



Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, 30 January 2018, 9:00-17:00 GMT at DFID, London

Participants

Executive Committee members: Jo Bourne (UNICEF), Tarald Brautaset (Norway, Chair), Dean Brooks (INEE), Stijn De Lameilliere (European Commission, representing Aida Liha Matejcek), Alicia Herbert (UK DFID), Rudolf Huber (Germany BMZ), Claire James (Australia), Preeta Law (UNHCR, representing Carol Batchelor), Annina Mattsson (Dubai Cares), Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly (Save the Children), Svein Osttveit (UNESCO), Pdraig Power (GPE), Evelyn Rodriguez-Perez (USAID), Frank Rothaus Jensen (Denmark, representing Nicolai Steen Nielsen), Yasmine Sherif (ECW Director), Nancy Smyth (Canada), Justin van Fleet (Office of the UN Special Envoy for Global Education),

Observers: Jesper Andersen (GPE), Laura Davison (INEE), Julia Dicum (Canada), Gorka Fagilde (Sida), Randi Gramshaug (Norad), Kerstin Holst (UNESCO), Alice Kunz (Germany GIZ), Nina Papadopoulou (USAID), Ita Sheehy (UNHCR), Emily Todd (DFID), Emma Wagner (Save the Children)

ECW Secretariat: Zeinab Adam, Niladri Bhattacharjee, Gabrielle Bonnet, Lucy Earle, Graham Lang, Daria Ng, Amrit Sandhu, Emily Travis

Apologies: Fadi Yarak (Lebanon)

Welcome and Introductions

1. The Chair opened the meeting and Alicia Herbert, as host, welcomed participants to DFID. The Chair welcomed Executive Committee members, Germany as a new member, and Sweden as their first time joining as an observer.

Remarks from Gordon Brown

2. The Chair introduced Gordon Brown (United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education and Chair, ECW High Level Steering Group) via teleconference, who commended ECW on its achievements to date and wished ECW the best in its future work and GPE the best for their upcoming replenishment.

ECW Director Update

3. The Chair handed over to Yasmine Sherif who provided the following Director's update:
 - 3.1. ECW's Secretariat has established Standard Operating Procedures, staff and the necessary fundamentals to establish systems and structures. A new senior P4 communications staff member, one of the previously approved positions, would be joining in mid-February.
 - 3.2. The recent mission to Afghanistan, coordinated by Education Cluster leads (UNICEF and Save the Children) along with the Government of Afghanistan, clearly highlighted ECW's added value. On one side, national execution (NEX) through the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund relied on a long-term plan, but it would only reach parts of the country and would take longer time to establish/deliver against on-budget. On the other side, Humanitarian Partners in Afghanistan applied direct execution (DEX) and could directly execute rapidly and reach further across country, but only over a short period so there were continuity and capacity development challenges. ECW, however, could fill the gap in between the two and add value by rapidly delivering funds through DEX, reaching out as the humanitarians across the country, while also ensuring both immediate and medium-term investments and linking to the WB/GPE development investment. ECW's added value in this space was identified and presented by partners (Government, development and humanitarian alike) in-country to the recent ECW mission.
 - 3.3. ECW had excellent meetings with the Government, humanitarian and development partners, including the Humanitarian Coordinator, WB, communities, school management, *shuras*,

