



## Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, 11 July 2017, 10:00-16:00 CEST at UNESCO, Paris

### Participants

Executive Committee members: Carol Batchelor (UNHCR), Jo Bourne (UNICEF), Tarald Brautaset (Norway, Chair), Dean Brooks (INEE), Alicia Herbert (UK DFID), Aida Liha Matejicek (European Commission, representing Jean-Luis Ville), Annina Mattsson (Dubai Cares), Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly (Save the Children), Nicolai Steen Nielsen (Denmark), Svein Osttveit (UNESCO), Pdraig Power (GPE), Evelyn Rodriguez-Perez (USAID), Yasmine Sherif (ECW Director), Nancy Smyth (Canada), Justin van Fleet (Office of the UN Special Envoy for Global Education), Fadi Yarak (Lebanon)

Observers: Grethe Sophie Bratlie (Norway), Raphaelle Brody (France) Stijn De Lameilliure (European Commission), Randi Gramshaug (Norad), Michael Hollander (GIZ), Preeta Law (UNHCR), Kelly Loewer (US Department of State), Idil Mohamed (Australia), Leslie O'Donoghue (Australia), Jessica Oliver (Canada), Nina Papadopoulos (USAID), Ita Sheehy (UNHCR), Emily Todd (DFID)

ECW Secretariat: Jesper Andersen, Lisa Bender, Daria Ng, Morgan Strecker, Anna-Maria Tammi, Emily Travis

### Welcome and Introductions

1. The Chair opened the meeting and Svein Osttveit, as host, welcomed participants to UNESCO. The Chair welcomed Executive Committee members, observers, the new ECW Director and the Secretariat, and thanked those who have been working on ECW over the last few months, recognizing that many have had other full-time jobs.

### ECW Director Update

2. The Chair handed over to the new ECW Director, Yasmine Sherif, who said it was a privilege to step into the Director role and thanked everyone involved with ECW. She said aside from her, there was only one other core ECW staff, the Senior Program Assistant, but four new staff would be onboarding in July-August 2017. There had been considerable support from others, and she thanked secondees from DFID and UNHCR, GPE and UNICEF staff and one consultant working on ECW. She also thanked France for funding an M&E post and Canada for funding a Gender Specialist.
3. The Director recapped her introductory consultations through missions and meetings since she started in May 2017. This included travel to Iraq and Lebanon, and to Geneva attending the Canada/Save the Children meeting on Education and Refugees, as well as meetings with UNHCR and the Global Education Cluster Leads. In Washington, D.C., she met GPE, UNRWA and USAID colleagues. She also attended the GPE Board Meeting in Ottawa. In addition, she had bilateral meetings with colleagues in Netherlands and Sweden, and a series of meetings with UN Secretariat, UNICEF and other UN Agency colleagues in New York, and had participated in the SDG events organized by the President of the General Assembly. She said

she would be going to Jordan for the Syria Education Dialogue Forum, which had been started through the ECW program, and the global INEE meeting. She would be meeting with UNESCO, and then travel to Uganda on a first ECW joint assessment mission (ECW, INEE and Save the Children) to review how ECW could scale up support following the Uganda Solidary Summit.

4. The Director acknowledged that while she had not been engaged from the beginning on ECW, she hoped her experience and fresh perspective would serve to further strengthen ECW. She felt honored, privileged and excited to work with the ECW team, EXCOM and HLSG colleagues to re-position education in the broader system as a central component in emergencies/crises and to deliver results that would make a lasting impact.
5. The Chair thanked the Director, and also noted the recent success for education at the G20, where G20 members adopted a communiqué that included reference to the UN Secretary-General's establishment of an International Finance Facility for education, while also taking into account other initiatives like GPE and ECW, which was a positive achievement.

