INITIAL GPE BUSINESS CASE FOR HOSTING EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT

For Decision

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 This paper responds to the Board’s request at its March 9, 2016 audio conference that the Secretariat develop a business case for hosting Education Cannot Wait (ECW), the new fund for education in emergencies and protracted crises, which was formally launched at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul on May 23, 2016.

1.2 ECW will be hosted on an interim basis by UNICEF for approximately one year, at the end of which time a decision about permanent hosting will be taken (through an independent hosting review process). It is expected that key design features will be developed, implemented, and modified during this initial period. The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Secretariat will be working with UNICEF on these design features. Over the coming months, the Strategic Financing Working Group (SFWG), with the support of an external firm, will be developing a range of options for raising and delivering GPE Funds, including through innovative financing. Therefore, this paper is a preliminary case provided as input to both the UNICEF hosted implementation period and the intended external process for selecting a permanent host; and is input into the Board’s wider consideration of strategic financing and the next replenishment.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Drawing upon the preliminary design of ECW as set out in “Education Cannot Wait: Proposing a Fund for Education in Emergencies” (ODI May 2016), this paper offers a preliminary analysis of the hosting implications for GPE. It proposes a hosting approach that maximizes synergies with GPE’s existing institutional arrangements. It outlines the implications for GPE governance, institutional arrangements, core work, and Secretariat resources, offering alternative options worth further consideration.

2.2 GPE currently does and will continue to support its partners facing emergencies and protracted crises. As highlighted in Goal 2 of its new strategic plan, GPE is committed to ensuring quality education for children and youth affected by conflict and crisis, including those internally
and externally displaced (refugees and migrants). Through its convening role in countries in crisis and countries hosting refugees, and through specific programmatic tools, GPE brings a longer term development planning perspective to providing education in humanitarian response settings. In this way GPE bridges the humanitarian/development divide.

2.3 Fully 30 of the 50 countries with UN recognized emergencies¹ are GPE partner countries (see Annex 2). Furthermore, among GPE developing country partners, all but one has UNCHR identified populations of concern. This suggests that there are strong potential synergies between the needs of children living in countries within GPE’s membership, and the needs that ECW has been created to address. Hosting ECW could enable GPE to more fully deliver on this mandate, and to further close the humanitarian/development divide.

2.4 Moreover, hosting could allow GPE to leverage its partnership model, which mobilizes diverse partners at global and country levels. At the **global level**, GPE has the distinct advantage of being uniquely focused on the mobilization of resources for education. It has a solid track record of managing replenishment processes and can provide a strong communications and external relations platform, building upon the high visibility and political support for ECW. Furthermore, GPE has experience in creating a pooled fund that is designed around needs-based allocations. At the country level GPE is focused on improving planning, policy dialogue, mutual accountability, and financing to ensure sustainable education systems that deliver equitable quality learning for all children and youth.

2.5 The ECW proposal calls for the establishment of two broad “funding windows” – an **Acceleration Facility** and a **Breakthrough Fund**. The paper offers one possible way of operationalizing these funding windows, building upon GPE’s existing theory of change and commitment to strengthening sector planning, coordination of financing, and creation of sustainable educational systems, in ways that bridge humanitarian emergencies and sustainable development.

2.6 As illustrated in the figure below, the proposed grant types are modeled as modifications of GPE’s existing planning and implementation grants (ESPDGs and ESPIGs). This approach could support early emergency response while building towards stable and sustainable education systems – systems with the capacity to support displaced children and youth, and the capacity to plan for preparedness and resilience in advance of future crises. Countries would move progressively from early emergency response and emergency grants, towards medium term transition funding, and ultimately towards longer term, sustained funding,

¹ This includes countries with a UNICEF HAC appeal in 2016 or another form of an emergency response plan.
### Possible Alignment of ECW and GPE Grant Types from Emergency to Stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Early Emergency</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Long Term – Recovery/Preparedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>GPE Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“BREAKTHROUGH FUND”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grants</td>
<td>1. Emergency planning grant</td>
<td>3. Transition Planning Grant</td>
<td>ESPDG - Education Sector Planning Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emergency Program Grant</td>
<td>4. Transition Implementation Grant (or top up)</td>
<td>ESPIG - Education Sector Program Implementation Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. ECW Acceleration Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global and Regional Activities/KGPE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 In all of these grants GPE would not be an implementer – rather it would work through partners with expertise in humanitarian settings as its Grant Agents; and mobilize local coordinating bodies at the country level or regional level, bringing together key humanitarian and development actors around a common emergency/sector planning and grant application process. GPE will act as a neutral broker, encouraging collaboration among different humanitarian and development partners and reducing fragmentation in the sector.

2.8 In line with this vision, four grant types are identified for potential consideration in order to deliver on the objectives of the Breakthrough Fund window identified in the ECW proposal. These are (i) an emergency planning grant and (ii) an emergencies program grant to allow for a continuation of services, including by alternative providers if a government or governments are not able; and (iii) a transitional planning grant and (iv) an implementation grant to provide bridge funding of between six months and three years after an emergency. These grants could also be used to provide additional funding for refugee education to host countries with GPE ESPIG allocations. All countries would be encouraged to move towards using GPE’s existing ESPDG/ESPIG grants rather than apply repeatedly to the ECW grant windows to encourage sustainable longer-term planning.

2.9 A fifth grant window, aligned with the “Acceleration Facility” in the ECW proposal, will provide funding to accelerate the capacity and work of key international actors, and for investment in global goods such as improved data, evidence and innovative and more cost effective approaches to service delivery. Key actors responsible for coordinating emergency response in education –
including the Education Cluster and the INEE would be candidates, alongside other humanitarian organizations, for funding from this window.

2.10 Hosting will require modifications in GPE governance arrangements, including the need for more rapid decision-making and inclusion of greater representation of humanitarian actors on the GPE Board and committees. The paper proposes several ways of mobilizing the strengths of the High Level Steering Group through the modification of GPE’s governance arrangements. It also emphasizes GPE’s commitment to the inclusion of civil society and developing country partners in all future governance arrangements.

2.11 Furthermore, GPE would need to modify some of its financial arrangements. GPE already has the ability to hold funds in trust from different types of donors; and under authority from the Board and subject to agreement of the Trustee, funds could be targeted for specific purposes. The most expedient approach would see the utilization of the present GPE trust fund with notional earmarking and reporting by purpose of funding. Although the Trustee is currently reviewing its policies and procedures around the use of hard earmarks in the context of funds such as the GPE, the Trustee may also be asked to consider whether it would be possible to create sub-accounts of the GPE Fund to allow targeting of contributions for ECW. Creating a separate Financial Intermediary Fund (which would require the approval of the WBG Board of Executive Directors) may also be considered. Consideration of the creation of a separate legal entity could potentially provide even greater flexibility for more complex financial instruments.

2.12 GPE would also need to expand the range of Grant Agents to include more partners with expertise in emergency settings. GPE has successfully diversified its pool of grant agents since 2015, and has established a process for accrediting INGOs as grant agents. GPE Grant Agents can effectively channel funds through to local CSOs. However, as a second stage in developing the platform, GPE could also explore the opportunity to deliver grants directly to these partners at the country level, however this would require creation of a new legal entity, and alternative fiduciary oversight and risk management mechanisms.

2.13 Hosting ECW has implications for Secretariat capacity and resources, which will need to be more fully explored. Adapting GPE’s governance structures, grant windows, management capacities, and bolstering its technical expertise in responding to emergencies whilst implementing a new strategic plan and rolling out improvements to its operational model presents a significant, but not unmanageable challenge for the organization if the transition to GPE hosting is carefully staged.
2.14 If GPE were to host ECW, the success of this arrangement would need to be measured against a substantial increase in overall resources for education and a significant increase in the number of children and youth affected by emergencies and protracted crises receiving quality education, including those internally and externally displaced. All GPE member countries would have Education Sector Plans that include actions to address the educational needs of refugee and displaced populations in their countries; and ESPs would include attention to emergency preparedness, peace and resilience. There would be a higher profile and priority for education financing, and an effective bridge between emergency and development actors and their activities in education would be established. Cost-effective, evidence based approaches to the utilization of ECW resources would be in place; and better monitoring and evidence would be available.

2.15 While there are certainly risks to hosting ECW, there are also significant risks to not hosting it. Of particular concern would be potential displacement of funding for GPE work in fragile and conflict affected settings and other low-income developing country partners, and the significant risk of a further fragmentation of international aid for education.

3. **RECOMMENDED DECISION**

3.1 The Secretariat requests that the Board of Directors approve the following:

**BOD/2016/06-XX—Business Case to Host the Education Cannot Wait Platform**: The Board of Directors:

1. Welcomes the launch of Education Cannot Wait (ECW), and recognizing the alignment between its objectives and those of GPE as set out in BOD/2016/06 DOC 18, confirms its interest in being considered as host.

2. Recognizes that significant additional analysis and information will be required before the Board can take a final decision on hosting the platform, and given the link with the ongoing work of the Strategic Financing Working Group (SFWG), requests the Secretariat to work closely with the external firm to be hired to further explore the implications of hosting ECW as part of this work and to report back to the Board at its second face-to-face meeting in 2016.

3. Mandates the Secretariat to continue to work closely with UNICEF in the design and development of ECW.
4. **ANNEXES**

Annex 1 – Initial GPE Business Case for Hosting Education Cannot Wait (p. 7)
Annex 2 – GPE Members and Non-Members Experiencing Humanitarian Emergency (p. 24)
Annex 3 – Innovative Financing Instruments for Further Exploration (p. 26)
Annex 4 – GPE’s Work in Conflict-Affected and Fragile Countries (p. 28)
ANNEX 1 – INITIAL GPE BUSINESS CASE FOR HOSTING EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On May 23 2016 the international community gathered at the World Humanitarian Summit to launch Education Cannot Wait (ECW), following more than one year of preparation led by a group of political champions and a technical strategy group.2

1.2 ECW, as laid out in a final proposal designed by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI May 2016), will address key gaps in global efforts to meet the educational needs of children and youth affected by conflict and crisis. It will do so by significantly improving the availability of funding for education in emergencies; strengthening the effectiveness and coordination of planning and response; improving capacity; and strengthening accountability. The ECW proposal sets the ambitious goal of raising US$3.85 billion over the next five years so that progressively all school age children and youth affected by emergencies worldwide can benefit from quality education by 2030.

