



The global fund for education in emergencies

MULTI-YEAR RESILIENCE PROGRAMMES (MYRPs)

Since becoming operational, Education Cannot Wait (ECW) has successfully established itself as the global fund to respond to education needs in emergencies and protracted crises contexts. Through its investments, especially the MYRPs, ECW is modeling a practical approach to implement the humanitarian-development nexus for education.

Towards its committed to continue developing its approach and expanding the impact of the MYRPs in accordance with the vision outlined in the 2018 strategic plan. The purpose of this note is to reflect on ECW's work to date and set the scene moving forward based on experiences from activating MYRPs in ten countries facing crisis around the world.

1) RELATED FACTS AND FIGURES

- As of February 2020, MYRPs have reached about 305,000 children in emergency contexts and protracted crises:
 - 50% girls in four countries Afghanistan, Bangladesh, CAR and Uganda
 - 97% of reached children are in primary school
 - 2% in pre-primary education
 - 1% in secondary education
 - 85% are in formal education
 - 15% in non-formal education
 - 70% of reached children are either IDPs or refugees.
 - less than 1% are children with disabilities.
- **Cost per Child:** ECW targets for fundraising were set on the estimates in the ODI evidence papers: US\$ 156 needed per child per year for EiE, with a funding gap of US\$ 112 per child per year to be provided as ODA. On the one hand, analysis from the ECW Secretariat has shown that the average cost for ECW provision of accelerated education alone is around US\$ 169 per year (without MHPSS or nutrition-related services). Partners have budgeted MYRP assistance on average at around US\$ 200 per year, sometimes without even including costs connected with provision of nutrition and MHPSS. This represents *prima facie* evidence that the “holistic” approach envisioned in the MYRP is significantly more expensive than the US\$112 per child per year envisioned in the ODI papers.
- **The MYRPs:** To date there are ten (10)¹ active MYRPs, responding to the education needs of children and youth affected by crises. These are developed relying on partners capacity and structures to avoid creating parallel structures which is key. MYRPs are conflict sensitive and contextualized to suit the different realities in each country.

¹ Afghanistan, Bangladesh, CAR, Chad, Ethiopia, Palestine, Somalia, South Sudan, Syria and Uganda



The global fund for education in emergencies

2) MYRP IN THE EMERGING FRAMEWORK OF HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

Since the Strategic Plan was approved in 2018, there has been a considerable increase in the level of political support to education in emergencies and protracted crises.

ECW is closely aligned with **Agenda 2030 - Decade for Action (SDGs)** in which the global leadership commits to redouble its efforts for those left furthest behind by enhancing national implementation and supporting local action. The **UN reform** agenda is being rolled out to support Agenda 2030 and enhance collaboration between humanitarian-development-peacebuilding with gender at the centre. As a global fund, ECW is contributing to making the UN system more efficient and collaborative by supporting joint analysis and planning, facilitating joint programming, and making more effective use of resources.

During the **Global Refugee Forum**, governments, UN and civil society recommitted to the Global Compact for Refugees. **ECW pledged** that the Uganda MYRP process which could inspire other countries with an inclusive multi-stakeholder approach under government leadership, increased collaboration between ECW, GPE and the World Bank. ECW also made a pledge on secondary education and the needs of adolescents.

The UN agencies, donors and civil society organizations agreed on **OECD-DAC guidelines humanitarian-development-peace nexus** in February 2019 as a legal document. The guidelines build upon the Good Humanitarian Donorship and Principles of Development Effectiveness underlining that nexus agreements needs to be **context-specific**, building on stakeholder's **comparative advantages** adhering to joint or **shared multi-stakeholder analysis, shared risk information and shared gender sensitive analyses**.

3) THE COUNTRY CONTEXT

ECW's experience has been that the contexts vary considerably in terms of the severity and type of crises but also **capacity in the countries**. The relationship between the political will, as expressed in a robust strategy or plan and the in-country capacity should **decide the speed of the MYRP process**. The goal of ECW is not to duplicate efforts and try to bring humanitarian and development actors together and addressing the gaps which pertain to those left furthest behind due to an emergency or protracted crisis and accelerate SDG4.

Based on the observation of the range of country contexts expressed in resilience strategies and in country capacity – ECW suggests **an approach that is responsive to the country context ECW best can facilitate the process**.

4) CONSIDERATIONS AND REFLECTIONS:

- **Speed vs. quality and inclusion.** Without compromising on the quality, the design or the exclusion of in-country stakeholders, the programme document requirements for developing a MYRP in



The global fund for education in emergencies

target countries should be shortened by ensuring strategic level inputs and looking more thoroughly at the bottlenecks.

