Amongst these positions put forward by CSO2 representatives, DCP representatives were mostly in agreement except on the issue of the calculation of GPE indicator 10.

Support with the GPE GPC nomination process for selecting a new CSO2 representative:

In June 2017, a vacancy for the GPC main representative CSO2 seat was made available, following the departure of Imad Sabi, ACEA representative, from his post. A selection process was carried out and as result Maxwell Rafomoyo, the Zimbabwe coalition (ECOZI) national coordinator, was chosen as the CSO2 nominee. Following the GPE Board's approval of this nomination, Maxwell was appointed to this post until December 31, 2018. Both the GPC CSO1 Alternate member and the CSO2 Communications Focal Point have assisted with the transition process, and provide ongoing support.

Ongoing support to CSO GPE committee representatives:

Throughout 2017, enhanced support was provided to CSO GPE committee representatives, particularly those within the Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC) and Grants and Performance Committee (GPC). Support included:

- Constituency consultations on GPE committee-related meeting information and documents;
- Inviting CSO committee members to CSO2 monthly calls to share updates;
- A CSO2 and 1 consultation process and joint development of a position paper on ASA and KIX design in advance of the October SIC meeting. The paper was well-received by SIC representatives and, as a result, this initiative will continue to be implemented in 2018 for the next important ASA/KIX consultation;
- Assisting with reviewing and summarizing GPC committee documents, contacting coalitions undergoing ESPIG processes whose applications were up for review, sharing the GCE LEG tool (as described in the CSEF 2016 Annual Report) with those same coalitions and forwarding responses to the GPC representatives, as well as uploading meeting documents on a shared Google drive for CSO2 constituency members to easily access. This support has been key to ensuring timely and quality responses from coalitions, as well as helping lighten the workload of GPC CSO representatives;
- GCE provided relevant support as solicited to CSO representatives on the Finance and Risk and Governance and Ethics committees.

Facilitating opportunities for CSO constituency consultation with ongoing GPE processes:

With regard to sharing consultation opportunities with the CSO2 constituency, these relate to both GPE and CSO2-led initiatives. In 2017, the Global Secretariat assisted the GPE Secretariat with reaching out to coalitions to engage with a GPE replenishment/southern advocacy survey, and a survey focused on LEG engagement (the design of which the CSEF Global Secretariat also contributed to strengthening as well as ensuring it was disseminated in all CSEF operating languages), as well as with outreach in relation to GPE-initiated webinars.

In addition, CSO2-led consultations included monthly CSO2 virtual meetings, where the constituency is invited to attend and learn more about CSO2 work, as well as gain an opportunity to voice their opinions on key issues. Additional, issue-based consultation calls were facilitated as needs arose, such as consultations on the ASA and KIX design, and to discuss CSO2 feedback on GPE Board documents.

Producing and sharing communications relevant to the CSO2 constituency:

One of the main responsibilities of the CSO2 Communications Focal Point at the Global Secretariat is to regularly share, via the CSO2 mailing list, all GPE news of relevance to CSO2 with regard to ongoing processes, as well as to produce, together with the CSO2 GPE Board representatives, a monthly newsletter which features CSO2-specific news and a CSO2 Post-GPE Board communication which reports on the outcomes of the CSO2 pre-Board and GPE Board meetings. Translations into all CSEF operating languages are provided for the newsletter and Post-GPE Board communications.

Documenting and gathering civil society stories of advocacy-influenced change:

The Global Secretariat has both produced and supported the development of almost monthly blogs authored by coalitions which showcase CSEF examples of good practice and outcomes, and which have been disseminated initially through the GPE Secretariat's online blog platform. In 2017, GCE produced 6 blogs, highlighting the work of national coalitions in mother tongue instruction, girls' education, Global Action Week activities, SADC Summit and GPE financing campaign, and UNGA. In addition, the CSO2 Board Alternate contributed a blog about strengthening CSO engagement in GPE processes. Finally, the regional coalition in the Middle East wrote about coalitions' continued efforts to advocate for more resources, particularly in emergency and conflict-affected contexts.

Additionally, civil society contributions to the 'GPE Southern Partners Update (SPU)' newsletter have also been gathered by the CSO2 Communication Focal Point, to inform a new newsletter section called

“Updates from CSO coalitions”, an initiative CSEF has welcomed and with which partners intend to continue collaborating.

Furthermore, as reported in the CSEF Biannual Report for the year as well as referred to earlier in this report, in 2017 the GCE established a cross-disciplinary ‘Case Study and Shared Learning Task Team’, which saw the production of the aforementioned ‘LEG Learning Exchange Brief’ and the ‘E-Directory of Partners Implementing CSEF’. The Task Team have identified the thematic and technical focus of case studies scheduled for development and publication during 2018, and this work will be bolstered by external support while the Networks and Learning post is being filled at the Global Secretariat. 3.6

2.8 Outcome 3.2 – National-regional-global linkages in SDG 4 implementation

Stronger links between national, regional and global CSO voices (inc S-S) in key regional & global debates & events on implementation of SDG 4.

Indicator 3.2.1 - Regional and global analysis/position papers on SDG 4 informed by national CSEF-supported coalitions

A key impetus of CSEF is to support civil society organisations, as members of national coalitions, to be able to make effective contributions in education policy dialogue in their respective countries, their wider regions and globally. A strategic mechanism to facilitate the realisation of this mission is the tri-level (national-regional-global) CSEF integrated partnership architecture. While located within Outcome 3.2 in this report, the synthesized narrative below is a demonstration of how each level mutually reinforces and collectively realises the expected results and desired outcomes of the CSEF program more broadly.

