



EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CALL WEDNESDAY, 5 APRIL 2017, 8:00AM ET

MINUTES

Participants: Jesper Andersen (GPE), Josephine Bourne (interim ECW Secretariat), Ambassador Tarald Brautaset (Norway), Dean Brooks (INEE), Justin van Fleet (interim ECW Secretariat), Anna French (UK DFID), Alicia Herbert (UK DFID), Stijn De Lameilliure (European Commission), Preeta Law (UNHCR), Annina Mattsson (Dubai Cares), Nicolai Steen Nielsen (Denmark), Daria Ng (ECW Secretariat), Svein Ostveit (UNESCO), Nina Papadopoulos (USAID), Pdraig Power (GPE), Atif Rafique (UNICEF), Nancy Smyth (Canada), Morgan Strecker (UNICEF/ECW Secretariat), Emily Travis (ECW Secretariat); Anna-Maria Tammi (GPE)

Apology was received from:

Charles Tapp (interim ECW Secretariat)

Confirmation of Executive Committee Chair

Justin van Fleet welcomed participants and noted that prior to the call, a note was emailed to the Executive Committee proposing the selection of Ambassador Tarald Brautaset as Chair. The Executive Committee was asked if they had any objections to this. There were no objections, and Ambassador Brautaset was confirmed as Chair of the Executive Committee until the end of the year. Justin van Fleet handed over the rest of the meeting to the new Chair.

Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) suggested nominating a Co-Chair or Deputy Chair to ensure continuity after Ambassador Brautaset had fulfilled his duties. This was agreed.

Preparations for High Level Steering Group meeting

The Chair asked Jo Bourne to give participants an update on preparations for the upcoming HLSG meeting. The following summary was given for information:

- The HLSG Chair wrote to members last month to confirm the date and time of the meeting (7:30am on Friday, 21 April in Washington DC).
- A Logistical Note had been emailed to HLSG members and focal points on Tuesday, 4 April with additional information.
- The Secretariat would send the papers by Thursday, 13 April.
- The meeting would be a principals-level, strategic discussion aimed at inspiring and mobilizing ECW's political champions. It would focus on: the progress and success so far in establishing and implementing ECW; the

priorities, challenges and opportunities for 2017-18; and finally, the permanent hosting review.

- Paperwork for the meeting would include:
 - Brochures for distribution that helped to tell the story of ECW (these will be on the table)

And sent in advance:

- Agenda
- Shorter, high-level summary of the Roadmap for 2017-18
- TOR for permanent hosting review
- The private sector seat for HLSG would be filled in time for the meeting, which will be a step forward in engaging that constituency. There might be more information about the southern civil society seat by then.

The Chair underscored the importance of the Executive Committee undertaking preparations with principals ahead of the meeting so they could think about what their principal/organization could offer and how they could help to advocate and influence for ECW.

Executive Committee members raised the following points for the HLSG meeting:

- Nancy Smyth (Canada) mentioned the importance of highlighting ECW's work and progress to date, including having case studies from the initial investment countries that could help highlight priorities and lessons.
- Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) said the attendance of the Secretary of State for International Development was yet to be confirmed, but believed that the activation of the first response window might be an area to engage her further on.
- Stijn De Lameillure (European Commission) mentioned the importance of discussing education financing and messaging with HLSG, including the coordination and collaboration between ECW, GPE, IFFed and other funding mechanisms.
- Justin van Fleet noted that IFFed, ECW and GPE were working on documents that would be available during the Spring Meetings to clarify how the funding mechanisms were all working together, and agreed that it should be included in the discussion with HLSG, perhaps under challenges and opportunities ahead.
- Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) raised the possibility of the HLSG meeting once per year, now that the Executive Committee was in place. This was noted for future consideration.