1.3 For its first year, ECW will be hosted on an interim basis by UNICEF, after which a permanent host will be sought. ECW will be led by a high level multi-stakeholder steering group, which will include representatives from bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society, the corporate sector, foundations and developing country partners.

1.4 This paper responds to the Board’s March 9, 2016 audio conference request for the Secretariat to prepare a business case that addresses the key opportunities, challenges and operational requirements for potential GPE hosting of ECW. It proposes an approach that would see ECW build upon, and gain maximum support, from GPE’s current operational model, grant windows and institutional resources. The paper begins by defining current challenges in emergency response and support to countries facing protracted crises and outlines GPE’s current approach to each. It sets out a proposal for an integrated approach to hosting ECW, and explores how GPE might build upon its existing strengths to support fundraising, financial and technical management of grants, monitoring and evaluation, partnership coordination, and governance.

1.5 Bringing ECW to GPE has several advantages. Most importantly, it provides a unique opportunity to bridge the gap between humanitarian and development financing, and to ensure sustained, multi-year planning and finance is available for the education of children and youth affected by conflict and crisis, including those forcibly displaced. The paper outlines GPE’s additional comparative advantage for hosting ECW as follows:

2 The initiative was led by a political champions group convened by UN Special Envoy for Global Education, Gordon Brown, UNICEF Executive Director, Tony Lake, and Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Board Chair, Julia Gillard; an interagency Technical Strategy Group led by Canada and the UK.


4 HLSG members include: Tariq Al Gurg, Chief Executive Officer, Dubai Cares; Marie-Claude Bibeau, Minister of International Development and Francophonie, Canada; Irina Bokova, Director-General, UNESCO; Børge Brende, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Norway; Dean Brooks, Director of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies; Julia Gillard, Chair, Global Partnership for Education; Filippo Grandi, UN High Commissioner for Refugees; Justine Greening, Secretary of State for International Development, United Kingdom; Former Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete; Anthony Lake, Executive Director, UNICEF; Elias Bou Saab, Minister of Education, Lebanon; Gayle Smith, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development; and Tove Wang, Chief Executive Officer, Save the Children Norway.
First, GPE’s mission and goals, and the characteristics of GPE developing country partners, mean that the Partnership already works in contexts affected by emergencies and chronic crises. Nearly half of GPE partner countries are affected by conflict or fragility. Significantly, of the 50 countries with recognized emergencies\(^5\), 30 are GPE members. While eligibility for support would need to be modified to address the needs in countries that are not currently GPE partners, there is significant experience operating in these types of environments (see Annex 2).

Second, GPE has already developed important mechanisms to address the needs of countries affected by conflict and fragility – bridging the humanitarian and development divide, namely through its grants for transitional sector planning; and its development of flexible and rapid financing mechanisms (the Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States, which includes Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations – see Annex 4 for overview). These are important innovations, as recognized by independent analysts.\(^6\) What GPE has lacked however is sufficient funding to avoid asking developing country partners to sacrifice their development funds for use in emergency settings. ECW offers an opportunity for GPE to address this.

Third, GPE has considerable experience in supporting coordination among and increased financing from diverse stakeholders at the country and the global levels, in order to reduce aid fragmentation – one of the key goals of the platform. It has more than a decade of experience of working as a multi-stakeholder partnership; its membership and constituency based governance structure includes many of the major partners to ECW, including representatives from developing country partners affected by emergencies. GPE has played a convening and brokering role that will be essential to working with partners to bridge the divide between humanitarian and development work in the sector.

Finally, GPE’s existing grants for sector planning, program development and implementation, combined with the proposed implementation of a knowledge and good practice exchange strategy, map well to the key financing windows envisaged by ECW. Some modifications – particularly in terms of engagement with humanitarian actors and more rapid decision-making - would be needed for GPE to effectively manage programming in rapid onset emergencies. Modifications would also be necessary to effectively address the needs of countries that are not presently eligible for GPE allocations, and to support the inclusion of refugee education in national sector programs. However GPE’s current operational structures and modalities provide a strong foundation from which to build, particularly in the case of protracted crises.

1.6 The paper also outlines some of the challenges and risks that would need to be addressed if GPE were to take on the hosting of ECW. Specifically:

- GPE will need to develop the capacity to plan for and oversee financing mechanisms to support emergency planning and response, as well as develop technical capacity to support better coordination and complementarity among humanitarian and development aid providers at both country and regional levels. To ensure success, GPE could draw on its own experience in bringing partnership solutions to some of the longstanding problems in coordination and predictability of financing to education in low-income countries.

\(^5\) This includes countries with a UNICEF HAC appeal in 2016 or another form of an emergency response plan.

\(^6\) GPE is recognized by Brookings for having introduced “modalities that not only allow GPE to support new CAFS entering the partnership, but also continue supporting the education needs of young people when stable countries experience crises and disasters.” (Winthrop and Matsui, 2013, “A new agenda for education in fragile states,” pp. 42-44); also Menashy and Dryden Peterson, 2015, “The Global Partnership for Education’s Evolving Support to Fragile and Conflict Affected States.”
GPE will need to expand its capacity to work in a broader number of countries – including in middle-income countries that are host to refugees and in regional crises. It will also need to appropriately plan for the changing nature of emergencies – which are increasingly protracted, complex, and the result of conflict. It should be ready to address the additional burdens in terms of costs and security that come alongside efforts to address the needs of the most highly vulnerable within insecure contexts.

Financing for the Fund will certainly be a challenge at the levels envisaged under ECW, which aims to meet an overall five-year funding goal of $3.85 billion. A key challenge, but one that GPE has already commenced exploring, is the creation of new and innovative financing options for both raising and delivering funds necessary to reach the scale of funding outlined in the ECW proposal. Nonetheless if GPE is to host ECW, it will need to carefully devise an allocation mechanism that fairly allocates scarce resources across a large set of needs, and leverage existing and new funding with the ability to prioritize and be flexible to new and/or surging crises.

2. EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES AND PROTRACTED CRISIS: ALIGNMENT WITH GPE 2020 AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

2.1 The proposal for ECW is based on the recognition that globally many children and youth are denied their right to education in countries affected by emergencies and protracted crises. GPE’s outcomes and objectives are framed by eight principles, including “Focusing our resources on securing learning, equity, and inclusion for the most marginalized children and youth, including those affected by fragility and conflict.” As GPE is a key partner in the creation of ECW and will continue to actively support its ongoing design and development, it is important to understand the alignment between GPE objectives and that of ECW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECW Objectives</th>
<th>Links to GPE 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Political Commitment</strong> – Strengthened commitment by governments, donors, and humanitarian and development actors increases proportion of affected children and youth receiving quality education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. GPE Mission; GPE Principles</strong> and <strong>Goal 2</strong> (both commit to a focus on inclusion of children affected by conflict and crises); <strong>Objective 5</strong> “Build a stronger partnership”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Joint Planning and Response** – New acute crises result in joint multiyear, costed education plans, underpinned by improved coordination and national financing mechanisms with focus on long-term sustainability.

3. **Generate and Disburse New Financing** – Substantial increase in generating and disbursing additional, predictable funds for education in crises.

4. **Strengthen Capacity** – National and global capacity to respond to and coordinate education crises is improved.

5. **Improve Accountability**: – Real-time, quality data and analysis supports education crisis advocacy, response planning and implementation and accountability.

2.2 Internationally, there is growing awareness of the challenges facing the humanitarian system. Although overall resources for humanitarian response have increased over the last few years, and there have been significant improvements in coordination and effectiveness in relation to natural disaster response, the overall level of resources has not matched the increasing need for coverage. In particular, the humanitarian system faces rising challenges in effectively responding to chronic and complex crises – that involve political crisis or conflict, insecurity, that unfold over multiple years, and are often regional in scope. To illustrate this challenge, of the 58 countries that received humanitarian assistance in 2014, 49 (84%) had received it every year for the last five years, and 40 of these were on their tenth straight year of receiving humanitarian aid (ANLP 2015). The boundaries between development assistance and humanitarian response increasingly overlap in such situations.

2.3 Attention to education as part of humanitarian response has been growing, and significant improvements have been made in coordination and the creation of minimum standards for response. The IASC Education Cluster approach (co-led by UNICEF and Save the Children), which was introduced as part of the Humanitarian Reform Agenda, provides an important coordination mechanism bringing together UN and other actors to coordinate education needs assessment and response at the country and global level. The International Network for Education in Emergencies has also made significant contributions through the development of minimum standards for preparedness, response and recovery in education emergencies. Greater coordination between UNICEF and UNHCR has also developed, and this now ensures more coherent response in complex crises where there are significant numbers of refugees and displaced persons. GPE has contributed to this coordination, through its support for Transitional Education Planning and its Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States; and more recently through its Memorandum of Understanding with UNCHR.

---


10 [http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/memorandum-understanding-between-gpe-and-unhcr](http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/memorandum-understanding-between-gpe-and-unhcr)
2.4 Nonetheless significant challenges remain along two main dimensions:

- The need for better educational emergency needs analysis, coordination of response, and financing at the onset of emergencies, as well as improved data, evidence and innovative and cost effective approaches to service delivery for forcibly displaced populations;

- The need for predictable multi-year planning and funding for chronic and complex emergencies, which are the type of emergency affecting the majority of children and youth out of school.