The planned 2017 targets for the CSEF Outcome 3.2 indicator were for i) at least one global analysis paper and one per region in the year, and for ii) at least one global event and one event in each region in the year in which national CSEF representatives present civil society findings. The **targets were fully met by the end of the year, with at least 12 global analysis papers** (including position statements) **and at least two regional analysis papers per region produced** (particularly on education financing, privatization of education, and civil society engagement in SD4 implementation - especially VNR processes). **In addition, all CSEF grant-contracted coalitions (100%) actively participated in at least one national-level, regional and/or global level engagement on SDG 4 implementation during the year**, facilitated by either the Global or Regional Secretariats (usually both in collaboration) in the cases of regional and global events.

Through CSEF-support and coordination, national coalitions represented civil society analyses and positions at the following key regional and global level events which, amongst other education policy issues, debated and put forward civil society positions on the implementation of SDG 4:

- ***Africa Union Women and Girls’ Education Conference***, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, March 2017
- ***International Forum on Human Resources organized by Education International, Dakar, Senegal, 26-27 April 2017***
- ***The 8th global CCNGO / EFA meeting held in Siem Reap, Cambodia, 8-9 May 2017***
- ***ACEA Regional Meeting held in Amman, Jordan from 17-21 May 2017***
- ***3rd Asia-Pacific Meeting on Education 2030 (APMED), Bangkok, Thailand, 4-7 July 2017***
- ***UN High Level Political Forum, New York, USA, 10-13 July 2017***
- ***8th International Conference on Special Education: ‘Access and Engagement’, Sarawak, Malaysia, 21 July – 2 August 2017***
- ***Latin America and the Caribbean 10th Regional CSEF Meeting, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 14-16 August 2017***
- ***EPJA (YALE) Regional Meeting: Towards the MTR of CONFINTEA VI, Lima, Peru, 15-17 August 2017***

- **Asia-Pacific Regional Consultation on Education Financing, Privatization and Regulation, Kathmandu, Nepal, 11-13 September 2017**
- **72nd Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA), New York, USA 19-21 September 2017 (plus side-events on Financing Education 2030)**
- **Asia Pacific Education Coalition Consultation Meeting, Hanoi, Vietnam, 9-11 October 2017**
- **Pan African Policy Forum, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, November 2017**
- **4th Meeting of the Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning (GAML), Madrid, Spain, 28-29 November 2017**
- **Regional Study Exchange on Youth and Adult Learning and Education: Realising lifelong learning in public education systems, Bangkok, Thailand, 27-30 November 2017**
- Furthermore, a number of CSEF-supported coalitions and regional networks shared their perspectives on SDG 4 implementation by contributing to a **survey facilitated by the working group of the SDG-Education 2030 Steering Committee on Policies and Strategies.**

In addition to supporting national coalitions to engage with their national level SDG 4 implementation and review processes, Regional Secretariats also actively participated in the vast majority of the events listed above. Regional Secretariats further invested efforts in a number of important additional regional and global events and high level fora on SDG 4 implementation. These have extended opportunities for presenting linkages between national, regional and global needs and agendas, as briefly summarised in Box 6.

Box 6: Regional and Global Secretariats' engagement in regional and global events on SDG 4 implementation to support stronger links between national, regional and global CSO voices

Box 6 provides just a few illustrative examples of relevant events for the July – December 2017 period. The CSEF 2017 Biannual Report includes examples of events from the first half of 2017:

- **Regional Coordination Group on SDG4-Education 2030 for West and Central Africa (RCG4-WCA), Dakar, Senegal, 6 July 2017:** ANCEFA is a steering committee member of RCG4-WCA and participates in two tasks teams: i) Gender Equality and Inclusive Education and ii) Teaching and Learning: Educators' Network for Transformation (TALENT). In the gender and inclusive task team, ANCEFA provided national coalitions' positions to contribute to a policy brief on "Promoting girl's right to learn in West and Central Africa", which was subsequently launched in several events and on-line. Through the TALENT task team, ANCEFA provided inputs gathered from national coalitions for research on Professional Norms & Standards for Teachers.
- ASPBAE sustained its involvement in the **Asia Pacific Regional Thematic Working Group (TWG) on Education 2030+**. This engagement was a means to gather information on the work with Member States on SDG4 implementation as well as to ensure CSO voices were represented which influenced civil society participation in the 3rd Asia Pacific Meeting on Education 2030 (APMED) in Bangkok, themed 'Mainstreaming SDG4'. ASPBAE conducted a pre-APMED meeting to discuss the theme, gather policy asks and forge unity on an Asia Pacific agenda based on civil society analysis of the contexts in the different countries. Despite strong resistance from a few member states regarding CSO participation in APMED, ASPBAE was able to secure the participation of 12 national coalitions in the meeting, seven of which were also accredited as part of their government's official delegations. In the post-APMED meeting of the TWG, ASPBAE called for a CSO-led protocol in identifying national education coalitions who will participate in future APMED meetings and other regional platforms. Consequently, the TWG agreed to put ASPBAE in charge of the selection, it being the Asia Pacific Focal Point in the CCNGO.
- Before attending the HLPF held in New York, in consultation with coalitions, CLADE prepared a **regional analysis on the extent to which education was included in the National Voluntary Review (VNR)** reports of the 10 coalitions from the regional who took part (of which Honduras is CSEF-supported). This ensured qualified participation during the event, during which, amongst other CS positions, CLADE denounced LAC budgetary cuts as well as the rise of criminalization towards education activists in the region, as well as regression trends in gender and education. Having obtained its ECOSOC consultative status in 2017, for the first time CLADE was able to participate directly in the process of reviewing the reports, with the possibility of asking questions to the States, from the plenary. After the event, CLADE organized a webinar