### Country Investments

6. The Chair asked the Secretariat to provide a progress update on the country investments and lessons learned.
7. **Initial Investments:** Jesper Andersen provided a **presentation** on the programs in Chad, Yemen, Ethiopia, Syria and with Global Partners, based on the **paper** shared in advance of the meeting. Jesper thanked all of those who had been involved in developing the Initial Investments, which included Executive Committee partners.
8. **Lessons Learned:** Anna-Maria Tammi presented the Lessons Learned **paper** from the Initial Investments. Anna highlighted some points from her **presentation:** the importance of facilitated, consultative workshops in producing higher quality proposals; starting with a broader, strategic vision was preferable to starting with a technical discussion; initial timelines were too tight for partners to produce quality proposals; and ECW programs were starting to effect a change in the way partners worked on education in these countries. For example, in Syria, the education dialogue forum was now established, bringing partners together who did not previously cooperate, and in Yemen, the ECW process had led to both sides of the government in the conflict cooperating on education.
9. Jesper said it was important to remember that the Initial Investments work had begun before ECW had an operational framework. Therefore, there had been no guidance except from partners, who while very experienced, all had different experiences. The Initial Investments had informed the development of the operational framework, but there would be no model that fit all, as each investment would need a flexible approach. He also thanked those who provided inputs and peer reviewed the paper.
10. **First Response Window:** Lisa Bender updated on the First Response Window, referring to the **paper** circulated in advance. Her update included the following key points:
  - The four funding modalities within the First Response Window had been employed and the Secretariat would be responsive to new or escalating emergencies.

- The Secretariat wanted an evidence-based approach, so a methodology had been developed that ranked the severity of crisis, humanitarian financing for education and educational equity.
- 41 underfunded countries (based on the UN CERF) had been analyzed using the methodology, which then assigned a score to each country. Aside from the score, there were also strategic considerations on the selection of countries.
- For example, in Peru, the floods started the same week as the analysis, so Peru was chosen to test funding modality 1.
- In Madagascar, the original intention had been to respond to drought, but then a cyclone hit the same month and the needs became even greater.
- In Ukraine, there had been an escalation of conflict on the border.
- In CAR, there was a large, complex, forgotten crisis that had received zero education funding from the Humanitarian Response Plan.
- In Somalia, there was a protracted emergency with many partners conducting remote programming, so it had also been selected to learn more about investing in localized NGOs.
- In Uganda, the refugee crisis had been escalating and fit under Modality 3.
- In Afghanistan, education had been excluded from the overall humanitarian appeal, and therefore also suited Modality 3.

11. Executive Committee members thanked the Secretariat for the progress and amount of work that had been done on country investments, including by double-hatted GPE and UNICEF staff. They said they appreciated the honesty of the challenges and lessons learned and that a safe space to learn was important. They were pleased that ECW's orientation was bringing it closer to the field.

12. The following comments were made by Executive Committee members in discussion:

- The swift allocation of funding under the First Response Window and the transparent communication process was commended, including the clear guidance and instructions for partners on ECW's website. Feedback from the EU delegation in Somalia was positive on this.
- Secretariat follow-up through implementation would be important, as would the ability to demonstrate quick results as a way to garner additional funding, but the added value of ECW beyond funding was the process of bringing actors together, which was worth developing further.
- Transaction costs for country partners should be managed, timelines should be flexible depending on context; joint missions should be employed as good practice.
- Lack of country level guidance on the proposal process could be due to limited Secretariat capacity and a complicated process; suggestion to simplify the process.
- In-country facilitation was important as it brought stakeholders together, reinforced capacity and could increase political will.
- Lessons learned should inform the First Response Window and new ECW investments.
- Ongoing lesson learning and improvement was important, but should be balanced with the demand for results.
- It was important to link ECW with processes on the ground, including humanitarian planning processes, existing emergency response plans and refugee response plans, and to avoid developing parallel processes in-country.

- It was important to consider all dimensions of a country crisis. For example, in CAR, the conflict had triggered a refugee situation into neighboring countries, which would also be important to consider for future First Response funding.
- There were timeliness issues in funding and disbursement, with Peru as an example.
- Limited Secretariat capacity was acknowledged, but there was also caution on developing into a large Secretariat.