- students and returnees in Afghanistan, as well as several EXCOM member representatives, Such as Canada, DFID, USAID and Sweden.
- 3.4. ECW's First Response in Afghanistan received positive feedback from partners, who said the modality was speedy and the fastest that money had ever reached them. The ECW mission also noted that the Humanitarian Coordinator had allocated 10% to education in the first tranche from the Common Humanitarian Fund.
 - 3.5. A joint mission to Bangladesh was being planned with GPE, UNICEF, Save the Children and UNHCR in February.
 - 3.6. On ECW's funding targets, there was a need to think outside of the box. Year 1 funding targets were reached and made possible by the Executive Committee and new donor partners. Moving forward, ECW needed to continue bringing in all partners, including humanitarian and development actors, private sector, GPE, foundations, innovative financing and new donors. There was also strong civil society involvement coordinated by Save the Children. EXCOM members were encouraged to invite their humanitarian departments to EXCOM, as this would assist ECW in pursuing additionality and access to humanitarian funding.
 - 3.7. ECW staff would have resource mobilization reflected as part of their performance review targets.
 - 3.8. Graham Lang commented on resource mobilization ideas that were in preliminary stages of thinking, including permanent mission tours in New York, capitalizing on the next UN General Assembly, engaging with private sector and Silicon Valley companies and innovative financing ideas such as development impact bonds.
 - 3.9. On diversification of grantees, ECW went from five grantees with Initial Investments, to 38 grantees with First Response, and was working in 14 countries (plus the Global Partners programme) after being operational for nine months. Even if one agency was leading in-country, implementation was inclusive involving new partners, both local (to strengthen the localization agenda) and international.
 - 3.10. Delivering fast on the ground for First Response gave ECW credibility. First Response countries were now asking ECW for joint multi-year programmes. In the future, ECW would programme First Response within Multi-Year so that the modalities would work in parallel and in an integrated fashion.
 - 3.11. ECW planned on facilitating 8-10 multi-year programmes in 2018 in its current countries. As ECW expected to be the catalyst in each country and not a programme implementer, 8-10 was reasonable provided that there were strong in-country teams/partners in place. The earlier ECW started, the more likely it would be to achieve its goals and produce learning outcomes by the fourth year of the ECW strategy (current cycle).
 - 3.12. On Secretariat staffing, and as discussed in the EXCOM meeting in 2017, ECW's original organogram was a long line of mainly P5 level staff. With the EXCOM's support, this organogram had gradually been transformed into a more functional structure. There was still a lack of resource mobilization capacity in relation to the HLSG targets for ECW, and a lack of P3 staff required to complete a functional structure. The Secretariat proposed three new positions to address this glaring gap. ECW was grateful for the secondments from UNHCR, DFID and France, with Denmark forthcoming, and invited additional secondments.
 - 3.13. The three new positions requested included a Resource Mobilization Specialist (P4), Planning & Operations Specialist (P3) (regularization of existing consultancy) and Programme Specialist – Field Support (P3).
4. The Chair thanked Yasmine for her update and suggested that issues of Secretariat budget and staffing were revisited later in the agenda.
 5. Executive Committee members made the following comments in response to the Director's update:
 - 5.1. There was appreciation for the Secretariat's hard work and achievements the past few months.