with coalitions to take stock of the participation in HLPF and draw recommendations for participation in HLPF 2018, including identification of countries that will be reviewed. Increased articulation between the advocacy process in HLPF and UPR was also suggested, and CLADE has also called for the VNRs to present progress implementation on *all* SDGs, otherwise each SDG (including SDG 4) would be analyzed only once every four years. The same positions as mentioned in the HLPF and VNR processes above were reinforced during *UNGA*, where the CLADE delegation (including the Bolivia and Dominican Republic coalitions) took part in GCE's "*Sustainably Financing Education*" session, as well as in the panel "*Ending LGBTI violence and Discrimination*", and in *the High Level Panel "Financing the Future: Education 2030"*.

- ACEA participated in the *Fourth Regional Partners Meeting on SDG4 (Quality Education) in the Arab Region*, which was held at the ALECSO Headquarters in Tunis, 17 and 18 October 2017. Building on the '2017 Dubai Roadmap'. The meeting shared strategic information on Education 2030 at global and regional levels and enhanced coordinated support among partners, including civil society, involved in the implementation and monitoring of Sustainable Development Goal 4 in the Arab region.

In conjunction with ActionAid international, GCE presented a workshop at the *UKFIET Education and Development Forum* in September 2017, entitled "*How to adequately finance education for development?*" Using national case studies, GCE detailed strategies for financing of education in line with the Fund The Future Campaign's "4S's" approach – namely increasing the size of national budgets overall, the education's share in national budgets, sensitivity of allocations towards equity issues and scrutiny of education to ensure accountability. The need for increases in all 4 of the S's were linked to the necessity of tax justice to expand national tax bases. Similarly, in September, GCE held "*Sustainably Financing Education*," a Sideline Event during the UN General Assembly. Co-convened by Education International and the Global Alliance for Tax Justice, and in alliance with ActionAid, RESULTS, Light for the World, Open Society Foundations, the International Council for Adult Education and Oxfam, this event held the spotlight on tax justice to achieve sustainable domestic financing for SDG4, as a balance to the donor focus at several of the other education-related events during UNGA. Examining national case studies' experiences of financing of SDG4, the event brought together a number of different stakeholders to the same table to tackle the question of education financing with the aim to produce meaningful resolutions/goals for education financing ahead of GPE's Replenishment conference in February 2018.

3. Grant Agent Management and Oversight of the CSEF Program 2017

GCE has continued to fulfill its role and functions as the Global Secretariat (GS) for CSEF, including overall program design, coordination and management, as well as financial oversight as the Grant Agent for GPE-funded aspects of the program. The GS has sustained its global education policy engagement capacity support for national and regional implementing partners, including through the production of resource materials, toolkits and learning documents and through organizing cross-regional learning events and CSEF partners' engagement in various GPE policy and communication processes at international level. Throughout the year, the GS has also contributed to the global education financing campaign including replenishment and advocacy on issues emerging from the national coalitions and regions, as well as elevated these rooted experiences and voices of coalitions into global SDG 4 and Education 2030 spaces.

This report further substantiates the strategic effectiveness of the tri-level (national-regional-global) CSEF integrated partnership architecture, and how each level mutually reinforces and collectively realise the expected results and desired outcomes of the CSEF program.

3.1 Parallel external evaluation and Mid-Term Review

The second half of 2017 was marked by an anomaly attributable to two parallel evaluation procedures. The 3-year term of the CSEF program had been scheduled to require a Mid-Term Review - in part as a key planned mechanism for periodic review of the program Theory of Change based on testing assumptions - and for which terms of reference (TOR) were discussed and agreed between the global and regional implementing partners during April-May 2017.

The GPE Board subsequently mandated the GPE Secretariat to pursue an evaluation of GPE's support for civil society engagement within its Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Strategy, and communication

with the GPE Secretariat of this GPE-led evaluation plan converged with the final deliberations on the MTR TOR mentioned above. The proposal made by the GCE Global Secretariat to combine both evaluation approaches into one single exercise could not be accommodated by the GPE Secretariat. Therefore, in practically two parallel interview and survey corridors, the external evaluation with the purpose of informing the design of ASA, was executed from October 2017 to February 2018 by Oxford Policy Management. At the same time, the Mid-Term Review was conducted by an independent team contracted by GCE. Both final reports will be available before the end of Q1 in 2018 and are expected to influence further decision making on a successor program for CSEF²¹.