2.5 ECW responds to these two main challenges through the creation of a new fund with two main windows:

- An “Acceleration Facility” that would invest in global goods and provide core funding to existing UN mandate holder and others to expand the scope and improve the quality of their work.

- A “Breakthrough Fund” that would provide grants for needs assessment/planning and for the implementation of these plans.

3. INTEGRATING ECW AND GPE FINANCING AND OPERATIONS

3.1 ECW’s core aim of uniting global and national actors “to deliver a more ambitious, joined-up response in line with national policy and plans in emergency contexts and beyond” is very similar to the partnership model GPE has been using for over a decade. GPE is both a global fund and a partnership that mobilizes financing from public and private-sector donors, while at the country level GPE locks together education sector planning, inclusive policy dialogue and monitoring; and financing. GPE is not an implementer – it delivers its financing through a variety of bilateral, multilateral and International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Grant Agents. It has developed a needs based allocation model that ensures that pooled funding reaches the poorest countries and the most educationally vulnerable. Recent reforms have further strengthened this operational model.\(^{11}\)

3.2 This paper proposes an approach that would see ECW draw upon the strengths of existing GPE approaches to education in crisis and emergencies. The main advantages of this are three-fold: as the world’s only multi-stakeholder pooled fund and partnership for education, GPE is uniquely placed to leverage coordination across the humanitarian and development divide; it has considerable experience in applying a needs based allocation formula to ensure resources are targeted to the poorest and most educationally vulnerable populations; and it also has a unique mandate to leverage collaboration and coordination.

3.3 As demonstrated in the Policy Brief included as Annex 4, GPE deploys a progressive approach in emergency and crisis contexts, providing flexibility to address challenges and optimize program results when a country faces a crisis. GPE finances education interventions that accompany children throughout a country’s progress from recovery, to longer-term development, to preparedness for any future crisis. Hosting ECW is an opportunity for GPE to build on its existing framework to strengthen

---

\(^{11}\) GPE’s intensive reforms to its operational model over the last 18 months have laid the foundation for delivering on GPE Strategy 2020. Reforms have included: new guidelines setting out roles and responsibilities and standards for mutual accountability needed for effective country level coordination; increased attention to quality assurance, grant monitoring and fiduciary oversight; and the introduction of an M&E strategy, Results Framework, and Knowledge and Good Practice Exchange Strategy.
coordination and predictability for education support during crisis and to reduce fragmentation of financing for education.

3.4 Furthermore, since 2010 GPE has refined its operational capacity to address emergencies and crisis in developing country partners (See Annex 4).

- GPE’s grants for Transition Education Sector Plan (TEP) support needs assessments and a coordinated response that results in a common framework to help the government align development and humanitarian actors around early recovery education activities. The TEP can also help link interventions in a Humanitarian Response Plan with longer-term development priorities for the sector. Currently 12 TEPs are being used with GPE support. GPE has updated its TEP guidelines to better reflect the unique planning needs of fragile and conflict affected states (FCAS), incorporating conflict sensitive analytical tools.

- GPE prioritizes and incentivizes inclusion of crisis preparedness and planning in sector dialogue mechanisms and education planning exercises including in countries not affected by crises. Revised guidelines for education plan preparation, created in cooperation with the IIEP, are used by GPE to establish minimum standards for all sector plans. These tools allow GPE to operationalize the embedding of capacity for resilience, protection, and sustainability into partners’ education sector development plans.

- GPE’s Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States, allows countries to reprogram existing GPE grants for emergency needs; and its Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations allow disbursement within 8 weeks of up to 20% of an existing GPE funding allocation when an emergency or crisis strikes, for use within one year, based on the Education Cluster needs assessment and agreed upon by a local education group. Countries apply for their remaining 80% allocation for longer-term development programming through the ESPIG process. This promotes a link between shorter-term emergency response and longer-term development needs.

3.5 GPE’s progressive approach to education sector planning and its funding for sector plan implementation provides the foundation for how it could take on ECW. GPE could offer, in addition to its current sector planning and plan implementation grants, two shorter planning/implementation cycles. Countries could be supported to move progressively towards greater sustainability after a crisis, including for preparedness and resilience. Regional coordination would also be supported.

3.6 Figure 1 below provides a simplified schematic of how ECW funding might operate alongside existing GPE grant windows. The four main challenges that ECW proposes to address are each provided a column: improvements in emergency planning and financing for emergency response; and improvements in multi-year planning and financing for multi-year response for recovery or protracted crisis. In addition, the opportunity to fund global goods and capacity, through an Acceleration Window, is pictured across the bottom of the diagram.
Five main “grant windows” are identified as possible ways to operationalize ECW’s “Breakthrough Fund” and “Acceleration Facility” in this schema, aligned both with existing GPE grant windows, as well as the goals and proposed design of ECW:

1. **Emergency Planning Grant**: The main purpose of the grant is to initiate coordination (at both country and regional levels), to do rapid needs assessment, to design an emergency program of up to 12 months, and to arrange high-level advocacy for an emergency incident. The grant would be triggered by an emergency appeal from a government or UN agency (i.e. UNOCHA, UNHCR, or UNICEF). Financing would be provided through a grant agent selected from GPE’s pre-approved list of agents by a coordination body. The coordination body would bring together the Education Cluster, the Local Education Group, and any other emergency or refugee coordination body. Applications procedures would be kept light, and would approved within two weeks of submission through delegated authority to the GPE Secretariat. Emergency plans would be quality assured and technically supported by the Secretariat (similar to the Secretariat’s role in ESPDGs).

2. **Emergency Program Grant**: This grant would provide finance for emergency service delivery for up to 12 months. It would be provided through pre-accredited grant agents, who in turn would channel funding to either government or alternative providers as necessary. In countries with pre-existing GPE ESPIG grants or GPE allocations, they would be able to continue to use GPE’s accelerated financing policy and the operational framework to draw...
down upon or re-purpose existing ESPIG allocations; in such cases, this grant would be used to replace or top up the total ESPIG allocation so that emergency needs do not displace longer term development objectives. This will provide immediate and quick support in a crisis, channeled through existing agencies, providing ‘top up’ grants against a consolidated appeal, provided a certain benchmark of funding is already met for education. The rapid response mechanism would typically finance start-up costs, such as temporary access, essential supplies or contingency stocks, psychosocial support, information management or back-to-school campaigns. Applications would need to be reviewed and approved rapidly so appropriate delegation of authority to a Committee or Secretariat would be required.

3. **Transitional Planning Grant**: This grant would support a Transitional Education Sector Plan or a costed emergency education needs assessment that is linked to an existing ESP. It would provide details how both formal and non-formal education will work to restore and build back better education services, financed through governments and direct service delivery actors. The plan would provide recommendations on the preferred modalities at country level through which to channel funds. It would also fund a coordination mechanism, in case one did not exist. This grant in scope and amount would be similar to the combination of the current ESPDG and PDG grants. Again, these smaller grants could be approved within two weeks under delegated authority to the Secretariat, which would also provide quality assurance and technical support (*similar to GPE’s ESPDGs*)

4. **Transition Support Grant**: This grant would provide funding for multi-year support of a country plan that bridges and consolidates existing humanitarian, sector, and other plans.

- In contexts where a country is not eligible for a GPE ESPIG grant it will be a stand-alone grant. All countries receiving transitional support grants will be encouraged to become full members of GPE and to join respective constituencies.

- In GPE ESPIG eligible countries, this grant could be used to top-up ESPIG allocations, with very low transaction costs if the same Grant Agent was used, to address ongoing educational reconstruction, displacement or refugee education needs. In rare cases, it could be used to fund a protracted refugee education program in parallel to a national sector program, though wherever possible, funding should be used to ensure sustainable integration of refugee children into national systems. This grant would similar to ESPIG and will follow a similar quality assurance mechanism for ensuring value for money. Program results, as designed, will be the key deliverables for this grant. It is important to note that even in countries with existing ESPIGs, the same Grant Agent does not necessarily need to be used. Depending on context, a dual track approach could be used to allow one Grant Agent continue to support development work, while a different Grant Agent may be focused on direct service delivery.

5. **Acceleration Grants**: These grants are intended to support global capacity for needs assessment, exchange of good practice, and improved approaches to data and evidence. They will target, in the first instance, the expansion of the scope and quality of the work of existing coordinating actors and mandate holders in the sector. The facility will support ‘upstream activities’ like development of innovative financing.

3.8 In GPE member countries, specifically those with GPE Education Sector Plan Development Grants (ESPDG) and/or ESPIG allocations, funds can be offered as a “top up” to existing financing, a procedure that can assure the rapid repurposing and disbursement of financing when there is a rapid onset of an emergency, while guaranteeing that development financing is not substituted for emergency purposes.
3.9 In countries without a GPE ESPIG allocation, these grants will be offered as stand-alone grants, following procedures indicated in Table 1 below.

3.10 Wherever possible, opportunities to provide these grants as “matching funds” to catalyze existing emergency appeals will be taken.

3.11 ECW grant windows will, where possible, adopt GPE’s country operating model, which relies for coordination on a Local Education Group under the leadership of government and supported by a coordinating agency, which coordinates dialogue around the design and implementation of plans and programs. In the absence of a legitimate government in emergency contexts, alternative arrangements will need to be established to play the de facto role of the LEG, in consultation with existing UN and other humanitarian coordinating groups and the Education Cluster.

3.12 It is proposed that GPE use pre-accredited grant agents (using transparent standards for fiduciary oversight and management) so that funding can be quickly mobilized and disbursed. These five windows will each need their own procedural guidelines and monitoring framework.