- **Focus vs. breadth of reach.** Since costs per capita to ensure holistic education are higher than expected, it could be considered if ECW should reach fewer children to a higher cost package of services to deliver holistic learning - or reaching a larger number of children with a more modest set of services? The Secretariat would like to explore how sustain a right based approach and at the same time deliver investments that are holistic in nature.
- **Selection of grantees.** Different designs for MYRP structures should be studied and perhaps also piloted to strike a balance between ownership, coordination and accountability for results at the outcome level. Giving grants to consortia (especially those with a mix of national and international NGOs) is one example for a structure that can be further explored.
- **In-country resource mobilization.** In most MYRPs in-country resource mobilization is not properly built into the programme design, it is unlikely to receive the required attention and follow up from governments, steering committees, grantees, and in-country partners. Having a dedicated outcome in all MYRPs on in-country resource mobilization as well as a costed work plan is essential.
- **Choice of funding window may be complex in certain cases.** Where capacities to develop a MYRP are limited, a hybrid design between a first response and a multi-year (akin to the initial investments), or the introduction of second FER, may be more appropriate.

5) WAY FORWARD

- MYRPs programme documents will need to be **shortened and tightened with regards to strategic content and analysis.** The structure of the template could be lighter, lifting it to a more strategic level. Accordingly, the existing guidance could be revised so that it explains how to undertake a fit-for-purpose approach. The enhanced template will highlight how ECW is improving quality, specifically in terms of impact, inclusivity, and measurement of holistic learning outcomes.
- ECW's original **target timeline for developing MYRPs** of four (4) months should be revised. The point planning and joint programming nature of the MYRPs compounded with an environment of protracted crises/emergency response, the need to ensure an extensive consultation process and a quality product, including a lengthy approval process provide the basis for reviewing these rigorous speed targets.
- MYRPs will **draw more on existing strategies and plans where possible**, for example multi-year HRP and Cluster/EiE Working Group strategies, Education Sector Plans and other recent and relevant country-led documents. MYRPs can be adapted to integrate existing education funding with provision of MHPSS, nutrition, or other key services to foster learning outcomes.



The global fund for education in emergencies

- **MYRPs should more clearly identify how ECW funding will be used in the interplay with other education donors and development partners**, to encourage and support meaningful change in [collective] learning outcomes, including promoting multisectoral approaches.
- **Invest in technical assistance to support the process of MYRP design** – looking at ways to work more closely with the Global Education Cluster, UNHCR and other standby partners who can deploy quickly to support the in-country process of drafting the MYRP document with partners.
- **ECW will be assertive in proposing a more diverse set of grantees** – recognizing the need for ECW to continue to adhere to the Grand Bargain principles and following an internal assessment on the capacity of partners to measure and report on outcome-level results.
- **Encourage budgets which are more coherent with ECW’s global commitments**, for example around the percentage of resources allocated to Early Childhood Education and with the commitments taken at the Global Refugee Forum on improving retention of secondary school aged children who were forcibly displaced.
- **Encourage budgets that address a critical mass of needs on the ground in well-specified areas**, to build “localized modes of resilience” in selected provinces/districts/areas following a holistic approach via provision of multi-sectorial assistance (e.g. also including nutrition if needed, MHPSS if needed, etc.). Once such “holistic” and localized models are tested vs their capacity to deliver results at the outcome level, they can be scaled up or replicated in other emergency-affected areas. The envisioned phased and evidence-driven approach seems more appropriate to resource mobilization (including in-country) as donors and partners are more likely to finance approaches with proven results.

6) ACTION POINTS 2020

- A. Revising the existing MYRP Guidance, ensuring that it is consistent with the new Operating Manual
- B. Revise the MYRP with rigorous speed targets
- C. Specific direction on the institutional arrangements and processes for selecting grantees (including models with consortia) and implementing partners
- D. In collaboration with Global Education Cluster, develop Terms of Reference for Education Clusters in ECW-facilitated MYRP processes to ensure impartiality, inclusion, transparency and accountability
- E. Develop a model for rapidly deployable expertise to support the processes
- F. Outline/clarify the approach for technical assistance to MYRP development, monitoring and implementation in gender responsiveness, MHPSS and EiE.
- G. Review the existing quality assurance process so that it fits with the approach outlined above



The global fund for education in emergencies

- H. Develop a better approach to in-country resource mobilization and tracking of aligned and leveraged resources.
- I. Entertain a lighter process such as a 18-24 months First Response approach in some contexts where response time is of essence and capacity for a MYRP development is facing limitations.