3.2 Broad civil society and GCE membership consultations on CSEF successor programme

As mentioned above, the new ASA funding mechanism has been an important consideration in the evaluation framework: Equally, the GCE Secretariat and CSEF program staff have been extremely busy, orientated around the new Financing and Funding Framework (FFF) mechanisms and have called on the wider constituency of GCE coalitions and its Board to engage with these new developments since July 2017, as described more in Section 2.7 of this report. As a result of these consultations a CSEF wide proposal committee was established that started to discuss the implications of a future CSEF design embedded into the ASA framework. Concerns were raised as to the risk of a break in funding for national coalitions. As the timelines for design work of ASA were considered the need for a costed extension or alternatively the need for a no cost extension were pondered and will need to be further explored as the design process for ASA takes shape. Some of these discussions took place during the meeting of the Board of GPE in Paris in December 2017.

3.3 Operational quality controls in two regions

Special attention was required by CSEF management to provide dedicated support for two regional implementing partners:

3.3.1 Africa

Early in the year, the recently appointed ANCEFA Regional Coordinator (Teopista Birungi) had requested a concerted effort from the CSEF Global Secretariat to enable her to understand the inherited ANCEFA management status and finance and administration controls. The GCE Global Coordinator and the Head of CSEF traveled to Dakar for a meeting with the Regional Coordinator, the CSEF ANCEFA Coordinator and the ANCEFA Capacity Building Officer.

A revision of ANCEFA's CSEF 2017 Implementation Plan was carried out, and it was agreed for GCE to continue to fulfil ANCEFA's request for CSEF disbursement payments to be made through the Global Secretariat until a new Finance and Administration Manager for ANCEFA could be in post and agreed system reforms implemented. Subsequently, the GCE Head of Administration and Finance and the GCE Internal Audit Coordinator prepared the internal and external audit in consultation with ANCEFA, facilitated a risk mitigation plan, conducted an internal systems review, and instituted internal review processes.

3.3.2 Asia and the Pacific

In August 2017, the GCE Global Secretariat informed the ASPBAE Regional Secretariat for the Asia and Pacific region of Education International's (EI) decision to depart from their role as regional Financial Management Agency (FMA) with effect from end November 2017. In order to ensure continuity and administrative streamlining, it was decided that the GCE Secretariat would be interim regional FMA until the end of the CSEF III program. A closing out process was prepared with EI, which implied increasing the finance human resource capacity at the GCE Global Secretariat for a gradual but temporary takeover of the regional FMA role for Asia and the Pacific. The details and modalities of how national coalitions were required to issue their 2017 quarterly financial reports during this close

²¹ The Mid-Term Review final report was concluded by mid-February 2018. The GPE-commissioned external evaluation report has experienced some delays and - at the time of writing - is anticipated to be shared with GCE and CSEF partners by end April 2018.

out process and how the transfer of funding to coalitions is to be managed was communicated with ASPBAE and coalitions in the region.

3.4 GPE Secretariat mission to Africa

In October 2017 preparations began for a mission proposed by the GPE Secretariat to meet with some key CSEF entities in Africa, including staff from ANCEFA, Oxfam-Ibis (regional FMA), the CSEF Global Secretariat, and the Senegalese and Ethiopian coalitions.

A final validation of the outcomes of this mission and the subsequent participation of GPE Secretariat staff members in the Africa Regional Policy Forum was agreed between the GPE and GCE Secretariats in early 2018, and these mainly focussed on some detailed operational matters.

3.5 Education Replenishment and Financing Campaigns

Following the launch in Washington DC on April 20th 2017 of its 3rd [replenishment campaign](#) with the GPE Case for Investment, GCE began to step up its efforts to contribute to the campaign in the second half of 2017, and this had implications for CSEF programmatic work at all levels. A Campaign Manager was hired for GCE's [education financing campaign](#), which saw global, regional and national advocacy for *"Increasing Global Education Financing: Bold and Credible Pledges To Achieve Sustainable Change."* In particular, the GPE replenishment conference was used as an opportunity to advocate for increased domestic budgetary commitments.

The GCE Global Secretariat supported national coalitions to feed into the campaign and ensure their perspectives were represented in GPE's policy processes at international level - including through GPE Board and committee meetings and UNESCO SDG 4 processes. Intensive collaboration and coordination between the GCE Global Secretariat and Regional Secretariats (ANCEFA, ACEA, ASPBAE and CLADE) continued in order to augment national level voices and actions.

The programmatic target was for national and regional level civil society engagement to positively contribute to increasing levels of domestic financing for education, in line - and sometimes above - the 2030 framework targets (both the 4-6% GNP and the 15-20% education budget targets). Interesting case examples of attempts to increase the revenue side and engage with tax evasion and tax justice advocacy were showcased in global communications. These efforts were bolstered by project support for ten African coalitions, funded by the German Backup Education Initiative (GIZ), which helped these coalitions to amplify their national campaign work for increased domestic level investment. Coalitions informed their work by analysis of the 2014 pledges against actual expenditure. All ten selected coalitions were guided and supported to adopt a three-step strategic implementation plan that started with the introduction of the replenishment campaign to members of the national coalition, after which the conversation was taken to both the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Education, and then the engagement of local and regional media sources as the third campaign strategy.

Many governments that placed the replenishment or the pledge making as a lesser priority were seen bringing the issue to the front. The GCE movement hosted events that demonstrated the importance of financing education as an enabler to the attainment of the other SDGs. Secondly, many governments kept the replenishment as an education conversation but with sustained civil society pressure, we noted increasing involvement and leadership by the Ministries of Finance and Economic planning leading the process. Another key change in Africa was the hosting of the first Pan Africa conference on Education Financing convened by the African Union with the Africa Union Chairpersons and select Heads of State and Government leading the call for more commitment. GCE, ANCEFA and other civil society organisations were invited to the dialogue.