3.13 Allocation and eligibility criteria for these five grant windows will need to be further developed and significant work would be expected during the interim hosting phase. As a starting point, it is recommended that GPE use the launch of a humanitarian appeal by a UN agency as a trigger for these funds. Rather than re-applying for ECW grants, countries would normally be encouraged to move towards longer-term financing windows, such as GPE’s ESPIG financing window, where there is an emphasis on sustainability, predictability of domestic financing, and emergency preparedness.

3.14 The basis for allocation of funds would need to be developed. However for illustrative purposes:

- For the planning grants, a flat allocation per country could be used (e.g. up to US$500,000 each).

- For grants focused on implementation, a simple allocation formula could be developed that calculated a cost per child per year and multiplied this by the number of impacted children could be used as a basis for establishing a target level of funding per country. However, the level of resources that could be made available per country towards that target would need to take into account the overall resources available for ECW to see how much of the target could be funded. Intensive fundraising efforts with partners including through the use of targeted financing and the creation of a pop up fund could then be used to try and raise funds to finance the remaining gap.

- Co-financing requirements with impacted governments or with other emergency appeal mechanisms and donors could also be examined but would be heavily depending on regional and country context. For example, the ability of an upper middle income country to contribute to the financing of refugees that have arrived from a neighboring country would be different from that of a low income country that is an ongoing conflict or has experienced a devastating natural disaster, and these factors might impact the method for allocation.

3.15 The creation of sub-accounts of the GPE Fund for financing of country specific activities and matched financing to support these proposed grants is considered in Section 5 below – on targeted financing. Expanding a range of pre-accredited grant agents to manage grants is considered in Section 6.
| Table 1: Alignment between ECW Grant Windows and GPE Grants in GPE ESPIG Eligible and Non-eligible Countries |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| GPE Member Countries                                          | Non-member Countries and GPE DCP without an ESPIG             |
| **Emergency Planning and Response 0-6 months**                |                                                               |
| LEG initiates dialogue on meeting the emergency needs, coordinating with the Education Cluster and/or other humanitarian agencies and working groups. | Coordination and dialogue structures at country or regional levels are formed or initiated under the leadership of the appropriate governmental representatives or (where not available) UN agency, including key humanitarian and development stakeholders. |
| LEG in consultation with the Cluster selects pre-accredited Grant Agent for receiving funds for the **Emergency Planning Grant**. | Coordination Body selects an agency for receiving **Emergency Planning Grant** from pre-accredited list. |
| **Emergency Planning and Response 0-6 months**                |                                                               |
| **Emergency Program Grant** is released to one or more Grant agents selected from GPE pre-accredited list, based on LEG recommendation in consultation with Education Cluster, or | **Emergency Program Grant** is released to one or more Grant Agents from GPE pre-accredited list, based on recommendation from Coordination Body. |
| Grant provides top up financing in GPE Countries with ESPIG Allocation – using GPE policies for Accelerated Financing and Operational Guidelines. | |
### Transition Program Grant

- GPE sets eligibility, allocation and other requirements for Transition Grants. Pre-approves Grant Agents.
- LEG selects the GA; the GA designs a program and submits an application.
- Transition Support Grant is released for protracted crisis period.

### Countries encourage to join GPE

### Local Education Group Established

### Transition Program Grant

- GPE sets eligibility, allocation and other requirements for Transition Grants. Pre-approved grant agents.
- LEG or Coordinating Body selects the GA; the GA designs a program and submits an application.
- LEG or Regional Coordinating Body advises whether grant will be used to finance national TEP or parallel refugee education programs.
- Transition Support Grant is released for protracted crisis period.

## 4. GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING

4.1 The interim arrangements for ECW envisage a High Level Steering Group (HLSG) comprised of heads of organizations and other political champions. It is uncertain at this stage how this body would relate to the governance structures of the permanent host. Therefore governance for ECW and the implications for GPE would need further examination over the course of the first year of ECW’s existence.

4.2 If GPE were to host, it is likely that a number of potential HLSG organizations may also be represented already in GPE’s governance arrangements. HLSG members represented on GPE’s Board include Canada, Norway, Save the Children, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UK, and USAID, as well as Dubai Cares (as a member of the Private Sector/Foundations Constituency); and Tanzania (as a member of the Africa 1 Board Constituency). Therefore a possible integration of the two bodies could be examined to create a single governing body. This would undoubtedly involve some changes to Board membership and the existing constituency structure.

4.3 An alternative option that could be considered might include maintaining the HLSG as a group of political champions with responsibility for advocating for resources, convening a partnership forum, and providing advice to the GPE Board on strategy. There could still be modifications to the GPE Board to allow new ECW partners to participate in the governance structure.

4.4 A further option would be for the HLSG to continue as the key governing body for ECW, although there would need to be clearly defined arrangements for how roles and responsibilities with the GPE Board would be delineated especially on issues impacting both bodies such as Secretariat costs, or grant allocations where both ECW funding and core GPE grant funding were used to fund a single program. This would likely be the most challenging and administratively heavy governance structure to adopt. The establishment of a governing body that is distinct from the GPE Board may also require consultation and approval by the World Bank Board of Executive Directors.

---

12 Three HLSG members are not represented on GPE’s Board, but potentially could be included – UN Special Envoy, Gordon Brown; Lebanon, and the International Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE).
4.5 Any future governance arrangement would require representation of civil society, humanitarian agencies, and developing country partners.

4.6 Irrespective of the governance structure adopted, it will be essential for rapid decision making to be made for grant funding in an emergency context. Therefore delegation of decision-making authority to the Secretariat or a Committee that could convene quickly to take funding decisions would be essential.

5. MOBILIZING FUNDING FOR ECW

Mobilizing Funds

5.1 Were GPE to host ECW, resource mobilization would be a collective responsibility of all partners, and the continued advocacy and engagement of global champions would be critical for success. GPE’s External Relations team would play a key role in building and maintaining donor relationships and in designing a replenishment campaign, which would ideally be undertaken alongside GPE’s next replenishment.

5.2 At present, it is difficult to determine the level of funding that could be raised for ECW and how much of the funds would genuinely be additional. Donors at WHS pledged an initial US$ 89.1 million to ECW over its first two years. The ability to access funds from humanitarian budget lines in addition to development would be an important source of additional financing from existing donors, while an expanded geographic coverage for the platform may unlock more funds.

5.3 Flexibility with respect to targeted contributions and the ability to show direct results for investments made will be critical to attracting investment from new and non-traditional donors. GPE is able to receive funding from a wide range of donors, including from the private sector, and would make special effort to attract new funding from private sector donors.

5.4 Decisions about how to raise financing for ECW would need to be planned in relation to other proposed changes in GPE’s financing model that result from the work of the Strategic Finance Working Group. The SFWG is considering overall eligibility for GPE funding, the creation of new financing windows, innovative financing mechanisms, and the safeguards needed for accepting financing that is earmarked for specific purposes or geographies.

5.5 There are a range of options to source financing for ECW activities. These will be explored in greater detail with the support of an external firm and integrated with GPE’s ongoing strategic financing working group.

5.5.1 Financing from the GPE Fund: The Board could allocate resources directly from the GPE Fund for ECW activities. Assuming that additional funding would be provided into the GPE Fund by donors as a result of GPE hosting ECW, then it should not negatively impact existing allocations for other activities. Allocating funds from the GPE Fund would essentially give all existing donors a stake in ECW and improve prospects for its success.

5.5.2 Targeted Financing/ECW “Pop-Up Windows”: The ECW proposal recommends the creation of emergency specific ‘pop-up’ windows that would allow for geographic earmarking by donors and funding to be channeled to specific countries through

13 Funding pledged as follows: Dubai Cares, US$ 2.5 million; Norway US$ 10 million; UK, 30 million pounds; United States US$ 20 million; European Commission US$ 5.6 million; Netherlands $7.8 million.
some or all of the five grant mechanisms mentioned above. The advantage of these windows would be to provide a mechanism for raising financing from non-traditional donors, philanthropists and the private sector, where there is less willingness to pool resources. It might also be used to channel funding towards the purchase of contingency supplies.

- Targeting could be through the GPE Fund through a notional approach. Although the Trustee is currently defining its policy around the use of hard earmarks in the context of funds such as the GPE, the Trustee may be asked to consider whether it would be possible to establish a sub-account of the GPE Fund to receive targeted funding for ECW specific windows (acceleration activities, breakthrough activities, or individual pop up funds to finance the Acceleration and Breakthrough activities in specific countries) within the platform. Alternatively, a new Financial Intermediary Fund, approved by the World Bank Group’s Board of Executive Directors, could be created if the governance and fiduciary arrangements of ECW were significantly different from the GPE Fund or if needed to accommodate the requirements of large donors to ECW.

- While targeting could be allowed for specific allocations within the various grant windows, key principles and safeguards around the use of targeted funding would be a pre-requisite to receive this. The Secretariat would need to work closely with UNICEF as interim host and other partners to ECW in the first year to develop a policy in this area that could in turn be incorporated into GPE’s own policies.

5.5.3 **Innovative Financing:** In addition to working on an approach to Targeted Financing, a number of innovative financing options are being explored within the scope of the Strategic Financing work. Options in the concept stage include matching funds for donor-private partnerships, and loan buy downs or blended financing. These innovative financing instruments are set out in Annex 3.

### 6. MANAGEMENT OF ECW FUNDING

6.1 If GPE were to host the Fund, it would not be a direct implementer of activities, but instead rely on channeling funds through partners and organizations with a proven track record and capacity to oversee and/or implement activities on the ground.

6.2 The existing World Bank based legal status of GPE allows the partnership to provide funding through multilaterals, bilaterals, and international NGOs, acting as Grant Agents. These entities in turn can either implement activities or provide funding through government and other non-governmental organizations in line with their own policies and procedures.