- 5.2. Resource mobilization was acknowledged as a challenge, as well as the global funding gap for Education in Emergencies (EiE), but ECW should balance between being fast and not bureaucratic while also ensuring quality, results and relevance.
 - 5.3. Many members were involved with ECW for a long time and needed more tangible, concrete results with data and numbers.
 - 5.4. Clarity was needed on: whether ECW was on track in achieving its goals, how it was performing in terms of efficiency, how money was being spent, policies/procedures for quality assurance, what ECW was doing differently than others, how the 3.85 billion funding target over five years was being counted, and what funding came in for 2017 and what would come in for 2018 out of the US\$172 million mobilized.
 - 5.5. ECW needed to have shared accountability for the Initial Investments, along with a clearer picture of what was happening, numbers and results against programme targets. It should also be clear what grantees had spent or disbursed, keeping in mind transaction costs. There should be a process for reprogramming or project extensions.
 - 5.6. There was great positive feedback from the Afghanistan mission from donors and partners, and appreciation for ECW's added value and the gender equality perspective. Lessons Learned from Afghanistan could be an important example that would inform future multi-year investment and make it easier to convince donors.
 - 5.7. Uganda was also a good example of ECW working at the humanitarian and development nexus.
 - 5.8. There was positive feedback on ECW's investment in Syria. There was a question whether the programme would be extended given that two years was short for producing learning results.
 - 5.9. It was great that ECW was diversifying grantees. Further clarification would be needed on the process in country and common terminology, and whether ECW would be granting directly or through an agency, as each would have implications on partners and transaction costs.
 - 5.10. In addition to diversification, there was also localization and the opportunity to work with smaller NGOs. Localization was important for advocacy and the development of national policies that would affect what resources would be provided and how they would be used.
 - 5.11. The content of ECW's programming should not only lead to quality education, but also address inclusion for refugees in national education programs and longer term solutions.
 - 5.12. If ECW were to have a replenishment, there would need to be a clear run up, advance notice for the High Level Steering Group (HLSG) and clear policy asks.
6. The Chair handed over to the ECW Director who thanked Executive Committee members for their positive feedback, comments and questions. The following responses were given:
 - 6.1. ECW greatly appreciated working with the Executive Committee and the HLSG in the past few months, as the EXCOM partners were very agile, supportive and constructive rather than overly bureaucratic.
 - 6.2. Achieving results required accountable human resources, a strategy with a results-based framework, guidance for implementation, a strong M&E framework and financial tracking. When Initial Investments were made, the ECW staff were not in place and most of these systems did not exist. However, now there was collective responsibility and the now operational Secretariat was doing everything possible to get the structure and systems in place and ensure results.
 - 6.3. In Syria, developing the coordination mechanism had been time consuming, but it was now very strong and we would see the fruits of that. There was concern about Yemen because the coordination mechanism was sitting outside of the country due to security reasons.
 - 6.4. If partners wanted to do things differently with regards to the localization agenda and Grand Bargain, it may come with added transaction costs.
 - 6.5. In Afghanistan, there had already been advocacy on the ground to ensure education was one of the priorities of the EiE Working Group, and the Humanitarian Coordinator served as a positive example.

- 6.6. But the commitment to increasing allocations from humanitarian funding envelopes could not rest with personalities, but had to be systematized and institutionalized. ECW would work with OCHA and its partners to include education in in the Terms of Reference for the Humanitarian Coordinators (and Resident Coordinators) so that the humanitarian coordination system could be leveraged. This is how other sectors had established stronger leverage with Humanitarian/Resident Coordinators.
- 6.7. ECW was working through recognized coordination mechanisms designed for emergencies and protracted crisis, so it was important to rely on the Education Cluster as it was linked to both the government and partners along accountability lines. This formed the basis for a consultative process in-country to determine who would lead the coordination on ECW facilitated multi-year joint programmes.
- 6.8. On resource mobilization, ECW's US\$3.85 billion target had been determined by the HLSG and it would be up to ECW's governance bodies to decide whether to keep that target or revise it. But as long as the target was \$3.5 billion by year five, it was logical for ECW to strive to operate at that level of ambition in all its functions.
- 6.9. Gabrielle Bonnet commented that the money counted towards ECW's funding target would come from both ECW and from pooled financing for a joint programme, and it would be money raised at the global and country level. Over time, the share of money raised at country level would increase. The Secretariat would also monitor global EiE funding.

Initial Investments and First Response

7. The Chair handed over to Gabrielle Bonnet who highlighted some points from her **presentation**:
 - 7.1. The Initial Investments Report was prepared in November 2017, but the Secretariat now had more detailed information to share.
 - 7.2. Of the 4 million children targeted by ECW, Yemen accounted for 2.5 million, so in speaking about the overall progress of ECW's investments, it sometimes made sense to exclude Yemen.
 - 7.3. ECW programmes were addressing formal and non-formal education, from ECD to Technical and Vocational Education and Training. Programmes were providing primary education (72%), secondary education (22%) and early childhood education (6%)¹.
 - 7.4. Ten out of 14 countries were addressing demand side barriers. Interventions to promote equity included targeting children across conflict lines; support to refugees, IDPs and host populations; and targeted actions to address demand-side barriers to education of the most vulnerable children, such as addressing perceptions of the importance of education, school feeding, provision of transportation, etc. Thirteen grantees were reaching children with disabilities. In Somalia, the demand for school feeding exceeded the original target, so it was a struggle to reach more children than anticipated.
 - 7.5. On gender, ECW programmes were training slightly more female teachers than in the general teacher population, and gender balance was being ensured when hiring teachers.
 - 7.6. On learning, some investments were 'pushing the envelope'. Four countries were planning to measure learning outcomes. Other investments were involving communities in monitoring and training to increase accountability for results.
 - 7.7. Programmes in Chad and Ethiopia were approximately three weeks behind schedule. Syria was more delayed because the coordination mechanisms and sub-grantee processes took longer to establish, but no reprogramming has been foreseen.
 - 7.8. In Yemen, their plan chose breadth over depth and had a target of reaching 2.5 million children, primarily by providing textbooks for all children in grades 1-3 and exams in grades 9 and 12. In Ethiopia, their plan chose depth over breadth, with many activities targeting the same children, so the cost per child was also higher.