3.6 Other technical and capacity support work

In addition to the above-mentioned labor-intensive activities concerning the future of the CSEF program, its funding in the ASA mechanism, and securing its funding through a successful replenishment campaign, the Global Secretariat was involved in many other ground-breaking and coordinating support activities during the 2017 year.

These included technical and capacity support visits to individual coalitions in collaboration with representatives of the respective regional structures; conducting internal audit missions; participation in and technical support to regional policy forums, and; quality oversight and engagement in regional funding committee (RFCs) meetings. Of particular note here is the joint organization of a discussion visit to Liberia in order to re-establish a new coalition supported by a broad and representative civil society base. It needs to be noted here that Liberia was not listed in the CSEF III application for eligible countries. In phase II of CSEF, the Liberian coalition LETCOM fell into disrepute because of funds not accounted for to Backup GIZ, which led to a deterioration of the relation also with ANCEFA. LETCOM was derecognized as a member of GCE in 2015. The mission in 2017 was an earnest attempt to establish a broadly constituted National Civil Society Education Coalition that could transform the way civil society advocacy works, enhancing credibility and integrity in civil society operations. The processes undertaken were successful and a proposal for CSEF to fund inaugural measures for the formation of a Liberia National Education Coalition can be expected in the spring of 2018.

3.7 Reduced HR for CSEF at the Global Secretariat

The human resource base at the GCE Global Secretariat experienced a set-back in mid-2017 when the position of Head of Learning and Networks became vacant and could not be successfully filled by the end of the year. While certainly not at a standstill (as demonstrated in Section 3.5 of this report), a felt decrease in the production of blogs, newsletters, website inputs and learning tool outputs was experienced as a consequence of the vacancy. The position will be filled in the first semester 2018. The Head of Policy and the Head of Communication and Campaigns post which are both partly covered from CSEF funds were filled in November 2017 and April 2018 respectively. The gaps in headcounts had to be filled with short term consultancies.

3.8 Embedding systems capacity for CSEF

Building on the gains made in systems development and capacity for the CSEF program as described in the biannual report for 2017, performance of the *Online (web-enabled) MEL system Platform* was improved in the second half of the year through software and translation perfections, and additional face-to-face training experiences that were delivered primarily to the Asia South Pacific and African user groups (in November and December 2017 respectively). These efforts resulted in increased and more successful engagement with the online platform, ultimately further enhancing the accuracy, efficiency, transparency and sustainability of CSEF data gathering and analysis. Bi-monthly MEL webinars have been planned and announced for 2018, targetting national and regional partners.

Also, the online *Financial Reporting Tool* underwent further refinement and was fully rolled out by the end of the year. This system ensures that financial reporting is less burdensome, reports are submitted on time, errors are minimised, and spending is in accordance with the approved budgets of grant recipients. The supporting documents are still submitted with the financial reports to ensure that expenditure is legitimate and that the correct processes have been undertaken to arrive at the final figures. The system covers a wide range of areas of the financial report framework and simplifies the reporting process.

Now fully embedded in operational practices, these two key CSEF system components enable real time tracking of program progress and achievements, as well as early detection of risk factors, thus serving to support timely programmatic decision-making and corrective action.

4. Challenges and Remediation Strategies

The majority of challenges experienced in the year within and across the three implementing partner levels have been outlined in the preceding sections of this report. Primarily they relate to some recurring barriers partners have been navigating since program onset which have been previously reported (for example in the CSEF 2016 Annual Report).

Table 6: Key challenges and remediation strategies 2017

Challenge experienced	Solution/remedial strategy
Political instability and/or fragility, political repression of civil society, and shrinking spaces for civil society engagement in sector (and more broadly development) policy processes.	Regional and global secretariats brought national voices to the fore, and provided space for national voices at those levels. CSEF has also engaged with GPE on the question of GPE funding supporting undemocratic regimes or countries that severely limit civil space and freedom of speech. This discussion will require high level engagement of the Board of GCE to come to conclusions
Delayed funding hindering timely activity implementation	More streamlined bureaucracy and transparent administration with the online financial management system more deeply embedded into program operations during the year.
Staffing, budgets, capacity, and time demands – across all three (national, regional and global) levels	The vast majority of partners adjusted their annual work plans and postponed some activities into early 2018
Extensive corrective action efforts required to maintain implementation of the risk and quality control protocols of the program, especially in the Africa and Asia and Pacific regions.	With ramped up HR headcount in 2018 we will be able to engage Regional Secretariats to improve on implementation and prop up quality assurance and monitor progress.
<p>Specific logistical obstacles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued risks in Afghanistan prevented any in-country support and travel to the Afghanistan coalition and sudden visa restrictions imposed by the governments of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan undermined ASPBAE’s capacity support visit plans to these coalitions. • For ACEA, additional support was required to assist the coalition in Sudan to access the CSEF online MEL system, due to the US embargo on communications with the country (the MEL system is hosted on the US-based Salesforce company platform). ACEA also continued to navigate sensitive procedures to engage optimally with the coalition in Palestine, and faced severe blockages reaching the Yemeni coalition (both virtually and face-to-face); moreover the coordinator of the coalition was arrested, reportedly due to his affiliation with advocating for the rights of teachers in Yemen. 	<p>Instead of in-country support a lot of the accompanying work has to be done in remote formats. Capacity building of coalitions members and staff partly happens in neighbouring countries.</p> <p>The Sudan challenges were overcome since the lifting of US sanctions against Sudan. A visit by the RFMA representative to Sudan helped to improve the reporting and accounting processes.</p> <p>The work in Yemen remains fraught with difficulties but to abandon the support cannot be a solution. The Programme Officer in the ACEA regional secretariat who is herself of Yemeni nationality keeps contact with this frontline coalition and lobbies on their behalf for continued support for the upkeep of schooling operations. Despite the challenges in the country the coalition keeps on lobbying and is active in enabling school operations.</p>