6.3 In terms of **accountability and due diligence**, the following outline could be applied without any change in how GPE operates, although there would need to be more customization when it comes to innovative financing arrangements that may require specific agreements (e.g. Development Impact Bonds, Debt4Education etc.)

**Accountability and Due Diligence**

6.4 The governing body (GPE Board) would be responsible for ensuring that it approves funding only to organizations that have the capacity to manage and/or oversee the use of such funds and the implementation of the approved activities. It is responsible for monitoring the use of resources and implementation of activities. The Secretariat would support the Board in fulfilling this function by ensuring that prospective Grant Agents have been reviewed against agreed standards, and by
reviewing and consolidating reports from Grant Agents in order to report on results to the Board. The Secretariat would actively engage with Grant Agents and other partners to follow up on poor performance or misuse of funds.

6.5 The World Bank as Trustee would be accountable to the donors for the use of the funds it holds in accordance with responsibilities laid out in a contribution agreement with each donor to the fund. Once funding is transferred to a Grant Agent based on an authorized decision by the Board (Board or a decision by a Committee or Secretariat based on the Board’s delegated authority), the Trustee is no longer financially responsible for the funds. To ensure no gap in accountability for partnership funds, Financial Procedures Agreements with the Grant Agents facilitate the transfer of funds. They outline the Grant Agents’ obligations with respect to the use of funds and implementation of the grant in accordance with the approved proposal. This would also cover obligations with respect to financial and programmatic reporting, and the return of funds in the event of misuse by Grant Agent or any third party receiving funds under the grant.

6.6 The rights of donors are included in the donor contribution agreement that facilitates financing for the Fund. This agreement would specify the responsibilities of the Trustee, and also the Grant Agent. These in turn would then be reflected in relevant areas of the Financial Procedures Agreement and would include the ability of the donors to seek recourse for a breach of the agreement.

Expanding the Pool of Grant Agents

6.7 While organizations like UNICEF and Save the Children have already signed Financial Procedures Agreement and are eligible to act as Grant Agents, it would be necessary for GPE to conduct a process to accredit more organizations to provide as many options as possible for channeling funding to in emergency and protracted crises situations.

6.8 Having a pool of accredited organizations not only improves options for funding in such a situation, it also provides assurance to the Board and donors that funding is only channeled to organizations with proven capacity to implement and/or oversee implementation by third parties. In addition, it greatly speeds up the timelines between decisions on funding and transfer of funds, as once a decision is made to fund an entity with a Financial Procedures Agreement already in place, funding can be provided within a matter of days.

6.9 GPE could also consider direct funding of local CSOs and entities providing direct services to affected populations. While not currently feasible under the current legal structure, the creation of a legal entity would allow GPE sign agreements directly with local entities and transfer funds rapidly to them. This would not be without risk, and donors in particular would need to consider their willingness to fund a potentially higher risk – higher reward strategy. GPE’s fiduciary oversight arrangements would need to adapt including using third-party monitoring in countries and outsourcing firms to conduct independent verifications of expenditure and results reported, and consideration of the creation of an audit function within GPE to provide independent assurance to the Board on the use of funds, and to directly investigate allegations of misuse.

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR GPE SECRETARIAT

7.1 The Secretariat has long experience supporting a partnership style governance structure, and managing processes to support proposal development with developing countries and development partners, quality assurance of those applications, review, approval, and transfer of funds. The Secretariat has experience managing replenishment campaigns and engaging with and building relationships with new partners. It has significant experience in adapting to changing expectations and requirements including developing or adapting funding models, and re-organizing itself
internally within a short time horizon. Because of the growing volume of its work in countries affected by conflict and fragility, GPE also has significant technical expertise in such contexts (See Annex 4).

7.2 Hosting ECW will no doubt have implications for the Secretariat’s size, structure, and operating expenses. The Board has agreed for the Secretariat to commission an external firm to analyze this in further detail as part of the overall work of the Strategic Financing Working Group. Therefore the analysis below should be considered preliminary and subject to significant change.

7.3 Integration of ECW with GPE’s Secretariat structures wherever possible makes development effectiveness sense because it allows for synergies across grants and activities that bridge the development and humanitarian divide. It is also a more cost-effective option, due to economies of scale and reduced duplication of effort on certain functions (e.g. technical support for DCPs, and relationship management with Donors, Trustee, Grant Agents, and Governance structures).

7.4 Currently, Secretariat operating expenses average 4-5% of total expenditure based on an average US$500 million per year in total expenditure. Assuming a strong degree of integration with GPE’s existing operations and governance structures, this level of operating expenses could potentially be maintained if integration was well managed and assuming the annual level of funding exceeded at least US$100 million per year. One could assume that for every $100 million in annual disbursements for platform activities, the Secretariat will require $4-5 million in operating expenses. If the disbursement amounts were lower, or the business model, governance, and institutional arrangements were significantly different, then this percentage is likely to rise. If annual disbursements were significantly higher and reached several hundred million per year through larger country allocations, there would likely to be scope for reductions in the overall percentage of operating expenses.

7.5 GPE already has staffing with experience and expertise in humanitarian and emergency settings. ECW could draw on specialist teams in the areas of quantitative analysis, evaluation, quality assurance, finance, country technical advisory support, advocacy and fundraising. Nonetheless, there are areas that would require strengthening:

7.5.1 **Technical Capacity For work in Humanitarian Contexts** – The Secretariat has a number of staff that have significant experience operating in fragile and conflict affected settings; and has an active technical cluster devoted to improving GPE work in FCACs. However the increased volume of work and modifications to how GPE would work to operationalize the platform will require additional specialists in this area. The numbers would need to be linked to the overall level of funding available and number and complexity of countries to be supported. There would need to be sufficient capacity to support countries in protracted crises to operationalize the multi-year funding window, but at the same time enough resources within the Secretariat to rapidly assemble a team to support the rapid response mechanism where there is a sudden onset emergency. Where a country with a protracted crisis is already an existing GPE partner (e.g. Yemen, CAR, Somalia, South Sudan, Chad), the incremental effort would be lower as we already have dedicated Country Leads than in a newly eligible country where the GPE has not operated before (e.g. Syria). The technical specialists would support the work of GPE Country Leads.

7.5.2 **Resource Mobilization** – As funding for the platform is expected to be sourced from a range of existing donors, along with new donors from the private sector, and non-traditional donors, it will be necessary to strengthen capacity both to build and maintain relationships. This is particularly true with the private sector/Foundations, and non-traditional donors. Even within existing donors, if funding is sourced from humanitarian budget lines rather than development,
there may be a need to build and maintain relationships with different parts of existing donor agencies.

7.5.3 Development of Policies and Quality Assurance Procedures: The Secretariat would need to adapt and develop standard guidelines and tools to support country level grant application processes, quality assurance, and consistency in Board and Committee decision-making.

7.5.4 Finance and Operations – The development of new and innovative finance mechanisms for the platform to facilitate the activities envisaged under the acceleration funds and the popup windows can be labor intensive in the design and piloting phase. While the Secretariat is recruiting an additional Senior Finance Officer in this area, it is likely to require further investment in specialist consulting expertise to set up these initiatives. This piece of work can be further examined through the external firm that will support the Strategic Financing Working Group.

7.5.5 Communications and Advocacy – A key element of the platform will be advocacy for education in emergencies and protracted crises. While all partners will have a responsibility to advocate to this end, it will be necessary to support these partners and political champions with sufficient communications products demonstrating the needs, how the platform addresses these needs, and the results of the platform. In addition to staffing, it is likely that increased investment in communications products and meeting costs will be required.

7.5.6 Monitoring and Evaluation – An investment in M&E will be critical for demonstrating the success of the partnership. A specific M&E strategy will be required for platform activities and there will need to be an initial investment in developing this strategy along with the associated information technology and systems to support it, and then longer-term capacity to implement it.

7.5.7 Acceleration Facility – Based on GPE’s previous experience in support global goods, and exchange of good practices, supporting the development of new initiatives in this area will require additional resources. The extent would be dependent on the volume of initiatives and their complexity.

7.5.8 Overall Management of the Fund and Its Activities– There will need to be a senior level position to help coordinate and lead the Fund and its activities within the Secretariat and to be the primary focal point with partners. Such person would be a member of the Leadership Team of the Secretariat. Administrative support and overhead costs would be required but would be in proportion to the growth in activities and relative increase in transactions under the platform.

8. IMPLICATIONS FOR GPE INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

8.1 Depending on the mechanisms envisaged, the creation of a legal entity for GPE may be desirable. If GPE wishes to attract funding from the private sector and individuals rather than just foundations, then it may need to examine tax efficient vehicles that could improve prospects for such donations. The use of more complex financial instruments explored in Annex 3 may also necessitate a legal entity. Finally, if GPE were to move beyond a Grant Agent approach and seek to channel funds directly to local CSOs or national entities, then it would require legal personality.

8.2 The GERF has already identified the exploration of creation of a legal entity where the World Bank could potentially continue, should its own Senior Management and Board of Executive Directors agree, to provide hosting services to as an area for consideration by the Strategic Financing Working Group.
9. **IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RISKS**

9.1 Hosting a new Fund, and ensuring that this fund meets the high level of ambition proposed for it, represents a considerable challenge. However, it also provides important opportunities to strengthen GPE’s capacity to deliver on its mission to ensure that all children and youth have access to quality education. By taking on a hosting role for ECW, GPE would be able to play an enhanced role in bridging the humanitarian/development divide.

9.2 Adapting GPE’s governance structures, grant windows and management capacities at a time when GPE is heavily focused on implementing a new strategic plan and rolling out improvements to its operational model presents a major challenge to the organization. To manage this risk, GPE would need a 6-12 month window from the time that a decision is taken for GPE to host ECW, in order to prepare itself. Short-term surge capacity to cope with the preparation costs and to ensure a smooth transition from the interim host would be essential.