¹ Noting that disaggregated figures by level of education were not yet available for all programmes.

8. Gabrielle Bonnet handed over to Graham Lang for a verbal update on the Acceleration Facility:
 - 8.1. It had taken some time for the Global Partners programme to establish the building blocks; for example: a Programme Cooperation Agreement with Save the Children, an agreement between Save the Children and UNICEF, staff recruitment and an agreement with ODI on the research component. The programme was now at the stage where work could begin in March.
 - 8.2. The Acceleration Facility approach was included in the ECW strategy. There were potentially strong links on the innovation aspect of the Acceleration Facility with the multi-year programmes in terms of learning outcomes.
 - 8.3. ECW was exploring a partnership with the Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation (GAHI) which has an existing Steering Committee comprised of civil society, private sector and others. An inventory of innovations within education that had shown results would be taken, and ECW would assess and prioritize which ones could be embedded in the multi-year programmes. The first Steering Committee meeting would meet in March.
9. Executive Committee members made the following comments on country investments:
 - 9.1. It would be important for ECW to strengthen the results framework, have more data on rates of disbursement and spend rates, and incorporate the standard ways of reporting on grantees.
 - 9.2. ECW should clarify: the process for reprogramming, the methodological framework, baselines, which countries were being measured for what and how it related to disbursements. For Initial Investments, it would also be useful to know what percentage was already disbursed.
 - 9.3. Measuring learning outcomes would be crucial in all ECW programmes and should be mandatory in multi-year programmes, while recognizing the difficulty in crisis contexts.
 - 9.4. Clarification was needed on ECW's plan for sharing results more widely and whether it would be on the website. It would have also been useful for the numbers in the presentation to be part of the progress report.
 - 9.5. The Chair asked for the presentation on country investments to be shared with members.
10. The ECW Secretariat mentioned that grantees were provided early on with guidance on ECW's main indicators and country specific indicators, but now there would be long term thinking about ECW's indicator framework. A draft indicator framework was included in the draft strategy. The Secretariat would revise the country investments presentation for circulation to the Executive Committee, and would be producing a results report in time for the HLSG meeting in April. Regarding measurement of learning outcomes, ECW will seek a substantial increase in the number of investments that measure learning outcomes, with the target that, by 2021, 100% of MYP² will be on track to measure learning outcomes. To do so, grantees will be able to draw upon the Acceleration Facility and experience from other ECW countries such as Syria, Uganda, Afghanistan and CAR. ECW will encourage grantees to build local capacity and adjust the type of assessment and level of learning to be assessed in light of the country context and programme focus.
11. The Chair noted that the Initial Investments progress report was timely and it would be important to reflect reality while also remaining forward looking. As ECW continued producing results, financing would continue. The Chair asked Executive Committee members to take note of the initial investment progress report.

Multi-Year Investments

12. The Chair handed over to Zeinab Adam who highlighted some points from her **presentation**:
 - 12.1. Multi-year programmes would be ECW's flagship funding modality as it addressed the nexus between relief and development. It was also the vehicle for fostering joint planning and

² In most FR programmes, measurement of learning outcomes will not be relevant/feasible e.g. when responding to a flood in Nepal through rapid delivery of textbooks, cleaning up of classrooms and rehabilitation of latrines.