<p>Communication and decision-making processes in the CSEF and GPE partnership. Specifically, the perceived shrinking space for CSEF voice and review in the GPC meetings have been documented and recently shared through the GPE Secretariat communication mechanisms. Concerns have mainly manifested through requests from the GPC for shorter biannual and annual reports (which results in CSEF reports to GPE becoming more quantitative than qualitative orientated), while at the same time allocating increasingly limited time and opportunity for productive discussion on CSEF.</p>	<p>GCE has requested for more space and time for GPE to elaborate on the full CSEF programme.</p>
--	---

5. Progress towards Sustainability and Diversification of Funding

5.1 National coalitions

While partners are astutely aware of the importance of attracting and securing funding outside of CSEF and becoming independently sustainable, commonly they have limited human and financial resource bases to meet prevailing deliverable demands (as referred to in section 4 above).

The CSEF funding model includes support for institutional and human resource-related costs – with these areas of support seen as essential, given the impact in terms of sustainability and increased efficiencies. Most importantly, although the range of donors is limited and aid to the sector incrementally diminishing, CSEF funds have been used effectively by coalitions to leverage other resources. The value of and extent to which other resources can be leveraged is however highly contextualised, varying significantly across locations. For instance, a rapid assessment was undertaken during the first and second quarters of 2017 through a survey targeting national coalitions, developed and administered by the Global Secretariat. The findings of this exercise have been documented in a summary report which forms a supporting document to this Annual Report²². It identifies that; while there are some clear differences between regions (with coalitions in the LA&C and ME&EE regions proportionally securing less resources beyond CSEF than coalitions in the other two regions for the 2017 financial year), core CSEF funding is crucial for the continuation of advocacy and social accountability work carried out by civil society education coalitions. This is because CSEF has directly supported their formation into strong civil society entities operating in the education policy arena, which in turn is a phenomenal resource diversification mobiliser across all coalitions. The survey also identified that, in aggregate, ***CSEF-supported coalitions mobilise more than twice the amount from third party donors in comparison to what they receive from CSEF.***

The abovementioned survey findings are drawn on data for the 2016-2017 financial year. For the 2017-2018 financial year, while absolute figures of additional funding secured are not conclusive (due to coalitions reporting new funding partnerships formally secured but not always disclosing the value), the following provides some illustrative examples of coalitions’ continued and successful resource mobilization efforts in 2017. It demonstrates ***coalitions have employed a multi-pronged approach (beyond the ongoing collection of membership fees) for improving the likelihood of sustainability:***

- The ***Burkina Faso*** coalition’s collaboration with MENA influenced the allocation of 30 million CFA francs in the MENA 2017 action plan, allocated specifically to support the coalitions’ advocacy activities in engaging civil society in national education priorities, and the funds are expected to flow in the next reporting period. The coalition also commenced negotiations with BØRNEfonden, OXFAM-IBIS and Aide et Action for the development of new partnerships as previous funding from these agencies came to an end at the end of 2017.

²² See “Resource mobilisation capacity of civil society education coalitions_A review by the Civil Society Education Fund”, submitted as a supporting document with this CSEF 2017 Annual Report.

