



EXCOM RETREAT
TARRYTOWN, NY
Outputs Report

November 8th and 9th, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>A.</u> INTRODUCTION	3
<u>B.</u> NEXUS STORY	4
<u>C.</u> GOVERNANCE	4
<u>D.</u> OPERATIONS	6
<u>E.</u> FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND FSO	8
<u>F.</u> FINANCING AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION	8
<u>G.</u> LIGHT FUNCTIONAL REVIEW	10

ANNEXES:

ANNEX A: GOVERNANCE, WORKING GROUPS REFLECTIONS	11
ANNEX B: OPERATIONAL ISSUES, WORKING GROUPS REFLECTIONS	12
ANNEX C: QUICK WINS – RESOURCE MOBILIZATION MOMENTS	19
ANNEX D: AGENDA	20
ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	23
ANNEX F: COLLAGE OF PHOTOS	24

A. INTRODUCTION

The ExCom retreat on November 8,9th at the Tarrytown House stemmed from an agreement at the July 2018 ExCom meeting on the need to discuss operational and governance in line with ECW's strategic plan, development and growth. A working group composed of ExCom members and the Secretariat developed the agenda and put together the working papers for the retreat through the summer.

The interactive and high-spirited ECW ExCom retreat (*see Agenda on pg. 20*) was designed to provide members of the ECW ExCom and the ECW Secretariat (*see Attendee List on pg. 23*) with an opportunity to jointly discuss elements of Governance, Operations and Finance, bring clarity to outstanding questions and explore the best ways to ensure alignment between the process and the strategic plan. Specifically, the objectives of the retreat were as follows:

- Develop a shared understanding of ECW's core functions and operations and clarify operational processes and how these can better fit the ECW strategic plan;
- Reach a common understanding of key opportunities and ECW's contribution to the new way of working in the humanitarian-development nexus;
- Define ways in which ExCom can best support the Secretariat and the Fund to succeed in its mandate;
- Agree on process and steps to update ECW operations and governance process, and;
- Define next steps/actions, timelines and responsibilities.

This facilitated dialogue was especially important since ECW has transitioned from a start-up fund to a rapidly growing scaled-up global fund with broad and trusted partnerships, investments in 19 countries and over \$300 million mobilized since its establishment.

The agenda of the two-day retreat focused primarily on discussions in relation to reviewing and further developing the governance and operational models as well as some components of the financial model that governs the relationship of ECW with its host agency, UNICEF. In addition, the retreat aimed to establish a shared understanding of the replenishment needs and approach for ECW during its strategic cycle 2018-2021: how to organize the collective efforts of all partners to ensure a predictable and continuous flow of resources to meet the demands and targets of the ECW Strategic Plan.

Through group sessions and plenary discussions, ExCom members had an opportunity to raise outstanding questions with the ECW Secretariat and identify areas of work that require more clarity on processes and alignment with the ECW strategic plan, which will enhance effective, efficient and accountable relationships and communication between the governance structures.

A major outcome of the retreat was the commitment to amend the operations & governance models to link processes to the ECW Strategic Plan, coordinated by the Secretariat and benefiting from the advice of a Task Team, while also drawing on external expertise to complete this work. In doing so, the objective is to ensure that the Governance/Operational/and Financial Models support and reinforce the ECW 2018-21 Strategic Plan. The four specific areas to finalize and execute follow-up actions will involve:

- 1) Governance & Operations alignment and redraft;
- 2) Improved service delivery by Host/UNICEF;
- 3) Resource Mobilization / Replenishment Plan; and,
- 4) Staffing Requirements to make Secretariat fit for purpose.

Throughout the retreat, ExCom positively engaged with the intention to align and enhance ECW by creating optimal conditions for the ExCom body to support ECW's work, more specifically to seek to empower a strong

and accountable Secretariat that can lead the work of ECW with agility, responsiveness, and an ability to exercise its delegated authority and role as a catalytic fund.

B. NEXUS Story

Outcome: The ExCom and Secretariat share a common understanding of the NEXUS and of ECW's and of ExCom's role and contribution.