- programming in emergencies to ensure a bigger impact, bring together partners to leverage resources and in-country expertise (ECW would serve as a catalyst) and strengthen the nexus between humanitarian and development efforts.
- 12.2. The SOPs outlined three phases for in-country coordination and communication: the first phase prior to a field mission included crisis selection, contacting Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators and developing the joint mission. The second phase focused on meeting relevant partners in-country and developing consensus through existing coordination mechanisms (e.g. Humanitarian Coordinator guidance, Cluster or EiE Working Groups) on who would lead the joint programme and what the focus areas would be. The third phase after the mission included proposal development, technical review of proposals and robust follow-up and monitoring.
 - 12.3. A proposed list of multi-year countries was included in the ECW strategy.
 - 12.4. The Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) was presented as one option for a country level pooled funding mechanism. It was housed by UNDP and acted as a neutral Trustee, with no conflict of interest as it did not implement programmes. The MPTF had extensive experience partnering with multilateral partners, efficient procedures for disbursing funds quickly and experience transferring funds to UN organizations, World Bank, NGOs and national governments.
13. Executive Committee members made the following comments on multi-year investments:
- 13.1. Multi-year investments were important and they would become the flagship of ECW, as was discussed in the Strategy Task Team. The multi-year approach was also important for the humanitarian-development nexus.
 - 13.2. There was a question on the status of the Independent Proposal Review Panel (IPRP). Without this, it would be unclear what the decisions were, when they would take place, where the quality assurance would come from and what role the governance structures would play.
 - 13.3. More specifics were needed on: stakeholder analysis, the comparative advantages to address the needs in country, monitoring moments, domestic resource mobilization and documentation of lessons learned. The SOP's may also need a next phase on staying engaged in the long-term.
 - 13.4. The SOP's mentioned a lot of assessments that would take place. Those needed to be planned and the roles and expectations made clear at country level between country partners and ECW.
 - 13.5. The multi-year pooled financing mechanisms needed to be further developed. Funding would come with evidence that the multi-year model was working on the ground. There was also a risk that donors would not contribute to a pooled fund, but would contribute bilaterally in line with a joint framework, so co-financing versus coordinated financing would need clarity.
 - 13.6. Education Sector Plans were not mentioned but important. GPE could provide updates before each ECW mission on the Education Sector Plans in development.
 - 13.7. While ECW mentioned it would not assess needs in country, it could still add value to improving assessment tools.
 - 13.8. There was mention that developing 8-10 multi-year programmes was ambitious. Since multi-year programmes would be innovations that would change the system, if ECW strategically chose some countries to focus on so there were successful examples, it would be a strong track record that would attract additional funding.
 - 13.9. There was caution about raising expectations and the risk of a lot of work done in countries without first confirming an interest in pooled funding.
 - 13.10. For the list of multi-year countries in the Strategy, it may be helpful to have figures for each country linked to a fundraising target. There could be a minimum funding threshold or certain percent of funding committed in country before ECW proceeded. The rationale for the selection of countries in the Strategy would need further explanation for the HLSSG.
 - 13.11. In the multi-year framework, it was unclear where coordination would lie, since the Education Cluster would not have the authority to direct action or select partners.

