



**EDUCATION  
CANNOT  
WAIT**

a global fund for education in emergencies



# **FER evaluation: Draft Management Response, and updates on other evaluations**

Virtual ExCom meeting, 23 November 2020

# Overall observations

1. Proof of concept for FERs but ensure focus and adjust selected FER features
2. FER has evolved over time; and many steps taken based on ECW's own lessons learned overlap with recommendations
3. 'Christmas tree risk' - do not overload FERs; keep focus on flexibility and speed
4. Management response requires making strategic choices on key trade-offs
5. Management response is not for ECW Secretariat alone, but for ECW as a platform including donors and partners
6. Therefore your inputs to this MR are key



Photo: UNICEF/ Sokhin

# R 1, 2, 4, 5: Strengthen FER use and allocations

## When to use FERs (vs MYRPs)

- 1: Continue to use FERs in sudden onset and escalating crises.
- 2: Reconsider to use FERs in protracted crises without escalating needs.

### Coverage vs depth

- 1. FER focus on sudden onset and escalating crises.
- 2. Use **lighter/ higher-level strategic MYRP** – if escalation of crisis in planned MYRP countries occurs, consider advancing the MYRP in timeline.

## FER allocation per country/region

- 4b: Review allocation between countries;
- 5: Award larger FERs when needed.

### Seed vs leveraged funds

- 1. Provide **larger FERs** where funding needs are large.
- 2. Continue with **ExCom non-objection approval for FERs larger than 3M USD**
- 3. Review **FER country allocation criteria**, and how and when these are communicated to partners.

# Rs 3, 4, 5: Making FERs work within countries/regions

## Timeline – quality rapid responses

**3a:** Keep reliance on country structures and processes;

**3b:** Keep overall rapid timeline;

**3c:** Maintain high flexibility.

**4a:** Revisit ‘too quick too early’ timeline;

**Quality vs speed**

1. Apply **flexible timelines** for **quality** but still **rapid** responses/partnerships.
2. Strengthen **country preparedness** so that structures are in place to respond rapidly.

## Grant fragmentation within countries – strengthening balance between strategy, costs and diversity

**3a:** Keep reliance on country structures and processes;

**3b:** Keep overall rapid timeline

**3c:** high flexibility

**3d:** light reporting requirements.

**4b:** Review allocations in countries;

**Diversification vs fragmentation**

**Localization vs risk management**

**Flexibility vs controls**

**Light vs heavy reporting**

1. Review lessons learned on **benefits of grantee diversification vs risks of fragmentation**.
2. Consider **floor on grant allocations** or cap on # grantees
3. **Track indicators**, i.e. average grant size; # grantees/country
4. Strengthen **joint planning, reviews and reporting** via revised templates and online grant applications
5. Strengthen **cost-efficiency checks**

# Rs 3, 4, 5: Making FERs work within countries/regions - continued

## Clear and transparent FER grantee selection processes

<p><b>3a:</b> Keep reliance on country structures and processes;</p> <p><b>3b.</b> Keep overall rapid timeline;</p> <p><b>3c.</b> Maintain high flexibility.</p> <p><b>4b:</b> Review allocations in countries;</p> <p><b>4c:</b> controls if agency is coordinator &amp; grantee;</p>	<p>Perception vs reality</p> <p>Flexibility vs control</p> <p>Speed vs bureaucracy</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apply <b>ECW's FER grantee selection guidance</b>, and <b>GEC's SOP</b>, combined with further <b>system strengthening</b> (cluster training, QA, advocacy) and improved <b>feedback</b> mechanisms.</li> <li>2. Explore further <b>control measures</b> when agency is both grantee and coordinator, using ex-ante approval and ex-post reporting.</li> <li>3. Produce guidance note on mitigating <b>conflict of interest</b> for Operational Manual Annex.</li> </ol>
--	--	--

## Targeting and reaching the most vulnerable – FER country coordination and processes

<p><b>3a:</b> Keep reliance on country structures and processes;</p> <p><b>4a:</b> Review lessons learned on FER coordination to target and reach refugees.</p> <p><b>9:</b> Facilitate global learning on key EiEPC issues, incl through AF/targeted evaluations, and strengthen guidelines.</p>	<p>Diversification vs fragmentation</p> <p>Risks vs cost efficiencies</p> <p>Localization vs risks</p> <p>Global vs country targets</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review lessons learned with UNHCR and GEC from COVID-19 II FERs focused on <b>refugees</b>, and develop guidance on coordination if needed.</li> <li>2. <b>Finalize guidance notes on ECW targeting</b> and relevant <b>group-specific programming</b> (consider existing ones, also through INEE), such as CwDs, girls, ECE, secondary school children, refugees, IDPs.</li> </ol>
---	---	---

# Rs 6, 7: Strengthen global and country preparedness

## Global preparedness – strong global support systems

6: Strengthen global support with GEC and UNHCR.

Quality vs speed

1. Discuss **stronger global support** with GEC, INEE and UNHCR under the **Initiative for Strengthening Education in Emergencies Coordination (ISEEC)** – GPP’s successor.

## Country preparedness – localization and data

7: Invest in preparedness, with a focus on localization and EiEPC data

Localization vs risk management  
Participatory decision making vs speed  
Information availability vs use

1. **Localization** is a key AWP 2021 priority. Strengthen involvement of local partners in **design and monitoring**, and enhance **partnership approaches** with local organizations.
2. Invest in **EiEPC data system strengthening** – in FERs but mostly through AF and MYRPs:
  - a. Strengthen **global/country EiEPC data architecture** through INEE EiE Data reference group, chaired by ECW;
  - b. Strengthen **holistic learning outcomes assessment** systems and **EMIS** in conflict and crisis contexts;
  - c. **Promote/require EiEPC data and M&E standards** through QA and TA in FERs (and MYRPs).

# Rs 8, 9, 10: Global, regional and country exchange and learning on FERs (and MYRPs)

## Country-level knowledge and learning – *to improve programming as well as processes*

8: Promote country-level coordination on implementation and learning across grantees.	Reporting burden vs implementation Information availability vs use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Introduce <b>joint reporting</b> to facilitate joint reflection and learning</li><li>2. Promote/fund <b>learning and exchange</b> among grantees but not mandatory.</li></ol>
---	---	--

## Regional knowledge and learning

10: Promote coherence and learning in regional emergencies.	Guidance availability vs use Global vs country targeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Finalize <b>guidance document on regional MYRP approaches</b> and expand it to apply to relevant FERs.</li></ol>
---	---	---

## Global knowledge and learning

9: Facilitate global learning on key EiEPC issues, incl through AF/targeted evaluations, and strengthen guidelines.	ECW Secretariat staff size vs workload Information availability vs use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Integrate a learning component within the <b>capacity development framework</b></li><li>2. <b>Targeted AF investments, evaluations and knowledge products/blogs</b> on key aspects</li><li>3. Conduct <b>cost-efficiency reviews</b> and VfM analysis</li></ol>
---	---	--

# Evaluations in 2021

- MYRP evaluation:
  - Oxford Policy Management to execute.
  - Inception Nov 2020 – Jan 2021
  - Final report and MR – July 2021
  - AG: Denmark, Porticus, Plan, BMZ
- Organizational evaluation:
  - ToR discussion with AG planned for early December 2020
  - Publish ToR in December 2020
  - AG: EU, Plan, Dubai Cares, Norway, FCDO