13. Executive Committee members raised the following issues for further updates and work:

- Analysis of country specific contexts and the political landscape.
- Initial Investment successes and how lessons have fed into the First Response Window.
- What Initial Investments would look like through a gender lens, which would be important to integrate into future M&E.
- Proof of concept on the First Response methodology and how to measure that.
- How the Global Partners proposal was supporting ECW and the Acceleration Facility.
- Next round of multi-year funding and the timing of new investments in relation to ECW's financials (where we were, how much we had and how much we could deliver).
- The \$30 million contingency for new emergencies.
- Need to communicate with partners from rejected proposals from the first round of investments (Myanmar, Cameroon, Kenya, Lebanon), as per HLSG recommendations that the ECW Secretariat would continue to liaise with these countries regarding potential submission of new proposals. For example, Myanmar consortium partners had started to discuss the submission of a new proposal post-summer.

14. Executive Committee members raised the following questions for discussion:

- Would the papers be shared publicly or be posted on ECW's website?
- How feasible was the October deadline for Initial Investments reporting?
- Would the Initial Investments mid-term reports in October be shared with the Executive Committee and if so, when?
- Would there be an update on GBC-Ed, since they were very involved in the beginning?
- Would it be useful to have a round of discussions before new multi-investments, in order to take in lessons learned and to harmonize governance and operations?
- Could the First Response methodology and analysis of all 41 countries be shared?
- In Syria, how was the Whole of Syria approach and ECW approach being addressed?
- Could partners take on any tasks to help ease challenges on the ground?

15. Executive Committee members said that the 'no objections' recommendation and decision needed to come out more clearly in the papers. They also said that the Secretariat should consider whether investments had been catalytic, because in some cases it seemed they had not been, so there should be caution on repeating the same lessons.

16. The Secretariat welcomed all the comments and questions, indicating that these would be used to help steer ongoing implementation and design of new programs, and gave the following specific responses:

- The October deadline to receive Initial Investment mid-term reports was reasonable, as it would be six months from receiving funds.
- It was still in the plan to link the Acceleration Facility with investments.

- Initial Investment templates had been developed after investments were approved, so sequencing had been an issue. Gender had been indicated in the initial templates as critical, but no guidance was provided at the time. However, there was now a mandatory gender template that would be developed with partners for gender analysis from the beginning.
- In Chad, a GPE program that funded teachers in the western lake region ended in June, but ECW would continue support to ensure education gains would be sustained. ECW would also be funding education programs for refugees from neighboring countries in the south.
- In Syria, the upcoming partner dialogue in Amman would discuss coordination of approaches; the first dialogue had demonstrated a lot of good collaboration among partners.
- There was an emphasis on First Response countries to diversify grant agents, in response to lessons learned. The methodology developed for calculating beneficiaries was meant to ensure less overlap and encourage good practice.
- To support better information-sharing and transparency on the First Response window, there had also been a global webinar supported by GPE and a call with civil society organized by Save the Children. ECW's website would continue to be updated to increase transparency and communication.
- There had been examples of some catalytic results: In Uganda, UNHCR matched funding. In Ukraine, there had never an education sector group until now.

17. The Chair thanked the Secretariat and Executive Committee members for the discussion and **concluded that members would need to make a written decision on providing funding to UNICEF for Madagascar and Ukraine on the basis of further information provided by the Secretariat.**

### **ECW Lessons Learned and Vision**

18. The Chair handed over to Yasmine Sherif to **present** on vision and priorities for ECW, as the new Director. The Director noted the long road leading up to the creation of ECW, and commented on the significance of its launch at the first ever World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016. The WHS signaled a shift in global, strategic, political and financial approaches to crises, and was important as the context for ECW. ECW was one of the key outcomes of the WHS that had translated into a concrete and systematic follow up. ECW offered an unprecedented opportunity to re-position education as a central priority in emergencies and crisis, while also closing the relief-development gap. This required humanitarian speed and development depth combined.

19. Given this background, ECW was not just a funding-envelope, but rather a global political, strategic and financial tool placing education at the center of conflict prevention, crisis response, post-crisis recovery and development. ECW had ambitious financing targets, designed to help meet the severe under-funding for the 75 million children whose education was affected by crisis. These targets (amounting to over \$3.5 billion over 5 years) were inspiring but also very challenging, and required a great deal of cooperation between partners, with support from Executive Committee and HLSG, as well as dedicated Secretariat capacity.