9.3 There is a risk that ECW and its activities during the first twelve months might evolve in ways that limit potential synergies with GPE operations and its ability to effectively bridge the development and humanitarian divide. To manage this risk, the GPE Board is being asked to mandate the GPE Secretariat to continue to engage in the development of ECW. Furthermore, the Chair of the GPE Board will be a member of the High Level Steering Group that makes major decisions about the platform.

9.4 GPE will need to appropriately plan for the changing nature of emergencies – which are increasingly protracted, complex and the result of conflict. To manage this risk, it should be ready to address the additional burdens, in terms of costs and security that come alongside efforts to address the needs of those in the most highly vulnerable and insecure contexts.

9.5 Financing for ECW will certainly be a challenge at the levels envisaged in the ECW proposal. To manage this risk, GPE will need to plan carefully for the inevitable challenge of allocating scarce resources across a large set of needs, develop innovative approaches to financing, and ensure that adequately invests in advocacy and fundraising capacity capable of stimulating global participation in the new fund. It will be critical that the champions actively advocate for a successful replenishment.

9.6 The process and criteria for selection of a permanent host has yet to be established. Obtaining clarity on this issue is essential as GPE looks to finalize its financing framework for the next replenishment period.

9.7 While there are certainly risks to hosting ECW, there are also significant risks of not hosting it. Of particular concern would be potential displacement of funding for GPE work in fragile and conflict affected settings and other low income developing country partners, and the significant risk of a further fragmentation of international aid for education.
## ANNEX 2 – GPE MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS EXPERIENCING HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Active education cluster</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GPE MCA as at Replenishment 2014 (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UNRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>14,505,807</td>
<td>144,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>7,923,756</td>
<td>17,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>4,816,381</td>
<td>195,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>9,660,152</td>
<td>147,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>1,906,310</td>
<td>974,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>6,332,848</td>
<td>1,747,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>1,881,429</td>
<td>27,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>33,607,204</td>
<td>63,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>299,248</td>
<td>93,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2,173,302</td>
<td>591,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>41,805,119</td>
<td>382,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>863,382</td>
<td>88,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>3,777,759</td>
<td>3,592,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>2,830,588</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>18,781,564</td>
<td>308,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7,515,348</td>
<td>1,209,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>7,869,682</td>
<td>1,134,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>1,604,863</td>
<td>515,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>10,308,619</td>
<td>13,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>9,111,497</td>
<td>855,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>70,206,770</td>
<td>5,626,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4,762,018</td>
<td>39,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>6,382,764</td>
<td>95,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>4,800,734</td>
<td>1,595,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>5,087,905</td>
<td>151,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>16,141,381</td>
<td>2,546,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>22,863,193</td>
<td>49,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>17,805,649</td>
<td>321,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>10,841,800</td>
<td>8,115,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6,389,392</td>
<td>375,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL (30 countries):** 12 countries, 355,422,446 children affected, 48,099,629 refugees, 2,214,609 children in conflict-affected states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Active education cluster</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GPE MCA as at Replenishment 2014 (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UNRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5,806,418</td>
<td>5,064,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4,919,240</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>28,933,341</td>
<td>174,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>FU</td>
<td>265,601</td>
<td>265,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>6,163,961</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>14,501,843</td>
<td>4,311,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>2,709,188</td>
<td>337,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>1,558,193</td>
<td>611,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>1,906,963</td>
<td>833,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia (Fed. States of)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>38,975</td>
<td>38,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>16,166,060</td>
<td>225,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>33,458,358</td>
<td>1,636,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>74,729</td>
<td>74,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>232,295</td>
<td>232,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank &amp; Gaza</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>1,871,925</td>
<td>812,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>7,329,886</td>
<td>5,102,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>40,705</td>
<td>40,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>21,445,313</td>
<td>825,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>HRU</td>
<td>8,928,357</td>
<td>881,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>97,067</td>
<td>97,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL (20 countries):** 4 countries, 154,445,648 children affected, 20,347,343 refugees, 2,186,066 children in conflict-affected states

**TOTAL (all 50 countries):** 16 countries, 512,870,116 children affected, 69,246,973 refugees, 4,409,594 children in conflict-affected states

Blue text indicates countries identified as fragile or conflict-affected by GPE (FCAC), based on WBG list of Fragile Situations (FY16) and 2015 UNESCO (GEMRB) list of conflict-affected states.
Annex 2 Notes:

1. "Recognized emergencies" reflects all countries who had either an active UNICEF Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) appeal in 2016 (as per ODI data), or were identified as having a Humanitarian or Refugee Response Plan (as of 2016), or had a Flash Appeal (as of 2015 or 2016) by UN OCHA. Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Nepal, Congo, Rwanda, and Tanzania do not have UNICEF HAC 2016 appeals, but are added to the list since they have Response Plans in 2016 and/or Flash Appeals in 2015/2016. Note that 64 GPE member countries (all but Bhutan) have been identified as having Persons of Concern to UNHCR.


3. "Cluster" refers to sectoral coordination that uses the 'IASC cluster approach'. An activated cluster indicates that an education cluster response plan with objectives, activities, indicators and accompanying projects have been planned. (For details, see: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/system/files/documents/files/SRP%20Guidance%202015%20final_2.pdf). For the purposes of comparison, note that all GPE countries have active LEGs (Local Education Groups).

4. UNICEF population figures are as supplied by ODI in May 2016. Total population aged 3-18 is calculated using UNPD 2015 population estimates, and values for affected population are as per estimates in UNICEF HAC appeals. Zimbabwe affected population reflects full HAC Zika response. Affected population aged 3-18 estimated in HAC refugee appeals for Sahel (Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Mauritania, Senegal) and Syrian refugees (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey) are split across affected countries in proportion to distribution of refugee population aged 0-17, as described in Note 5 below. Total children affected across Pacific Islands estimated at 1.2 million in HAC appeal; in core countries (Fiji, Micronesia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu) affected population is assumed to equal actual population aged 3-18. Affected population does not apply to countries who do not have HAC appeals.

5. UNHCR refugee data is as per 2014 year-end - note that UNHCR provides values for children aged. 0-4, 5-11 and 11-17. Where available, actual demographic breakdown for full refugee population is reflected; if no or partial demographic data is available, GPE estimates based on available data are provided.

6. GPE MCA represents the maximum country ESPIG allocation as at latest replenishment (February 2014). Note that certain country allocations were subsequently cut due to funding shortages.

7. Myanmar, Philippines, and West Bank and Gaza are currently not GPE DCPs, but are eligible for GPE membership

SOURCES:

ODI data (using UNICEF and UNPD as sources), UNHCR, GPE Secretariat data, GPE Secretariat estimates

OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS), retrieved 05/20/2016:

OCHA 2016 Global Humanitarian Overview, retrieved 5/20/2016:
https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/GHO-2016.pdf

List of education clusters retrieved 05/20/2016 from Global Education Cluster:
http://educationcluster.net/country-coordination/education-clusters-and-working-groups/
ANNEX 3 – INNOVATIVE FINANCING INSTRUMENTS FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION

This is not an exhaustive list and further work through the Strategic Financing Working Group, the report of the International Commission on Financing Education Opportunity, and through the first year of ECW under the interim hosting arrangements would be very relevant to further develop this area. Depending on the level of complexity involved in these mechanisms, the creation of a separate legal entity for GPE may be required.

Matching Funds – In addition to ensuring that ECW funds are matching to existing humanitarian appeals, platform funders could provide incentives for the private sector to contribute additional resources by pledging matching funds up to a certain limit. A successful matching fund is already established by GAVI. Essentially for every $1 provided to the fund by a company and its employees, specific donors provide an additional $1 in matching funds. Further analysis would be required to determine if a tax efficient vehicle could be established to increase the incentives to companies and their employees.

Reducing the Cost of Credit - Depending on eligibility, countries could be incentivized to borrow funds to meet the additional financing needs of refugee children by reducing the cost of credit through loan buy downs or blended financing where grant financing is combined with loan financing. This might be particularly relevant for encouraging countries such as Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey that are faced with an influx of refugees from Syria but may not be able to borrow on concessional terms for education.

Debt4Education - Countries that hold bilateral debt in platform eligible countries could be encouraged to provide funding through a debt4education program where a portion of the debt is cancelled and in return, the debtor country would make repayment to GPE where it would be counted as a contribution from the creditor country. The funds would then be made additional to any allocation the debtor country could receive under the platform and be channeled back to the country through the platform windows. The creditor country receives credit for making a contribution to the platform via the cancelled debt and has the comfort that the debtor country will use those funds through an approved platform activity. This may be an approach that can encourage countries that prefer to provide bilateral financing rather than through multilaterals to contribute to the platform.

Development Impact Bonds – The Platform could seek to create a pool of funds from private donors (primarily foundations and high net worth individuals) that would encourage investors to provide funding to service delivery organizations to deliver services that would result in independently verified outcomes. (E.g. enrolling and improving learning for refugee children). If the program met expectations, then the private investor would receive a return on investment from the pool. If not, then no funding from the platform would be provided. The funders to the platform pool would have the assurance that they were only providing funding for demonstrably successful programs while the investors would have an incentive to provide financing and work with the service delivery provider to ensure success. This approach may be appealing to private foundations and high net worth individuals that don’t have the resources and experience to oversee direct service delivery but who want to see direct results for their investment and only to pay for success. Significant additional analysis would be needed to determine whether this is a worthwhile approach given the high transactions costs to negotiate the return on investment, cost of investment, targets, independently verify results, and ensure no perverse incentives occurred.

Disaster Risk Reduction – The use of catastrophe bonds or parametric insurance could be an area that could provide a predictable source of financing in an emergency situation.
For parametric insurance, premiums would be paid (could be through co-financing between platform funds and government funds) each year and multiples of the premium payment would be made to a country or indeed to GPE if a named disaster occurred (e.g. earthquake).