- 13.12. There was mention about protecting ECW staff time, as staff would be on missions to countries and reviewing proposals. The lines between staff facilitation, coordination, implementation and quality assurance could be blurred, so protocols would be needed on the ground.
 - 13.13. On the MPTF, it was an important and needed modality. It would be important to look at cost implications and to ensure that it satisfied the accountability requirements set out in the Standard Contribution Agreement (SCA). ECW would need to be clear on the ways in which granting could be made to governments, NGOs and others beyond the MPTF.
 - 13.14. Multi-year programmes would need to look at how to promote inclusion for refugees and IDPs. ECW programmes on resilience could transition to development and donors could be part of strengthening processes.
14. The Chair handed over to the ECW Director and the following responses were given:
 - 14.1. There needed to be a logical flow between ECW's ambition and its resource mobilization targets. Since ECW was established as a highly ambitious global fund that operated differently, this ambition needed to be consistently maintained to achieve those targets. Best practices existed in other sectors and ECW could benefit from these. Furthermore, if the Secretariat did not move speedily in establishing Multi-Year programmes, the conditions (time) for delivering learning outcomes would narrow, and there would also be a risk of disruption of First Response and Initial investments until a Multi-Year programme was put in place.
 - 14.2. Country missions to Uganda and Afghanistan have allowed ECW to explore options of how Multi-Year programmes could be developed to fit different contexts.
 - 14.3. On the IPRP, with the current level of funding and grant work, the Secretariat would rather operate with the Executive Committee's expertise and level of oversight for the coming year. There would be a risk that shifting to an IPRP would divert time and resources from staff.
 15. The Chair said that the vision for ECW was defined and stood decided by the HLSG. The vision had not changed in any discussion with the Executive Committee. There was support for ECW's flagship model of multi-year programmes and the ECW Secretariat would have flexibility in developing such programmes. It would be useful for ECW to invest in "winners" amongst the list of countries and use best practices to ensure success. "Winners" would demonstrate ECW principles and results.
 16. The Chair asked Executive Committee members to take note of the multi-year guidance note, papers and verbal presentations. He said there was a unanimous Executive Committee in support of ECW, and the Secretariat would take into consideration the proposals from Executive Committee members. The Secretariat would also share written responses to follow up with some of the points raised.

Risk Management

17. The Chair handed over to Emily Travis who highlighted points from her **presentation**:
 - 17.1. The Risk Task Team was operational and the first product was the Corporate Risk Framework.
 - 17.2. The Corporate Risk Framework was a living document, aligned with the Strategy, and would be reviewed regularly by the Secretariat, Task Team and Executive Committee. It presented five broad categories, definitions of risk severity and inherent and residual risks.
 - 17.3. Risk owners were responsible for overseeing the risk & ensuring the appropriate response was in place and risk managers were responsible for risk response actions.
18. Executive Committee members made the following comments on the risk framework:
 - 18.1. The work done on risk management and the progress made to date was welcomed, as was the next stage of focusing on portfolio/country level risks.
 - 18.2. The framework was about managing the risks for achieving ECW's strategic objectives, so getting the Strategy in place was a key starting point.

- 18.3. There was a proposal that the Risk Task Team assessed what the three key core risks or mitigating actions would be for future ExCom/HLSG attention.
 - 18.4. At some point, there would be a misuse of funds case, so it should be clear what the procedures would be to handle that and ensure advance preparation.
 - 18.5. GPE had an external firm conducting a review of GPE policies and frameworks and ECW could learn from this and consider future external review. ECW should ensure close working with GPE on risk management given GPE had already been through something similar.
 - 18.6. It was agreed that there should be further discussion amongst partners on contentious learning materials, as this was becoming even more difficult to manage.
 - 18.7. On sanctions, a lot of crisis countries were subject to UN and/or EU sanctions, so this risk needed to be kept in mind. ECW could strengthen its procedures for ensuring funds did not go to listed entities. This could mean that donors like Germany would not need to earmark in the future against certain countries.
 - 18.8. There was a question about why some residual risks remained high and what message that was sending, and how well the Secretariat would be able to monitor its existing programmes.
19. The Chair reiterated that the risk framework would need to be aligned with the strategy. He noted there was no objection from Executive Committee members to the Corporate Risk Framework, but with the understanding that this is a living document that might need revision for example to ensure that it is in line with ECW's strategy.