ECW Roadmap 2017-18

The Chair asked Jo Bourne to introduce the ECW Roadmap. The following overview of the Roadmap was given for information:

- The 2017-2018 Roadmap served to guide ECW work until the 3-year strategy was developed and implemented (through June 2018).
- Much work sat underneath the roadmap, which was in line with the operational and governance frameworks, but what was being presented was a *summary* of priorities and sequencing. More details on strategic prioritization of ECW would be developed in the full, consultative strategy-setting process.
- The Executive Committee was asked to comment on the Roadmap, including challenges and opportunities and how they might contribute to advancing the strategy. They were also asked to provide a steer on key elements of the Roadmap that should be highlighted to HLSG, who will get a much shorter version. Finally, they were asked endorse the Roadmap (for internal Secretariat use).

Jo Bourne asked Emily Travis (ECW Secretariat) to provide a summary of the Roadmap slides, presented below:

- The first slide reviewed the progress and results to date as well as the beneficiary and financing targets to test in 2017/2018 to inform the long-term strategy.
- Slide 2 was a re-cap on ECW's value-add – important principles for implementation as well as for advocacy. The original core functions and principles for ECW still stand, but this needs to be defined more clearly this year – and particularly over the strategy-setting phase.
- Slide three was on the three main areas of delivery, underpinned by strong governance, operations and learning. Each of these pillars comprised a significant volume of work, finance and human resource.
- Under the pillar on launching new investments through the 3 ECW windows, the immediate priority was to activate the First Response window in order to be able to respond quickly to emergencies and crises (slides 5 and 6).
- The Multi-Year window, proposed to be operational by summer, would require work on the methodology for the selection of countries and governance support such as establishing the Independent Proposal Review Panel (slide 7).
- The Secretariat proposed to launch the Acceleration Facility with a request for proposals in the third quarter. This would ideally draw on some of the initial learning from the Global Partners Initial Investment, as well as some DFID-funded work on research.
- Strategic Planning Process (slide 9): Boston Consulting Group recommended that the strategic planning process take up to one-year, which on reflection seemed too long for developing a 3-year strategy. Therefore, ECW Secretariat was proposing a 6-month strategy process, starting from Autumn 2017. It might be difficult to do this more quickly, given that before the strategic planning process could start, a new Director would need to be on-board, a Strategy Task Team established and TOR approved by HLSG.

The Chair reiterated the questions on the Roadmap for discussion and Executive Committee members raised the following points:

- Preeta Law (UNHCR) noted agreement on the main points of the Roadmap and suggested that more detail on new sources of financing would be useful.
- Nancy Smyth (Canada) suggested that for HLSG, the Roadmap should highlight the value added and expected results of ECW, including gender equality, results and other concrete ideas where possible. There should be clarity on funding mechanisms and a suggestion to put the First Response work in context with other grant making that is already happening. She also suggested an update on Secretariat staffing and how ECW is streamlining with UNICEF resources for increased effectiveness.
- Nina Papadopoulos (USAID) suggested identifying key moments over the next year for HLSG or the Executive Committee to take on key functions. A timeline for other activities that were in the Roadmap and costing information could also be included.
- Pdraig Power (GPE) said having a governance roadmap with key dates and milestones and a timeline on reviewing the initial investments could be useful. He also suggested distinguishing the information on financials needed between the Executive Committee and HLSG, and having projections on costing.
- Stijn De Lameilliere (European Commission) agreed on including the activation of the First Response window with HLSG. He highlighted the need for advocacy and the role that HLSG could play in advocacy around the first response investments to leverage more funding. He also suggested making fundraising plans more evident in the Roadmap.
- Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) said that the Roadmap for HLSG should strike a balance between detailing the process and the change/ impact on children. The big focus could be on results to date, in numbers in addition to just money. Then also on how ECW is contributing to the humanitarian reform agenda, taking forward innovative financing systematically (and linking with other financing mechanisms like GPE, IFFed) and improving quality education and learning outcomes.