For catastrophe bonds – a bond would be developed and issued. Private investors would provide the funding in return for an annual payment. If an event triggering some or all of the funds occurred, then the investors would forfeit their right to repayment. If no such event was triggered during the period of the bond, then the investors would be repaid in addition to their annual payments, and a new bond issued.

These mechanisms would have to be explored to see whether they could be applied beyond traditional natural disasters such as conflict. The premiums for insurance, or coupon for the bond would still need to be paid each year whether the insurance or bond funding was triggered or not. However these costs on an annual basis would be significantly less than the immediate funding requirements of a country when a disaster occurs.
ANNEX 4 – GPE WORK IN CONFLICT-AFFECTED AND FRAGILE COUNTRIES

Highlights

- 28 GPE developing country partners are classified as fragile and conflict-affected countries (FCAC). That’s 46 percent of all of GPE’s developing country partners
- 12 transitional education sector plans are currently being used with GPE support.
- 4 countries have benefited from accelerated funding, totaling more than $22 million (99 percent disbursed as of January 31 2016).
  - CAR: $3,690,000
  - Chad: $6,955,170
  - Somalia (South Central): $1,380,000
  - Yemen: $10,000,000

GPE has provided a foundation for coordination and dialogue among development and humanitarian actors in countries as diverse as Chad, Burundi, Central African Republic, South Sudan, Somalia, and Yemen. Through its Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States, and its Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations, GPE has successfully promoted coordinated decisions about the best way to utilize resources in crisis settings, such as shifting them to non-governmental providers for direct service provision during acute crises.

According to a 2013 Brookings study, GPE has introduced “modalities that not only allow GPE to support new FCAS entering the partnership but also continue supporting the education needs of young people when stable countries experience crises and disasters.”

1. Overview

Millions of children around the world are affected by conflict, natural disasters, complex humanitarian emergencies, internal strife, and fragility. More than half of the world’s out-of-school children live in countries facing war and violence, and 100 million children and young people are affected by natural disasters and hazards annually. As a result, they are deprived of their right to education. Ensuring access to education protects the rights of children and youth in the midst of chaos while instilling a sense of normalcy and shoring up resilience.

Many of these children have not been given an opportunity to go to school or have been taken away from schooling. Children cross borders or become permanently displaced without a guarantee that they can go to school when they finally arrive at a safer destination. Over one-third of the world’s refugee children are still missing out on primary education, and three out of four have no access to secondary education. More than one-third of countries hosting refugees do not recognize their right to education; more than 60 percent of these refugee children live within the boundaries of GPE partner countries.

---

15 Twenty-two are classified as fragile by the World Bank and 18 are classified as conflict-affected by UNESCO; 12 fall into both lists.
The Global Partnership for Education is strongly committed to addressing this crisis. GPE 2020, the partnership’s new strategic plan, makes support for conflict-affected and fragile countries a focus over the next five years. This continues what has been a steady increase in GPE support to FCAC. Such a focus is supported by participation of countries affected by conflict and fragility on GPE’s Board and Board Committees.

GPE’s approach to FCAC begins with the allocation of GPE financing, using an eligibility and allocation framework that places an emphasis on low- and lower-middle-income countries with high levels of out-of-school children. It specifically weights allocations toward countries affected by fragility and conflict. This has led to a significant increase in the proportion of grants disbursed to FCAC (Chart 1) and the growth in the number of FCAC in the partnership (Chart 2).

**Chart 1: GPE Allocations to FCAC**

![Chart 1: GPE Allocations to FCAC](chart1.png)

Source: GPE Secretariat, 2016

GPE deploys a progressive approach in emergencies and during protracted crises, providing flexibility to address challenges and optimize program results. GPE finances education interventions that accompany children throughout a country’s progress from preparedness through to recovery to reduce the impact of any future crises. It recognizes that securing a continuum of education services across the divide between humanitarian and development interventions is crucial to maintaining the important progress made by school-going children and youth, teachers, and education systems.

GPE support in emergency contexts has three main components:

- GPE supports **education sector plans** that reinforce emergency readiness, preparedness, and planning through its sector planning grants.
- GPE supports **transitional education sector planning**, which offers a unique starting point for policy coordination when countries are emerging from a crisis—specifically recognizing the need to link between development actors (organized within a local education group (LEG) and humanitarian actors (through the education cluster).
• Through its **accelerated financing** mechanism, countries with existing GPE allocation are able to draw down on up to 20 percent of this allocation to meet immediate needs when a crisis strikes.

• GPE grants can also be restructured to meet urgent emergency needs, and can be deployed for direct service provision to address urgent needs, under the **GPE Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States**.

**Chart 2: Number of Conflict-affected and Fragile Countries within the Global Partnership for Education, 2002-2016**

![Chart 2]

Source: GPE Secretariat, GEMR Conflict-Affected States, World Bank “Harmonized List of Fragile Situations”

2. **GPE Mechanisms for Support in Conflict-affected and Fragile Contexts**

   a) **Transitional Education Sector Planning and Preparedness Planning across the Partnership**

   During early recovery, GPE can provide financial and technical support to help countries to establish a transitional (or interim) education sector plan (TEP), which forms the basis for a coordinated approach by identifying priority actions in the medium term.

   A TEP enables a government and its partners to develop a structured plan to maintain progress toward ensuring the right to education and meeting longer-term educational goals. It further seeks to address immediate needs relevant to the context, as well as actions needed to strengthen education system capacities.

   A TEP results in:

   - A common framework to help the government align development and humanitarian partners in support of education. This alignment is especially important in situations where both development and humanitarian partners and their funding are present. The TEP can then also serve as a vehicle for harmonizing emergency or early recovery education activities that may be specified in a humanitarian response plan with longer-term development priorities for the education sector.
   - Accelerated timelines so that urgently needed funds can be received in transition contexts.
- Robust plans that will facilitate access to external education financing opportunities.
- A sense of ownership among those involved in the planning process, which will aid the implementation of the plan.
- A “road map” for a few priority education programs for three years.

In addition, GPE prioritizes and incentivizes the inclusion of **crisis preparedness and planning** in sector dialogue mechanisms and education planning exercises. Revised guidelines for education sector plan (ESP) preparation, created in cooperation with the International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP), are used by GPE to establish minimum standards for all ESPs, which GPE has committed to monitoring as part of GPE 2020. To qualify as credible, a plan must include “**an analysis of the country vulnerabilities, such as conflict, disasters, and economic crises, and shall address preparedness, prevention, and risk mitigation for the resilience of the system**.”17

**b) Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations** (adopted by the Board in 2012)

GPE accelerated funding allows disbursement within eight weeks of up to 20 percent of GPE’s indicative allocation for a partner country. The use of funds is based on the education cluster needs assessment and agreed upon by the local education group and the education cluster at the country level.

Through this mechanism, GPE can provide rapid assistance to countries that are: (i) eligible for education sector plan implementation grants (ESPIG); (ii) affected by a crisis for which a humanitarian appeal has been launched and published by the UN Office for the Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs, with education as a part of that appeal; and (iii) able to demonstrate that GPE funds will not displace government and/or other donor funds, but will be in addition to other resources.

Activities can include, but are not limited to, emergency activities such as temporary shelters, school meals, and distribution of school supplies, as well as activities critical to establishing or rebuilding education services, such as classroom construction, teacher remuneration, and school grants. Accelerated support should be implemented within one year, by which time the country should have applied for the remaining 80 percent allocation for longer-term development programming. This promotes a link between shorter-term emergency response and longer-term development needs.

**c) GPE Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States** (adopted in May 2013).

In 2013, GPE adopted an Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States. This policy aims to provide more effective support when emergencies occur during ESPIG implementation, calling for a rapid review of the situation by the local education group, immediate notification and exploration of alternatives in cases where a grant agent can no longer implement planned activities due to a crisis, and efficient grant revisions where adjustments are needed in order to address education needs arising from an emergency.

Under this policy GPE is able to redirect resources to priority activities arising from the emergency— with the same grant agent (as in Yemen in 2015), or to an alternative grant agent who can ensure continuity of services and salaries, as occurred in Madagascar in 2009 and is currently underway in Burundi.

---

3. GPE’s Increased Focus on Refugee and Displaced Children

GPE partner developing countries are home to just over 3 million refugee children, about 63 percent of the world’s refugee children population (UNHCR and GPE data). Yet few GPE partner countries include refugees in their education sector planning, and many lack the capacity and resources to address the educational needs of refugees.

In response, GPE is reaching out to strengthen the partnership by bringing in key partners that address the needs of displaced children affected by conflict and crisis, and also by encouraging greater attention to the education of refugees and displaced populations in education sector plans.

GPE and UNHCR signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) on April 15, 2016, that aims to enhance their collaboration and further strengthen GPE’s work on refugee education. Some of the activities under the MoU include:

- Strengthened engagement by UNHCR in local education groups, and by education partners working with UNHCR on refugee education
- Focused work with national education partners on the inclusion of refugees in national and sub-national education policies, sector plans, and budgets
- Provision of technical advice to national partners in design and implementation of programs to address key challenges in meeting the educational needs of refugees
- Leveraging of development partners for programming and funds to benefit refugees in protracted settings and/or where enhancement of national systems is required to absorb refugees
- Targeted support to address critical gaps in refugee education service provision, including education for girls and adolescents, quality, and learning achievement

4. GPE’s Results in Partner Countries

Central African Republic (CAR): Early Recovery and Coordination

In the Central African Republic, GPE contributed to an early recovery intervention through the provision of accelerated funding and support for the development of a transitional education sector plan. After the 2013 crisis, over one-third of schools were damaged and non-functioning. A GPE grant for $15.5 million for 2014 to 2015, managed by UNICEF, has helped more than 100,000 children return to school. The grant has also delivered school kits to more than 250,000 children, rehabilitated more than 250 classrooms, and supported catch-up classes in target schools.