Finance and Secretariat Update

20. Emily Travis handed over to Niladri Bhattacharjee who highlighted points from his **presentation**:
- 20.1. ECW mobilized US\$172.2 million in pledges and signed contribution agreements, out of which 49% was earmarked and 51% was unearmarked. US\$111.8 million was committed.
 - 20.2. Of the Initial Investments, 47% was disbursed. Of the First Response investments agreed in April 2017 (Peru, CAR, Somalia, Afghanistan, Madagascar, Uganda and Ukraine), 97% was disbursed. First Response investments from September 2017 (Bangladesh, Nepal and Palestine) came from the First Response Reserve and 100% was disbursed.
 - 20.3. The current remaining First Response Reserve was US\$22.9 million, but the proposal would be to reduce the First Response Reserve to US\$15 million up to April 2018.
 - 20.4. The Executive Committee should exercise caution with earmarking and monitor the issue.
 - 20.5. The Secretariat requested future contributions to be made to the ECW trust fund governed by the Standard Contribution Agreement, rather than bilaterally through UNICEF.
21. Executive Committee members made the following comments on the finance update:
- 21.1. There was agreement that earmarking by EXCOM members needed to be closely monitored to allow the Secretariat to be agile and flexible in responding to the actual needs.
 - 21.2. On the First Response Reserve, there was agreement on reducing the amount. Clarification was needed on whether a Reserve was needed, whether it was a revolving cost that needed replenishment or an allocation, and for what duration of time.
 - 21.3. There was a proposal to rename the contingency to "First Response Balance", as "Reserve" implied unearmarked funding. There was also a suggestion to consider a percentage for the emergency reserve rather than an amount.
 - 21.4. On the financial tables, it would be helpful to show: gross and net figures, amount available for allocation, amount earmarked versus unearmarked, the year/period that money came in and overhead costs including UNICEF fees and other recurring costs.
 - 21.5. There was a question on whether contributions received were conditional upon certain requirements and on how decisions would be made to utilize the unallocated funds.
 - 21.6. Getting multi-year pledges for multi-year commitments would be important. Resource mobilization asks should be clear on how long funding was being requested.

- 21.7. The Chair mentioned that Norway allocated from its humanitarian funding and there were no restrictions on multi-year funding.
- 21.8. Canada's contribution was from humanitarian funding over a two-year period and there was a remaining disbursement. There were legal issues that prevented them from signing the SCA, and requested that the ECW Secretariat revisited and resolved this with UNICEF's legal team.
22. The ECW Secretariat said that the amount for the First Response Reserve came from unearmarked contributions, which meant less unearmarked money to spend on multi-year programmes. Common reporting would be possible with multi-year programmes.
23. The Chair handed over to Daria Ng who highlighted points from her **presentation**:
 - 23.1. All Secretariat staff positions were filled, including three secondments and a further secondment from Denmark in progress. As mentioned by the Director, three new staff positions were being requested.
 - 23.2. The Secretariat budget for FY18 took into consideration the FY18 workplan, growing volume of grant work and assessment of the FY17 expenditures. The FY18 Secretariat budget was US\$6.85 million, but with a US\$1.43 rollover from 2017, the budgetary request for FY18 was US\$5.22 million. This amount was less than 2% of operating expenses as a percentage of the total funding target of US\$383 million.
 - 23.3. Funding for the Secretariat in FY17 came mostly from donors who had earmarked for the Secretariat, but predictable multi-year funding for the Secretariat was preferred.
 - 23.4. Key reasons for the FY18 budget increase included: a growing volume of grant work; the substantive technical support provided to countries to establish programmes; financial and programmatic monitoring; additional staffing; global advocacy and resource mobilization.
 - 23.5. Workplan priorities for FY18 included: mobilizing resources and developing a resource mobilization strategy; providing high-quality support to First Response investments; driving forward results for Initial Investments; facilitating new multi-year programmes; strengthening monitoring and evaluation; scaling up communications and advocacy plans.
24. Executive Committee members made the following comments on the Secretariat update:
 - 24.1. Clarification was needed on: whether the Secretariat was asking for three new P3 level positions or one P4 level and two P3 level staff and the duration of secondments.
 - 24.2. There was a question on whether the timing was right to add new Secretariat posts.
 - 24.3. There would likely be staggered Secretariat recruitment with the three new posts, as they would not start until the Spring, so this could be reflected in the budget.
 - 24.4. There was a question on whether an amount would be set aside for the Acceleration Facility.
 - 24.5. Some additional money might be required if the Secretariat decided to have a replenishment.
 - 24.6. There was trust that the ECW Director knew what staffing resources she needed.
25. The ECW Director said that the staffing request was for two P3 level staff and one P4 level staff. With these posts, the Secretariat could manage its increasing workload. (Note: The Resource Mobilization Specialist (P4) has replaced the Communications Specialist (P3) mentioned in the first version of the Secretariat paper and budget. The Secretariat would circulate a revised Secretariat paper and budget to the Executive Committee with an explanation to reflect the updates).
26. The Chair invited EXCOM members to make a decision. The EXCOM approved: a) the establishment of three new Secretariat posts (one P4 level and two P3 level staff); b) the Secretariat budget and workplan for 2018; and c) reducing the First Response Reserve to US\$15 million until April 2018, noting the need to look into the Reserve as part of the ECW Strategy process including whether it should be a percentage rather than an amount.