20. The five core functions steering ECW's work (inspiring political commitment; joint planning and response; generating and disbursing new funding; strengthening capacity; improving accountability) were essential and central to everything ECW would now deliver. Funding could not be disbursed without being part of a broader strategic vision, integrating the ECW core functions. Every ECW country investment would be designed to embed and help achieve these core functions. This meant – for example - that strengthening political commitment at country level and global level, and working with and empowering all partners to develop targeted and well-designed programs, partnerships and strategies was essential to ensure that funding become catalytic and results-driven.
21. The Director emphasized the particular nature of crisis and emergency contexts within which ECW operated (displaced, traumatized, vulnerable populations, often marked by violations of international law, access challenges, unable or unwilling governments, weakened or absent institutions and systems, etc.), versus a traditional development situation. It was important to pay due attention to the lessons learned and best practices that had evolved over the past two decades through the UN system, NGOs and bilaterals operating in crisis and emergencies – the major lesson learned being that neither traditional development, nor traditional humanitarian, approaches produced lasting impact in crisis. This was also the starting point for the WHS – out of which ECW was established.
22. Therefore, reaching ECW targets required crisis-sensitive recovery/development responses. Over the years, a sophisticated humanitarian and development coordination architecture had been developed to manage crisis and drive recovery towards development. ECW's success would largely depend on how it applied crisis-sensitive approaches and aligned with the multilateral coordination architecture, and with UN/humanitarian reform at global and field-level.
23. ECW should engage and optimize the multilateral coordination architecture for crisis/post-crisis/development, mobilize it to get behind ECW; and benefit from the UN and humanitarian reform strategic goals; and focus on results, impact, and accountability. The WHS outcome, UN/humanitarian reform and the SDG's represented the larger vision, and ECW needed to seize the opportunity to reposition the education sector as a major, if not also central, sector across the board to deliver these global and local commitments.
24. In order to be fit for purpose, ECW needed a whole-of-system approach and it needed to work differently, away from 'business as usual'. The Director emphasized ECW's Multi-Year Window as the funding window that would best bridge the relief-development gap, meet the five core functions, and situate ECW at the center of joint programming, pooled funding/financing, and concrete results leading to transformative impact. Such multi-year approaches enabled an interdependent and sequenced approach, ensuring that immediate crisis-responses were designed as stepping-stones for recovery towards development.
25. Multi-year funding should be based on rapid needs assessments and would best help to mobilize the political and strategic engagement in-country, enable joint planning and response, and deliver more sustainable results. Best practices indicated that it was also a more effective catalytic tool for attracting substantive and pooled financing.

26. ECW needed a lean, crisis-oriented Secretariat, focused on delivering differently, which could be described under the UN reform logic: “Less bureaucracy, more accountability.” While ECW was a learning organization, and would continuously pursue new lessons to improve, we had to be mindful of the fact that funds were involved (tax-payers’ money). As such, ‘learning’ also meant to seek out and welcome best practices and existing evidence-based research, practices and expertise. This was part of the accountability expectations.
27. In the same vein, the current Secretariat Structure did not match the targets, if one were to do a functional review based on best organizational practices. There was a need for an alignment between financial targets and organizational/structural capacity. ECW needed additional, dedicated support on: resource mobilization to help reach ECW’s ambitious financial targets, and on finance and risk management – neither of these critical areas currently had any dedicated staff.
28. The Secretariat also needed an extrovert skill-set, as this was key to forging strategic partnerships, bringing in-country actors together, and positioning education locally and globally. The Director said she had revised the Secretariat structure into a more logical organizational set up (Strategy/Coordination, Accountability/Monitoring/Evaluation, and Advocacy, Communications/Resource Mobilization), embedded staff funded/seconded from partners to optimize the staff available, and had added one more position for resource mobilization at the regional level in the Gulf and one for financial and risk management. To deliver, ECW needed alignment between all aspects of its vision, strategy, governance, operations, and human and financial resources.
29. The Director drew to conclusion by quoting Jan Eliasson, the former UN Deputy Secretary-General: “Without compassion, the wrong thing happens. Without passion, nothing happens”. ECW was about combining vision, strategy, and technical skills with compassion and passion to deliver in crisis with a long-term perspective. 75 million children in need of education amidst the most abnormal of circumstances - and for their future - required extraordinary solutions. As a positive illustration, the G20 Leaders’ declaration was a major achievement for global education - the first such reference to education, including specific mention of IFFed, GPE and ECW. The G20 summit highlighted inspiring political and popular passion and commitment, which ECW could build on. The Director concluded by showing the speech by ECW HLSG Chair Gordon Brown at the Global Citizen concert in Hamburg on the importance of reaching all children with education, which presented a powerful vision for change, and why this had to be prioritized by global leaders.
30. Executive Committee members welcomed the Director’s presentation and the energy and strategic vision behind it. Members made the following specific comments in discussion:
- The Director’s presentation was a strategic rallying call and members liked the focus on systems strengthening, ECW needing to be different and to think outside of the box and ECW’s focus on the field.
  - There was great potential in linking up ECW with the different financing mechanisms through new ways of working.
  - There was ‘no objection’ to the added partnership/resource mobilization position at the regional level (Gulf) and the financial manager position.