GPE played a unique role in promoting donor coordination through the creation of the first local education group in CAR, which in turn proved to be an important mechanism for planning when crisis struck. It also helped to leverage additional financing, aligned with the transitional education sector plan. Today, donors are fully aligned around CAR’s sector plan: an EU program, fully aligned to the transitional education sector plan, complements the GPE program (targeting provinces not covered by the GPE program but with the same package of interventions). A program of Agence Française de Développement helps to re-establish the capacity of the Ministry of Education in coordination with the GPE program, NGOs provide co-funding to implement activities through the GPE program, and the humanitarian education cluster works closely with the local education group.

Chad: Supporting a Coordinated National Response to a Humanitarian Crisis

---

18 UNHCR and GPE data. UNHCR data only accounts for refugees for whom demographic data is available.
The humanitarian crisis in the Lake Chad region involves large numbers of refugees and returnees fleeing violence in northeastern Nigeria. The crisis is exacerbated by declining oil prices, which challenge the government’s ability to meet spending targets in education.

Using GPE support, Chad set a strong example for GPE partner countries by becoming the first GPE partner to include refugees in its transitional education sector plan in 2013. GPE subsequently provided Chad with two grants to implement the TEP ($7.06 million and $40.14 million for the period 2013–2016.) An existing humanitarian appeal includes education, and GPE confirmed in May 2015 an indicative allocation of $34.8 million in new funding for Chad. GPE is supporting Chad’s development of an education sector plan for the period 2017 to 2026.

In March 2015, during Chad’s annual joint sector review (JSR) of the education sector, a discussion between the Ministry of Education and its development partners led to a decision to mobilize additional funding to respond to its humanitarian crisis. Under GPE’s accelerated support policy, Chad was eligible to request $6.96 million as accelerated funding to focus on basic service delivery in August 2015.

GPE and the members of the local education group worked closely with the country’s education cluster to develop an emergency project aimed at addressing the education crisis in the Lake Chad region. The Chadian government’s approach has been to shore up the school system in the most troubled areas so that affected populations will not feel abandoned in the context of severe national spending cuts. This has included payment of subsidies for community school teachers, school feeding, micronutrients, dignity kits for girls, and support for civics education, in addition to classroom construction, latrines and water supply for schools, in-service teacher training, textbook distribution, and literacy for out-of-school youth.

The Chadian authorities submitted a final proposal for accelerated financing to GPE on January 8, 2016. Funding was approved by the Country Grants and Performance Committee on February 4, 2016, meeting GPE’s commitment to processing accelerated funding proposals within a four-week window. Funds were rapidly disbursed to GPE implementing partner UNICEF by February 9, 2016, demonstrating the speed with which GPE can move to support accelerated financing for humanitarian crises.

**Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): Support for Better Planning and Domestic Financing**

Access to a free, quality education for all Congolese children was introduced in 2010 by the government. But in many towns and villages, parents still contribute to school costs to cover school maintenance, administration, and even supplies and teachers’ salaries.

GPE has supported DRC to prepare a transitional education sector plan for the period 2012 to 2014—the country’s first education sector plan since independence. Motivated by the new TEP, the government increased the share of its budget allocated to education, from 9 percent in 2010 to 16 percent in 2013, with the goal of reaching 18 percent by 2018.

GPE is presently supporting the government’s efforts with a US$100 million grant that covers school rehabilitation and construction in the most deprived provinces, distribution of 20 million textbooks around the country, and improvements in sector management. It is also investing in a new education sector plan, which includes a vulnerability analysis conducted with the support of the IIEP.

GPE is supporting the DRC to develop a new ESP for the period 2016 to 2025, and to prepare its application for a second grant of US$100 million for consideration by the GPE Board in 2016.
Sierra Leone: Grant Restructuring during a Health Emergency

In 2015, education progress in Sierra Leone was significantly affected by the Ebola crisis. In response to this crisis, Sierra Leone, a GPE partner since 2007, used GPE’s Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States to restructure a part of its $17.9 million GPE grant to meet immediate educational needs. GPE funds were used to support emergency radio and television school programs when schools were closed and to ensure safe and secure learning environments when schools reopened.

GPE stood ready to similarly restructure its funding in Guinea and Liberia, staying in contact with local education groups and monitoring each situation closely. This however proved unnecessary as other sources of funding were available in these countries, allowing GPE financing to focus support on the transition out of crisis response to allow development efforts to resume.

South Sudan: Linking Humanitarian Response and Long-Term Development

Two years after its independence, South Sudan joined the Global Partnership for Education. GPE supported the development of the country’s education sector plan, and provided US$36.1 million in funding to support that plan during the 2013–2016 period.

In December 2013, renewed conflict broke out in South Sudan, creating another humanitarian crisis in which an estimated 2 million people, including 500,000 children, were displaced in three states. Using GPE’s Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States, the local education group, in consultation with the education cluster, including the Ministry of Education, donors, and UN agencies, was activated to plan for the best use of GPE and other funds to address this crisis.

GPE played an important role in facilitating consensus among these stakeholders to leverage funds from other donors to the sector to support educational programming in the three conflict-affected states. This allowed GPE funding to protect the rights of children in the unaffected states, as well as to support the transition from emergency to long-term development in the conflict-affected states.

Today, South Sudan is concluding its second sector analysis with support from GPE, and preparing for a GPE education sector plan implementation grant. The sector analysis has included a vulnerability analysis in order to integrate emergency needs within the ESP. As a result, the Ministry of Education is planning to establish an education-in-emergency unit within the ministry so as to better coordinate development and emergency activities in the future.

Somalia: Innovative Approach to Transitional Education Sector Planning

After years of civil war, in 2012 Somalia joined GPE as a federal state. More than 75 percent of Somalia’s public schools were destroyed or closed, and two generations of children had grown up largely without access to basic education.

GPE provided critical funding and helped Somalia rally support for a plan to rebuild the nation’s school system, working in an innovative fashion with three regions to develop transitional education sector plans. For the first time ever, there are TEPs in place for all three Somali regions: South and Central Somalia, Somaliland, and Puntland. As a result, Somalia is shifting away from fragmented, emergency activities and toward better planning and program implementation.

Since 2012, GPE has supported Somalia with grants to each of these regions, providing $14.5 million in total. These grants have supported payment of teachers’ salaries, girls’ access to schools, and
accelerated training programs that allowed children in South Central Somalia access to public schools from the beginning of the 2013–2014 school year.

Somalia is presently eligible for an additional allocation of US$33.1 million for a second grant phase.

Yemen

Yemen, a GPE partner since 2003, has received over $120 million in funding from the partnership. GPE supported the country’s most recent TEP for 2013–2015.

In 2015, escalating conflict led to considerable disruption of education in Yemen. An emergency meeting of the local education group was convened by the Ministry of Education to determine how best to use GPE funds to respond to the conflict that left 1.8 million children out of school.

Using the GPE Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States, approximately $10 million (of a $72.6 million grant) were subsequently redirected for rebuilding 150 schools, psycho-social support to 37,500 girls and boys, and basic school supplies for nearly 91,000 children.

More recently, during the meeting of the local education group in Amman, Jordan, Yemeni partners supported the TEP to ensure the continuation of education activities in the country. The LEG in Yemen helped partners who have suspended their operations in the country to be involved in the sector dialogue and so enabled them to remain engaged during the crisis.

5. Conclusion

GPE’s three main mechanisms for support in fragile and conflict-affected contexts—accelerated financing, transitional education sector plans, and the Operational Framework for Effective Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-affected States—ensure that GPE’s funding to the education sector does not stop when emergencies strike, and that partners work together to identify needs and the best use of GPE funds, as has happened in CAR, Chad, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

Moreover, the process to receive accelerated funding requires development and humanitarian actors to work together in a way that helps strengthen the link between emergency response, recovery, and development, and promotes improved coordination. Notably, this model has ensured rapid response, sustained financing, and improved donor alignment and coordination in countries such as CAR, DRC, Madagascar, Yemen, and more recently Chad. As demonstrated in Chad and Sierra Leone, GPE financing can be moved rapidly and effectively to meet emergency needs.

GPE is continuing to refine policy and program approaches to improve support for education in crisis environments and address gaps and challenges:

- The Operational Framework for Effective Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-affected States and its accelerated financing mechanism forces a choice between emergency and development needs, whereby funds for crisis are not additional to existing development funds. Some countries choose to use GPE funding to address emergency needs; on the whole, however, governments tend to choose to try to raise funds from other sources if possible and retain GPE funds to address longer-term development goals, as South Sudan chose to do when the crisis intensified and the potential reallocation of GPE funds was discussed and decided against in 2014.

---

19 See GPE Portfolio Review 2015 and Menashy and Dryden-Peterson, 2015a and 2015b.
• Although more than half of the world’s refugee children live within GPE partner countries, few countries include them in their national education sector plans and programs—a notable exception being Chad. More can be done to include refugee education within nationally owned planning and programming.

• GPE’s eligibility and allocation models are not responsive when there is a rapid deterioration of educational opportunities in countries and regions that are not already GPE partners. For example, as of the 2014 data released in 2016, Syria is now eligible for GPE financing because it has more than 15 percent of children out of primary school and a per capita income of under US$2,500. However, GPE was not positioned to support Syria as the crisis unfolded, missing the chance to provide education for the millions of out-of-school children who are the victims of this crisis.

Given the significant gap in education emergency funding, and the fact that so many out-of-school children affected by conflict and crises live within GPE partner countries, GPE recognizes the need for enhanced action. GPE’s current approach should be seen as a solid foundation and model for future efforts, but also warrants further elaboration in order to meet these challenges.
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