The Nexus and the New Ways of Working (NWOW) towards collective outcomes inspired a lively and comprehensive dialogue that identified many potential opportunities for both ECW and ExCom to engage and strengthen the bridge between humanitarian and development on education in emergencies and protracted crisis. Save the Children and INNE, who were part of the initial ECW joint missions to Uganda in 2017, presented a compelling account of collaboration and vision, leading to the ECW-facilitated multi-year Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host-Communities.

The ECW mission had brought together humanitarian and development actor for the first time, starting off within the coordination framework of the EiE Working group and expanding to include development actors. ECW engaged closely with the government and UNHCR, who oversaw the process with DFID and USAID playing an instrumental role. Multiple UN agencies, NGOs and civil society actors were involved, including refugee youth, themselves, in substantive, technical and strategic discussions lasting for a week. The programme development continued with positive cooperation between government, in-country partners and ECW, until completion and approval of the ERP, which is managed by an NGO consortium.

ECW will capture this positive experience and other similar ones in more detail in both a Nexus paper and a Lessons Learned Paper first part of 2019.

C. GOVERNANCE OVERVIEW

Strategic Question: What governance structure best serves ECW's scaled up position?

Desired Outcome: Revisions of ToRs and process to align with evolution of ECW and the Strategic Plan 2018-2021

Objectives of the Governance session:

- a) Agree on the required update of the of the Governance/Operations module and related terms of references to ensure it is fit for purpose to a scaled-up ECW;
- b) Invite suggestions from ExCom members on central issues such as membership, the appropriate constituency and voting model including functions of each body, and;
- c) Agree on the process for updating the Governance/Operations model.

There was common understanding that ECW has evolved rapidly since its inception in late 2016, and that the current Governance/Operations Model (which was drafted in the fourth quarter of 2016 and was subsequently adopted in February 2017 and thus produced before the establishment of the Secretariat and the ECW Strategic

Plan) may require re-alignment to be fit for purpose. The ExCom retreat was therefore a timely moment in order to collectively review this need.

Discussions focused on the following:

- a) Membership, voting and constituency model, as well as the role and responsibility of the HLSG;
- b) Whether the membership of ExCom should mirror the membership of the HLSG;
- c) Roles and responsibility of the ExCom vis a vis the role of the Secretariat and the Director of ECW;
- d) Purpose of Task Teams, including the right modality and composition for the proposal technical review panel.

Through active and positive work-group discussions, the following conclusions and ideas on the way forward were presented:

On the HLSG, the current structure is one of a restricted membership and 17 voting members drawn from the five founding constituencies and key partners. Since ECW has grown to 13 donors, and four UN agencies (UNICEF, UNHCR, UNESCO and OCHA) and new donors investing substantive financial resources, the discussion revolved around the need for a more inclusive membership model, which provides ownership to each government and foundation providing resources instead of a restrictive model. Since all donors are equally important and a two-year rotation would exclude decision making by key stakeholders for a substantive period of time, a more inclusive approach was emphasized. Moreover, given the strong and positive role played by Civil Society, it would be important to ensure inclusion of more than one civil society member, including both North and South.

The outcome has resulted in considering an *inclusive* constituency approach where current and potential donors are invited to take part in the dialogue and consensus-building around ECW's continued growth and scale-up position. In terms of the role and responsibility the consensus was that the HLSG should continue to: (a) provide the strategic direction of the fund; (b) engage in key advocacy and resource mobilization activities in a structured manner outside the two-yearly meetings; and, (b) endorse the appointment of the Director of the Secretariat.

On the ExCom, the current membership mirrors that of the HLSG membership, including its voting system that is based on a restrictive model. The current governance model also assumes a very small secretariat and ExCom to invest a lot of time on tasks now handled by the Secretariat's full-time staff. The discussions focused on whether to use an inclusive membership vs a restrictive membership model (GA vs SC), the roles and responsibilities of the ExCom, and the rationale for task teams, and whether to let the Secretariat team shoulder its responsibilities with continued advisory services by Task Teams.