The Chair asked for an endorsement of the roadmap for internal Secretariat use. The Secretariat would incorporate feedback from the Executive Committee for the shorter version of the Roadmap for HLSG. There were no objections and the Roadmap was endorsed.

First Response Proposal

The Chair asked Justin van Fleet to introduce the First Response Proposal. The following overview was given for information:

- The Secretariat has proposed to allocate \$20 million for immediate delivery through the First Response window, as well as to hold \$30 million as emergency contingency for crises over the rest of the year.
- The aim is for a catalytic approach in investments and engagement and to use the opportunity to prioritize the diversity in grant agents.
- The First Response window has not yet been tested through the Initial Investments. The aim would be to deliver through all four modalities of the window, in order to support learning and improvement, and to help inform the 3-year strategy.
- Executive Committee members were asked for their broad support of this proposal, and steer for taking it forward.
- A particular question for the Executive Committee was on the two options for the second matching modality and whether to fund Option 1 - fewer (2-3 countries) or Option 2 - more (5-7 countries) crises. Lastly, whether this should be taken to the HLSG meeting in April as an announcement.

Justin van Fleet asked Emily Travis (ECW Secretariat) to run through the First Response Proposal in more detail, presented below:

- There were 2 proposed stages. The first stage was on methodology and crisis selection and the second stage detailed the four funding modalities.
- For the first stage the Secretariat, supported by UNICEF's education team, undertook an assessment of crisis-affected countries and developed a methodology, scoring and ranking, which was included as an Annex. We were happy to answer further questions on that, as needed.
- In the selection of countries, we had chosen not to fund existing ECW-supported countries, plus those that tended to be relatively well-aided (such as South Sudan), while prioritizing countries with recent escalations of crisis (Madagascar and Ukraine).
- As a next step, the Secretariat would work with coordinating partners on the ground to identify proposals and pre-accredited grant agents.

Executive Committee members raised the following points on the First Response Proposal:

- Nicolai Steen Nielsen (Denmark) said that the Secretariat would need to look at their capacity to work on either option. The preference was for Option 1 (fewer countries) based on Secretariat capacity. He asked whether Peru (and countries with similar situations), would still be considered "onset of a crisis" in the time between the crisis and funds being disbursed, which may be some months later. On pre-accreditation, this needed to be taken up within the conversation on the Standard Contribution Agreement, noting that Denmark needed more information on accountability, and legal issues before funds could be distributed to agencies other than the UN.

- Pdraig Power (GPE) said the preference was Option 2 because it was an opportunity to test a broad range of countries as quickly as possible. He also noted capacity issues in moving ahead.
- Svein Osttveit (UNESCO) said the preference was Option 2, in order to learn as much as possible from more countries.
- Stijn De Lameilliure (European Commission) expressed preference for Option 2, but highlighted that this would require substantial advocacy and networking, potentially from HLSC. He also noted concern on the workload it would entail for the Secretariat. He said with the contingency reserve of \$30m and the \$20m for First Response, there would be no funds left in September, which meant that a fundraising strategy should be in place.
- Preeta Law (UNHCR) agreed on the potential opportunities for a broader set of investments, but said that the sustainability of the First Response should be taken into account. It would not just be about the visibility of the investments and getting the funding out, but whether it could be sustained in conflict affected crises.
- Nancy Smyth (Canada) said that a short narrative on the methodology to show transparency, including data sources and country selection would be helpful. The slight preference was for Option 1, given caution about spreading \$20 million too thinly over a large number of investments, but perhaps there could be something between Option 1 and 2. She also said it would be useful to show deliverables when the funds were distributed. Her team could support communication and advocacy work if needed.
- Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) said the preference was for Option 1 - fewer investments in larger amounts would be better not only because of current capacity, but also to be able to prove the concept more strongly, keeping ECW more tightly focused. She said it should be announced at HLSC, but not the countries unless those have been confirmed, but at least the window could be announced. She also suggested doing some analysis on other crisis response funding; for example, the World Bank also had a crisis window.
- Annina Mattsson (Dubai Cares) said the preference was Option 2.
- Nina Papadopoulos (USAID) said that a methodology should be in place to capture results, effectiveness and learning from the beginning.
- There was a question on how matching funds would work in countries with zero financing. The Secretariat said that in such cases, it would be about bringing in the funding for the matching, particularly targeting non-traditional donors.
- Jo Bourne said that on the concerns around capacity, each option required capacity – just a different type. The discussion on which option to take forward would help the Secretariat better plan where to bring in more capacity.
- Dean Brooks (INEE) said the strong preference was for Option 2.
- Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) said that a strategic discussion on ECW focus would be needed, given the differences of opinion amongst Executive Committee members, being mindful also of other funding mechanisms.