27. The ECW Director Thanked EXCOM members for the approval of the three new positions, for approving the proposed 2018 budget and for approving the reduction of the First Response Reserve.
28. Executive Committee members revisited the discussion on the IPRP. There was a question about the feasibility of ECW staff reviewing technical proposals while also heavily supporting the field. Members said that a solution could be found to ensure that setting up independent reviewers would not be cumbersome or time consuming. INEE, for example, went through a similar process online before and INEE experts would already be familiar with ECW. The Initial Investments also went through an independent review and that material could be used. The complicated part would be setting up a framework for reviewing proposals, so the sooner this could be set up the better. In terms of capacity, it would not be recommended for Executive Committee members to review proposals.
29. The Chair suggested that the Secretariat draft a short note with proposals for decision regarding the IPRP, which could be presented at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Permanent Hosting Review

30. The Chair handed over to Emily Todd who provided the following update on the hosting review:
 - 30.1. The Assessment Design Report was approved following an Executive Committee call. Afterwards, the hosting review consultants were in touch with potential hosts.
 - 30.2. The Recommendations Report was expected to be circulated to the Executive Committee the week of 5 February, assuming no other delays. There would then be a call with members to discuss the recommendations.
 - 30.3. The consultants would afterwards revise the report and the final Recommendations Report would be submitted to the Executive Committee at the end of February, and then to the HLSG for their April meeting. The consultants would provide final scenarios with weighted criteria to allow the Executive Committee and HLSG to reach their decisions.
31. The Chair said that it would be important to prepare HLSG members to make decision. The Executive Committee would need to decide how to take this forward with the HLSG. The Chair of the HLSG expected the Executive Committee to provide a recommendation.

AOB and Conclusion

32. Executive Committee members under AOB made the following comments:
 - 32.1. For the next HLSG meeting, close attention needed to be paid to ECW's added value. There also needed to be thinking on what HLSG could do at the strategic and political level for ECW.
 - 32.2. There was a suggestion to invite the World Bank.
 - 32.3. The ECW Director said there was potential for inviting the Chair of the High Level Panel Report on Humanitarian Financing (current WB no 2) or OCHA to the next HLSG meeting.
 - 32.4. The Chair said there would be an Executive Committee call in March to discuss the agenda for the HLSG meeting in April, which would take place on Friday, 20 April in D.C. at 7:30am.
33. The Chair said that he had been chairing for one year and that the decision moving forward was up to the Executive Committee.
34. There was a suggestion for the Chair's extension until April 2018 to coincide with the Strategy development, after which the Executive Committee would reevaluate. There was no objection to this proposal from Executive Committee members, so Ambassador Tarald Brautaset was confirmed as ECW Executive Committee Chair through April 2018.
35. The Chair said that the Executive Committee would need at least two calls before the HLSG – one in February to discuss the hosting review and one in March to discuss HLSG preparations. The next in-person Executive Committee meeting would take place in Q3 before the September HLSG meeting.
36. The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking DFID for hosting, the ECW Director for the papers and presentations and the participation of all members.