- In **Cameroon**, the coalition recruited a new Program Manager for CSEF in 2017, and this role explicitly requires the post to play a major role in mobilising new resources within the coalition, to ensure its sustainability. The Program Manager has already conducted a donor mapping exercise with the coalition and commenced the process of targeted proposals development, which will be submitted in 2018.
- In **Rwanda**, having finalized the official and legal registration of the coalition in early January 2018, REFAC has already positioned itself to engage with new partners both inside and outside the country to mobilize additional partnerships and resources. The coalition has joined the Rwanda Civil Society Platform to initiate links with other local NGOs, and is in the process of joining the Rwanda Education NGO Coordination Platform (RENCOP) which will widen the coalition's opportunities to work with International NGO members of that platform.
- CAMPE **Bangladesh** submitted multiple concept notes to different development partners including PKSF, Water Aid, AusAid, CIDA, the ILO, UNESCO and Oxfam, and additional proposals were in process by the end of the year for submission to DFiD, the EU, MJF and Unicef. And NCE-**India** engaged in dialogue for partnership support with the Malala Fund and UNESCO
- NEP and the NGO Forum in **Cambodia** signed an agreement to carry out joint research on School Budgets Disclosure. In the agreement, NEP contributed 10,922 USD and the NGO Forum Cambodia contributed 18,000 USD for the costed research activities. It is hoped that launching of the research and advocacy action plan will attract more funds from other partners such as Action Aid Cambodia, World Vision, USAID and AFD. In addition, NEP has joined the consortium on the Implementation of Social Accountability Framework (I-SAF) led by Oxfam, and NEP will be a core applicant with Oxfam to apply for an EU grant to promote school accountability at the grassroots from 2019-2020.
- In the Latin America and Caribbean region, the coalition in **Honduras** continued its efforts to secure funding at regional level with the network of the fora and coalitions of Central America, Mexico and the Caribbean (CAMEXCA). Three proposals were prepared: i) Directed to the government of New Zealand through the RACI initiative for the amount of USD15,000 to support monitoring the right to education for marginalised people; ii) Proposal to the NED Foundation on civic education and values for democracy, and; iii) a proposal to the Coca-Cola Foundation, on contributing to the improvement of education in 10 municipalities of Santa Bárbara. Then, in the **Dominican Republic**, the coalition has a cooperation agreement with Oxfam and this will be continued in 2018, and the coalition is in dialogue with the InteRed Foundation to extend an existing partnership into 2018.
- Finally, in the ME&EE region, ACCE **Albania** and its members have been preparing for a joint application to submit in the call for proposals that UNICEF and Save the Children will be opening in 2018, while the coalition in **Georgia** secured an undisclosed amount of financial support from a private philanthropist, and APSCF in **Moldova** submitted a proposal around inclusive education in partnership with the Alliance of Organizations for Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Moldova. APSCF also recruited assistance of a consultant to develop a fundraising strategy for the coalition. And, during 2017, both the **Palestine and Sudan** coalitions primarily focused their drive for independent sustainability by securing (realized) commitment from members to distribute the workload and activities amongst members, according to their thematic or technical expertise, capacities and resources.

5.2 Regional and global level efforts

The following case example is provided to illustrate efforts to diversify resources at the regional level:

During 2017, CLADE developed new fundraising proposals as well as engaged in strengthening relations with donors outside of CSEF. In particular, CLADE organized several meetings with AECID, to prospect

options for a new long-term agreement for the next 4 years, in alliance with Ayuda en Acción. The conversations helped to prepare grounds for presentation of a new project that focusses on SDG4 monitoring and advocacy in the region.

Furthermore, CLADE presented itself for the Aram Gulf Program for Development Prize, that recognizes efforts from international NGOs that contribute to SDG 4 implementation, and CLADE currently awaits the outcome.

CLADE also submitted a proposal to the European Commission, aimed at supporting education initiatives for people with disabilities, in alliance with coalitions in Peru, Costa Rica and Honduras, and with the Brazilian NGO Mais Diferenças, and the outcome of the submission is awaited. CLADE also engaged with the Tinker Foundation in New York, USA and submitted a proposal focused on secondary students and school violence in Central America, but unfortunately the proposal was not approved. Several other proposals are currently being developed, including one on education privatization (for the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation) and Education and Migration in Central America (for the Sasakawa Foundation). Efforts to sustain the network also include continuation of financing from CLADE's traditional donors, including Ayuda en Acción, OEI, ActionAid, UNICEF, UNESCO and others.

At the global level, GCE funding sources include grants and membership fees. It is important to note that a significant proportion of the funds that GCE receives is regranted to regional partners as well as to national coalitions. In total, 67% of GCE annual income is sourced from GPE.

GCE started 2017 with the development of a Resource Mobilisation/Fundraising strategy, to be reviewed for the second time at the May 2018 Board meeting. Some of the proposals in the draft strategy are already being implemented - for instance the GCE Board has approved a percentage increase in membership fees which has taken effect from January 2018.

GCE engaged in discussions with the Open Society Foundation to explore the possibility of a new funding opportunity. In addition, and as indicated in the CSEF 2017 biannual report, the Oxfam-Ibis grant, which was scheduled to come to an end in 2018 has been extended for another two years, now to end in 2021, though the funding envelope will be reduced from 2019. Within the reporting period the new four (4) years proposal to Oxfam-Ibis under the title 'Transformative Education and Rights' was initiated and a first draft proposal was submitted in December 2017 for review.

GCE also received two grants from the GiZ/BACKUP Initiative during the reporting period which amounted to a total of over Euro 115,000. The two supported projects were outlined in the CSEF 2017 biannual report,

6. Financial Report for January to December 2017

GCE and CSEF Financial Management Framework

As the Grant Agent for the CSEF program, GCE has overall fiduciary responsibilities. This includes general financial management, oversight and coordination of the CSEF program between various grant-recipient tiers. To ensure that financial management processes are working optimally, GCE has a strong governance and accountability structure in place which ensures that no level of the program is left exposed to financial management risks.

Governance Oversight

The GCE Board's primary function is to provide oversight and strategic decision-making for the GCE Secretariat and the entire Movement. The Board is required to exercise necessary care in its duties to ensure that decisions made are contributing to the process of strengthening financial management processes within the organization. The Board's role includes evaluating financial policies, approving budgets and work plans, reviewing and approving management accounts and reports, overseeing internal and external audit processes among others.

The Finance and Personnel Committee (FPC) is a sub-committee of the GCE Board. All documents and decisions relating to finance and staff matters are discussed and decided by this committee, and this practice was continued throughout the reporting period. The key contracts and decisions require the FPC's full approval before the full board endorsement and, as in previous years, this protocol was duly adhered to in 2017.