The Chair proposed that since there was no majority consensus on either Option 1 or 2, the decision could be to do something in between, so four countries for the matching modality. This was agreed. The Chair noted the point about a strategic discussion on ECW focus for a future Executive Committee discussion.

Review of Permanent Hosting

The Chair asked Alicia Herbert (UK DFID) to provide an overview of the TOR for Permanent Hosting. Alicia presented the TOR DFID had drafted and asked members for their views particularly on the following questions:

- Did the timeframe sound right? After HLSG's endorsement, the first engagement exercise would start in May, then a few weeks later there would be the launch for bids and the decision on who to take forward by mid-June.
- Should it start with a short or long list of potential hosts?
- Methodology, extent and number of informant interviews?
- Specific criteria for host assessment –what is missing? Are any of them unclear?
- Any other comments?

DFID said that they would take forward the contracting, including reaching out to potential consultants. Individuals could be nominated to form the team. For example, BCG had one person from their group who wanted to be a part of the exercise. For other nominations, names could be sent to Alicia.

Nina Papadopoulos (USAID) said it would be useful to add an expert on qualitative research, data collection and analysis to be able to think about a methodology for data collection and storage. She also suggested putting out a request for information to see which other entities had not been included in the original ODI assessment of hosting.

Due to the meeting running over time, the Chair agreed that UK DFID should re-send the TOR and questions via email and that Executive Committee members should respond with their comments by Monday, 10 April. The draft TOR needed to be finalised in order to circulate to the HLSG next week (by Thursday, 13 April).

Education Financing and ECW

The Chair asked Justin van Fleet to provide an update on education financing and ECW. The following points were made:

- There had been a lot of momentum on how the different education financing mechanisms worked together.

- On the day before the HLSG meeting, Global Business Coalition for Education would be holding a session on how to bring private sector support to ECW. All members/organizations of HLSG had been invited.
- ECW co-Directors had met with the UAE government at the Dubai Humanitarian Summit on ECW funding.
- There had been ongoing donor discussions with South Korea, Japan, Germany, Spain and France.
- Dubai Cares would be giving a presentation to a group of foundations at the International Education Funders Network on how they could support ECW.
- A Hotel Levy initiative was being pursued with potential partners.
- A formal nomination to HLSG for a business leader to fill the private sector HLSG seat was forthcoming.
- It would be important to prepare HLSG principals in terms of fundraising and advocacy/resource mobilization. Moving forward, it would also be important to continue ensuring that ECW was mentioned in advocacy work.

AOB

A question was asked about a general recruitment update on the ECW Director position as well as other Secretariat positions.

Justin van Fleet said that Director nominations had been put forward to the Chair of the HLSG. The aim would be for the Director to be in place before the HLSG meeting. The proposal would hopefully be sent to the Executive Committee for non-objection prior to the HLSG meeting.

Jo Bourne said that interviews had taken place for a majority of the Secretariat positions and appointments would be moving forward in a sequenced way. In the meantime, short-term consultancy support had been brought in to support the Secretariat.

Conclusion

The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking all participants.