The outcome resulted in that the membership of the ExCom should mirror the HLSG, hence one that is based on an inclusive and constituency-based approach where current and potential donors are invited to take part in the dialogue and consensus-based decisions; and, that the HLSG approves all members of ExCom based on experience, background and proximity to the HLSG member (the Boston Global Consulting assumption being that ExCom members were to be Directors with 24 hours' access to their ministers and heads of agencies). While the ExCom performs both oversight on certain operational issues and advisory roles through the Task Teams, discussions sought to clarify when these roles are applicable and not.

As for operational decisions, the Director had a broad discretion of delegated authority from the HLSG (as per the position's Terms of Reference), reporting to the Chair of the HLSG on substantive issues and to the Deputy

Executive Director of UNICEF on administrative issues. This includes strategic, policy, operational and financial management. As per the Governance module, it also includes, among others, First Emergency Responses below \$3 million (except where UNICEF is the grantee). It would therefore be helpful to clarify the roles and responsibilities as originally envisaged.

As for the Task Teams, as per the BGC, these were meant to be advisory and, initially, to support an understaffed Secretariat. With a Secretariat growing into one that is more fit for purpose, it was agreed that Task Teams be established on a needs basis and to be timebound (as is the current practice), and as the BCG stated, 'as the Secretariat is strengthened the need for TTs is reduced.'

Finally, there was discussion on reducing the number of ExCom meetings per year and include *ad hoc* meetings based as needed. Each ExCom meeting and HLSG meetings currently totaled eight/8 per year and required substantive time for preparation and follow-up, which tended to reduce time spent on supporting the field to deliver, focus on content and results. In this regard, several ExCom members were actively supporting and engaging with ECW both at global and field-level and were in close contact with the Director and the Secretariat, which allowed for an inclusive inter-action and joint decision making both in the field and global level.

The agreed Action Plan is to establish a working group coordinated by the Secretariat and assisted by a small focused Task Team to take forward the update of the Governance model and TORs for all governance/decision making bodies.

With respect to both the HLSG and the ExCom membership, it is worth highlighting the following: There was a resounding agreement that HLSG and ExCom membership need to be enhanced and modified to create a more inclusive approach essential to catalyze resources and real ownership. This will require clearer articulation of their functions and purposes including a key focus on how operational decisions are determined. There was also a commitment to strengthen the responsibilities of both bodies in supporting resource mobilization. With respect to frequency of meetings, there was a motion to reduce the number of meetings of ExCom, but encourage more informal, strategic and operational dialogue. This would allow shortening the time for approvals and formal updates on the impact of the work, while leveraging membership on both substantive and strategic issues in relation to operations.

D. DEEP DIVE ON OPERATIONS

Strategic Question: Do the revisions reflect a conflict/crisis approach and ECW's scaled up position?

Outcome: Desired amendments to the operations manual

First Emergency Response (FER) Window and the Multi-Year Resilience (MYR) Window

Objectives of the Operational session:

- a) Agree to update the Operating Model to ensure it reflects the requirement for ECW to meet its targets and objectives.
- b) Invite suggestions from ExCom members on the latest version of the Operating Model and central issues such as dual role of grantees, selection of partners, funds allocation, accountability and the like.
- c) Agree on the process for updating the Operating Model and rename it to Governance - and Operations Manual

The current Operation model, which was produced before the Strategic Plan was developed, does not adequately reflect the needs to advance education in emergencies and protracted crises and to achieve the five strategic objectives of ECW. Realignment is therefore necessary. Through this session, the Secretariat presented the central issues requiring realignment, based on crisis sensitivity, the multi-lateral system designed for crisis and the experience to date. Emphasis was placed on the need to ensure the module is conflict sensitive and adequately reflects how the First Emergency Response and Multi-Year Resilience Plans both ensures quality education and advances the new way of working (NWOW). Through this session, the Secretariat presented revisions to processes that are in need of realignment.