In this reporting period, the FPC committee met to discuss internal audit, finance and personnel matters. Some key decisions that arose from these meetings that relates to the CSEF program included approval of the 2017 internal audit plan (May 2017 meeting), approval of the 2018 internal audit plan; discussions, suggestions and comments to the internal audit charter as well as expanding and defining the FPC's role to include internal audit process (November 2017 meeting).

The CSEF Global Oversight Committee (GOC) provides strategic oversight, accountability and the avoidance of potential conflict of interests throughout the CSEF program. To retain its independence, the committee is comprised only of GCE Board members from constituencies that are not eligible for CSEF grants. In this reporting period the GOC met to discuss the following:

- i. GIZ support to Gambia and Kenya Coalitions following the audit that was commissioned by GIZ and actions the GCE Secretariat had to undertake following the concerns raised by GPE Secretariat
- ii. New GPE funding mechanism.

CSEF Financial Management Structure

As reported previously, for the CSEF program to be coordinated and supported at all levels, GCE has a financial management structure in place. All the functions within this structure were consistently applied throughout the 2017 year to ensure that grant management and coordination exists and is compliant with all CSEF financial processes and procedures as below:

Global level

GCE holds the role as a Grant Agent for CSEF and reports regularly to the GPE Secretariat on CSEF implementation. The CSEF Global Secretariat works in close coordination with the Regional Secretariats and the Regional Financial Management Agency partners at regional level and is responsible for two distinctive functions:

- i. Financial and grant management and oversight.
- ii. Program coordination and support including strategic planning, reporting, inter-regional coordination, learning and capacity building, and linking CSEF work to global advocacy.

In this reporting period, GCE's *financial management and oversight* function within the program included:

- a) Oversight of financial reporting in line with CSEF financial regulations
- b) Ensuring that all contracts and addenda have been issued to all Coalitions
- c) Coordination of the internal audit work. This included capacity building through financial management trainings and the sharing of the CSEF finance and grant management tools and resources(i.e. CSEF Financial Regulations, guidelines and procedures documents, terms set out in grant recipient agreements and addendas, terms of reference for financial management agencies and funding committees and audit committees, grant management processes, budget and accounting formats, audit standards and guidelines etc.); risk profiling of CSEF grant-recipients; and internal audit reviews conducted on a sample of national coalitions either independently or jointly supporting regional structures.
- d) Fund disbursement to Regional Secretariat and Regional Financial Management Agencies
- e) Reviewing financial reports from all the CSEF regions
- f) Continuing supporting Coalitions and Regional Financial Management Agencies in the rollout of the Online Financial Reporting Tool

Regional Level

At the regional level, the financial management agencies are an extension of the CSEF financial management framework/system. With support from GCE and the Regional Secretariat, the RFMA role includes national level grant distribution, capacity-building support, reviewing budgets, overseeing national coalition financial reporting processes and contracting Coalitions once their proposals have been approved by the Regional Funding Committee. To prevent conflict of interest and strengthen accountability and transparency at regional level, all regional decisions on funding including approval of or amendments to coalition proposals and decisions about final levels of funding, are taken by the **Regional Funding Committees**, in line with the CSEF guidelines for evaluation of national proposals. On the other hand, the grant management is carried about by **Regional Financial Management Agencies (RFMAs)** which is independent to the programmatic work oversight provided by Regional Secretariats.

In this reporting period, the RFMAs provided support to all contracted Coalitions. A total of 29 monitoring and capacity support visits were conducted

It is important to also note that internal audit was added as one of the RFMA roles at the beginning of 2017. All RFMAs were able to provide support to national coalitions in weak areas through recommendations following internal audit assessments; build the capacity of national coalition internal audit committees through induction programs during monitoring and support visits; and monitor the implementation of recommendations provided to ensure that internal audit is working effectively and strengthening the systems of the coalition.

Financial Reporting (January – December 2017)

In this reporting period, GCE as Grant Agent for the program received a total of **\$7,813,325**. Global and Region spending totalled **\$3,242,488** and spending for National Coalitions totalled **\$7,770,493**. This represents recorded expenditure for 2017 only. But since the inception of the program in 2016, a total of **\$15,327,617** has been the reported expenditure. This figure includes 2017 spending.

Budget Variance and possibilities of an extension

The budget for 2016 and 2017 period was **\$18,651,274**. Total expenditure for this period as noted above was **\$15,327,617**. The overall variance is **\$3,323,657**. The breakdown for this variance is as follows:

- i. Global and Regional - **\$1,509,739**
- ii. National Coalitions - **\$1,813,91**

Annex C, titled 'CSEF Financial Report: Budget versus Actuals and Variance Analysis Jan-Dec 2017' provides further details.

The budget variances at global, regional and national level were due to delayed activities as well as savings made during the implementation period. A total of 1400 activity were planned by Coalitions in 2017 of which 1,160 activities were successfully implemented leaving a balance of 240 as partially and not implemented. Some of the partially/not implemented are around such activities as:

- i) Stakeholder engagement meetings and capacity building workshops
- ii) Development, production, presentation and dissemination of research or review papers

Due to this and other reasons, the GCE Secretariat has started discussing with the GPE Secretariat on the possibility of a no cost extension for the first 3 months of 2019. The GCE Secretariat is in the process of reviewing funding needs for 2018 so to determine the overall budget to be carried over into 2019. These details will be shared with GPE in the coming days.