- More clarity was needed on what space ECW occupied within the larger architecture, what it was doing what could not be done before, or that could be done bilaterally, for example, and how it would be fit for purpose. There was also a request for further definition of key words such as ‘catalytic’ and ‘innovative’, as well as key messages and talking points so partners could speak about ECW to people beyond the usual audience so they could feel the urgency.
- On ECW’s ambitious financial targets, there needed to be clarity on whether this referred only to ECW finances narrowly, or whether wider, catalytic funding or money coming to the education in emergencies sector as a whole would count towards ECW’s financial targets.
- It would be helpful to set out below the overall vision what the short-medium priorities were, alongside metrics to measure these.
- Members recognized the pressures on ECW with regards to speed, operations and resource mobilization, and encouraged the Director to use all partners around the table to support the ambitious work that needed to be done to meet targets.

31. The Director said that she appreciated all partners’ support, expertise and knowledge, and looked forward to working together with all in achieving the ECW targets and goals. In response to the above comments, she agreed to share further thinking on ECW’s strategic position and contribution. A short concept note would be produced, which could be used for explaining ECW positioning, as presented, to stakeholders. The forthcoming ECW Strategy would further develop the vision, short-medium term priorities and measurable indicators.

### **Working Lunch – Strategic Discussion**

32. The Chair handed over to Emily Travis who outlined the strategy note circulated in advance and invited comments and inputs to support the Secretariat’s development of the strategy content and process. The Strategy was intended to be developed up to April 2018 (a shorter process than originally envisaged by BCG consultants), led by the Secretariat and supported by the Strategy Task Team, and to be highly inclusive and consultative. Proposed areas for inclusion in the strategic plan were:

- Context and strategic positioning of ECW, including context of education in crisis globally, ECW’s strategic positioning and ECW lessons learned and adaptive approaches
- Objectives and priorities for the next three years, including key objectives with performance indicators and priorities aligned to ECW’s five core functions
- Program framework and delivery, including a three year program framework, operations and management arrangements, monitoring and evaluation and risk management frameworks
- A communications plan for the strategy, ensuring that it was well understood as all levels, including at country level.

33. Executive Committee members made the following comments:

- There was caution on the six-month timeframe, as it could be ambitious if the process was to be consultative. The strategy could be broad with details filled in later, but the current strategy note seemed very detailed and could take more time.

- The Director stated that one year was too long, so the agreement was nine months (now until April 2018) and that it would not be a detail-heavy strategy, but a broader document to steer ECW. This was reiterated by the Chair, who said nine months should suffice.
- There was also caution on the distinction between a strategy versus a strategic plan, because there were already approved operational documents and ongoing work, and new work should build on this. The suggestion was to call it a strategic plan.
- The importance of ECW's strategic positioning within the global education architecture landscape and a clarification of where ECW has fit in was raised. There was a need to answer the question of how ECW has related to other education initiatives.
- The Director would draft a short concept note on ECW's added value and strategic positioning that would be sent in August 2017. A more detailed description would transpire in the April 2018 strategic plan. However, donor partners should not need to wait for this to be finalized to know the added value and strategic positioning of ECW.
- Since ECW was already operational, there had already been working assumptions, but there remained some big questions around focus and prioritization. For new work to move ahead, particularly on multi-year investments, decisions would need to be made sooner before the strategic plan was finalized. This timing needed to be considered.