There was consensus that the Operating model in its current state required realignment and required revisions so to ensure it: (a) puts the Secretariat and ExCom on the same page and strengthens predictability and a shared understanding; (b) reflects how ECW actually operates, its processes and procedures, including templates and guidance checklists.

With regard to the **First Emergency Response Window**, among others, the main alignment proposals for further discussion and consideration for the FER were outlined as follows:

- a) Based on experience in 2017, the ECW Secretariat now has one main modality encompassing all criteria for disbursing FER funds and requires all allocations to be made against project proposals;
- b) All prioritization of FER funds is undertaken at country-level through the Education Cluster, EiE Working Group or the equivalent local coordination body established specifically for humanitarian crises;
- c) The HACT assessment is the main risk assessment and eligibility tool for non-UN grantees and is, indeed, a requirement for the UNICEF Funds Support Office to disburse funds.
- d) The Director has the delegated authority of the HLSG to assess the need for FER and approve up to \$3 million (in line with the CERF/OCHA modality upon which the FER is established), but ExCom no-objection is required for disbursements to UNICEF, since UNICEF hosts ECW.

With reference to the **Multi-Year Resilience Window**, among others, the main alignment proposals for further discussion and consideration for the MYRPs include:

- a) The dual role of grantees, i.e. when the grantee also performs the functions of implementing partner. The dual roles were applied for the Initial Investments (before the Secretariat became operational). However, there is a need to now address potential conflict;
- b) Selection of grantees and sub grantees, which will require written guidelines/check-list in the Operations module (since the module did not foresee the consultative in-country process for grantees or grant-managers, while for sub-grantees the call for proposal's process remain intact);
- c) The role of the humanitarian coordination architecture, and that of the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator as the main entry points in countries, in line with UN reform aimed at bridging humanitarian and development actors through the humanitarian-development nexus;
- d) Advancing the new way of working in the nexus and funding predictability and;
- e) Timelines for approval and non-objection.

The reflections and clarifications sought during the session are spelled out in annex 2

Conclusions and actions on way forward:

There was a consensus that the Governance/Operating model require alignment and updating to: (a) ensure that it is fit for purpose for ECW's mission, mandate and strategic objectives; (b) reduce confusion among

governance structures; and, strengthen ECW's ability to reposition education as a priority in emergencies and protracted crisis (strategically, operationally and financially).

1. Establish a small, focused, Task team led by the Secretariat, which will convene before the end of 2018 to agree on the most appropriate process and methodology for updating the Governance/Operations module and determine a timeline for the exercise. The Secretariat will send out a communication to ExCom members that have offered to be part of the task team to convene a meeting. The group will be composed of ten (10) participants (5 Secretariat and 5 ExCom) to ensure efficiency and speed.
2. ECW to continue developing guidance notes and templates relevant to the needs and requirements for the development and implementation of its investments, while also shifting focus to its five strategic, core-objectives, including field-support to achieve quality and resource mobilization to meet financial targets.
3. ECW to ensure that retreat questions are clarified and reflected in the updated Governance/Operations module.

E. ECW FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND FSO

Strategic Question: What are the next steps in optimizing ECW's Value for Money (VfM) and improve efficiency from ECW's financial host?

Outcome: Improved efficiency and VfM from UNICEF identified, and SCA updated

Objectives of session: (a) Agree on the requirement to update the Standard Contribution Agreement (SCA); (b) Incorporate views of all donors including new strategic donor partners in the revision of the SCA; (c) Formalize a written agreement between ECW and UNICEF on the role, responsibilities and deliverables of FSO and establish a feedback mechanism; (d) Engage the strategic donor partners in an exercise of driving efficiency and VfM with UNICEF; and, (d) Agree on the process for updating the SCA and developing an SLA with UNICEF

The Secretariat made a presentation, highlighting the specific areas where the current Standard Contribution Agreement could be updated and sought ExCom views on the revision to the SCA. No objections were raised and there was a consensus by ExCom to revise the SCA alongside a similar process being conducted by EVAC (End Violence Against Children) another Fund hosted with UNICEF.