34. The Chair concluded by thanking members for important points and noting that the drive for a strategic plan had come from the HLSG. Executive Committee members had the responsibility of briefing their Principals on the plans.

### **Advocacy, Communication and Resource Mobilization**

35. The Chair handed over to Morgan Strecker to provide an update on advocacy, communication and resource mobilization, which included the following key points:

- There had already been evidence of ECW inspiring political commitment with the example of ECW being featured in key milestones like the G20 communiqué. This took a lot of collaboration among partners, including civil society advocacy.
- On improving accountability, there would be a financial tracker to show money-in and money-out on ECW's website.
- So far, resource mobilization had focused on existing champions and cultivating current donors. However, a strategy would be needed to convince on-the-fence donors and less-than-convinced donors.

36. Justin van Fleet provided an update on the **Global Business Coalition for Education's support:**

- There had been one full-time GBC-Ed staff working on education in emergencies that has been mobilizing private sector support for ECW.
- They had helped secure the private sector constituency of HLSG.
- GBC-Ed had been identifying companies interested in providing financial and in-kind support through the REACT database, which mapped companies and services.
- They had launched pilot investments in emergencies and had some lessons learned from that. In Somalia, they were working with the Education Cluster to donate radio capacity for long-term distance learning.

- Further updates on the private sector (including GBC-Ed and the REACT database) would be circulated to Executive Committee members.

37. Annina Mattsson updated on **private sector support**:

- In March, Annina gave a presentation to the International Education Funders Group in Amman, but the content had not felt relevant to all foundations, so it was unclear whether IFG was the right venue to talk about education financing mechanisms.
- At the HLSG meeting in April 2017, Dubai Cares proposed a private sector event during UNGA and three champions, including UNHCR agreed to participate. Annemiek Hoogenboom, as the HLSG private sector constituency, would co-host with Dubai Cares and reach out to private sector contacts.

38. Joseph Nhan-O'Reilly updated on **civil society support**:

- Civil society had been supporting resource mobilization for ECW, including for G20. However, they had also been advocating for other parts of the financing architecture.
- In the absence of a clear ECW moment, it would be hard to garner a wide range of CSO's, so it would be important to know when the next push would be for ECW.
- Provision of information to civil society colleagues needed to be improved.
- ECW, GPE and UNICEF participated in the recent Save the Children and Canada refugee event in Geneva. The ECW Director presented during the session on funding, where she spoke about funding developments and collaboration among actors.

39. The following comments were made by Executive Committee members in response:

- More information was needed on major fundraising moments for ECW coming up and how GPE Replenishment would affect fundraising or advocacy of ECW.
- ECW could consider how to respond to funding particular crises that arose and to look at crisis-specific opportunities. It could also consider linking in with broader movements in refugee education.
- There was a question about how much ECW was expected to raise in 2018 and a suggestion to develop a methodology on counting money-in and money-out.
- Norway and other donors would be finalizing 2018 budgets before the end of the year and would need to decide how much funding for 2018 fairly soon.

40. The Secretariat said that the ECW website had background documents, including a one-pager on the different financing mechanisms. On ECW moments, there would be the following opportunities for announcements at UNGA:

- HLSG meeting (19 Sept)
- ECW private sector breakfast or dinner (date TBD)
- Secretary-General's event on education, to include ECW (20 Sept)
- Global Business Coalition for Education breakfast (20 Sept)
- UNICEF No Lost Generation event with links to ECW (20 Sept)

41. Justin said that the International Finance Facility for Education was in a design phase with participation from many stakeholders. They would be asking donors for technical support in the next few months. Some ECW countries could link with IFFed and explore collaborations.

42. The ECW Director said she recently met with humanitarian and development colleagues while on mission in Sweden and Netherlands and encouraged Executive Committee members to reinforce the need for resource mobilization with potential new partners.
43. The Chair encouraged all members to get behind ECW's resource mobilization, given there was a need to raise more financing for new investments. There was a case to be made for financing ECW ahead of /alongside GPE replenishment.

### **Financial & Secretariat Update**

44. The Chair handed over to Emily Travis and Daria Ng who **presented** a financial and secretariat update based on the **paper** circulated in advance. Emily Todd provided some context to DFID's Due Diligence Assessment (DDA), included in the paper alongside the Secretariat's response: the DDA was part of DFID's standard procedures and assessed ECW's capacity to manage the financing and funding of its activities against four pillars and outlined recommendations to address areas for development.
45. The following comments were made by Executive Committee members in response:
- On the Secretariat budget, a 2018 budget before October and specific job descriptions would help make the case for additional funding for the Secretariat.
  - There were no objections to recruiting extra staff, but there was a suggestion to think about recurring staff costs once the full Secretariat was on board.
  - There was a need to look in more detail at financial issues such as cash flow, money-in and money-out and earmarked funds. The Financial Oversight Task Team could help with this.
  - There was a suggestion to consider adjusting the reserve for emergencies in light of projected shortfalls.
  - There were no objections on the Financial Management Advisor firm TOR and process. The Secretariat confirmed that the proposed TOR was a standard UNICEF document.
  - Members welcomed DFID's Due Diligence Assessment, which was a helpful contribution to ECW oversight, on behalf of the Executive Committee.
  - On donor contributions in the paper, members reiterated the importance of accurately reflecting the disbursements that had been made.
46. The Secretariat thanked members for their Task Team nominations and said that the three Task Teams would be activated in the next few weeks. The Secretariat would send the list of nominations to the Executive Committee via email for approval.
47. **The Chair concluded that the Executive Committee had taken note of the information provided by the Secretariat.**

### **Permanent Hosting Review**

48. The Chair asked Alicia Herbert to provide an update on the permanent hosting review:
- DFID had put out a call for bids in May and received two bids, but one was out of budget and the other needed to be more technically robust.

- Recognizing the need for a high-quality, credible, rigorous process, they felt it was better to delay the timeline and re-tender.
- Another call for proposals would be put out before the end of July and the report would now be finalized by the end of November.
- DFID would provide further updates, as the review process progressed.

49. Executive Committee members made the following points:

- There were concerns that some donors were waiting until the hosting review had concluded before making commitments to ECW and GPE, so it was important to resolve the question on permanent hosting as soon as possible.
- On the other hand, Executive Committee members needed to keep a clear message that both ECW and GPE were important, regardless of where situated.
- It was agreed that a decision ahead of the GPE Board in December was nevertheless important.
- The HLSG would need to be informed about the delay at its next meeting.

### **AOB and Conclusion**

50. Executive Committee members under AOB made the following comments:

- On the HLSG meeting in September, there was a request that members be briefed on the agenda in advance, so they knew what was coming and could brief their principals accordingly. A phone call in advance was recommended, along with papers circulated well in advance.
- Existing governance issues still needed to be resolved (for example, Executive Committee members that were not HLSG members), as well as further discussion about new constituencies and donors coming in. These and other governance issues needed to be resolved and documented.
- Since ECW needed to go ahead with new multi-year investments before the strategy was concluded, inclusive and consultative processes would be essential.
- Need for a more systematic approach to sharing information, particularly on missions so that members could mobilize their partners on the ground.

51. In response to the comments, the Secretariat responded with the following key points:

- It was important to have an inclusive approach to Executive Committee and HLSG membership. Strategic partners who contributed financially should be included, regardless of the financial amount pledged.
- HLSG was meant for macro level issues, so the agenda for the next meeting would likely be shaped around ECW's repositioning with the Secretary-General's broader education agenda, while updating on key ECW achievements of immediate relevance to the Principals.
- ECW has a quarterly newsletter and the website has brochures, branding and logo guidelines as well as technical background documents.
- The Director would establish rolling updates [ECW Director's Update].

52. The Chair stated that his time as Chair would expire in the second half of this year and that he would welcome inputs from members in the next few weeks on the next Chair, so that a decision could be made ahead of the next Executive Committee meeting.

53. The next Executive Committee meeting would be a phone call in early September 2017. The next High Level Steering Group Meeting would take place on Tuesday, 19 September around 7:00am at UNICEF in New York. The Secretariat would be in touch to confirm these dates and times.
54. The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking UNESCO for hosting and for the participation of all members.