Following this presentation, an intervention was made by FSO, highlighting the current services provided to ECW, costs and how this could be improved subsequent to the ExCom agreement that UNICEF would remain ECW's Financial Host. FSO outlined ways in which greater efficiency and value for money from could be achieved.

Conclusions and actions on way forward:

1. The Secretariat to write to ECW strategic donor partners to seek agreement to revising the SCA.
2. The Secretariat to develop matrix of potential revisions on SCA to share with strategic donor partners and UNICEF legal/FSO. Suggestion to refer to annexes rather than attach them so they can be updated separately.

3. FSO, ExCom and Secretariat to work on the following: a formal written agreement setting out services that FSO will provide ECW with a breakdown of costs, including feedback mechanism; interest to be returned to ECW from Jan 2019 as backdating would not be possible; clarify FSO role in terms of due diligence of implementing partners; and improve the software made available to ECW.

F. FINANCE: RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND REPLENISHMENT

Strategic Question: Now that targets are determined what is ECW's strategy for fundraising at global and in-country level (MYRPs)?

Outcome: Different scenarios for replenishment identified.

This session aimed to achieve 5 main objectives: 1) clarify the financial needs of ECW in relation to the approved targets; 2) differentiate between global needs versus country level needs and explore how the first can help mobilize more resources and rally further support for the second; 3) to explore some of the quick wins that can be achieved by showcasing and promoting ECW at the margin of planned events and moments; 4) determine the needs of donors from ECW to be able to support its case for investment; and last but not least 5) to discuss the timing and feasibility of organizing a major replenishment event for ECW in the following months or years.

Under objective 1: The agreed-upon targets were presented graphically to show needs, secured funds, and type of funding all in the same illustration to allow the members to clearly see the funding gap and better assess the urgency of when funds need to be made available to ensure smooth and sustained responses on the ground. It was also agreed in this session that the used targets are at this stage ECW's best estimates and should be revisited and adjusted once the secretariat conducts in-depth analysis in each crisis context to better assess needs. Until then, these targets will be used by the Secretariat and ExCom to determine the ask for new funding for ECW investments. (see RM presentation)

Under objective 2: The illustrated presentation helped differentiate between financing needed at the global level and financing needed at the country level, which helped fragment the burden of resource mobilization for ECW into two parallel and complementary strategies. One that focuses on mobilizing approximately 630 million USD at the global level to secure the needed resources for investing seed money in countries, ensure the presence of a mini-contingency fund within ECW for first response to emerging crises, and finance the acceleration facility. Focusing on mobilizing these resources at the global level, will help get investments started on the ground and enable the resource mobilization efforts at country level through local, regional and global advocacy and fundraising campaigns. This will allow country partners to engage in the RM efforts and to secure more funds for their MYRPs. (see RM presentation)

Under Objective 3: three groups were formed to seek answers for the next three objectives. In the group tackling objective 3 a list of events as well as invitations from donors and partners around the table were made. These contributions will help the planning process within the RM and Advocacy group to prioritize and mobilize Civil Society partners to position ECW, and enable the fund to mobilize resources and make a case for its investment in EiE. (see annex c1 for list of identified moments)

Under Objective 4: The partners including donor members as well as agencies and CSOs brainstormed about the information and capacity needs that ECW needs to ensure to make a compelling case for investment. Among the important things highlighted under this objective was showing results from the field; successful results are considered the best way to convince donors to invest more in ECW. In addition, the clarity of ECW design and the soundness of its approach were also highlighted as a need to convince donors, which also ties to the earlier

sessions of the retreat focusing on processes for the three main response windows. Other ideas were included under this objective such as the need to do donor mapping and find out more what they require and how best to align with their national priorities in ECW targeted countries and themes (see annex C2 for ideas identified by members as donor needs)

Under Objective 5: it was agreed that a special event is needed to help ECW bring new donors onboard, as well as secure higher levels of funding to bridge the gap. It was recommended that such an event requires time, help from all, and extensive planning. It was recommended that a feasible time for it would be 2019 to allow ECW and partners to prepare. Meanwhile it was recommended by several partners to utilize the moments under Objective 3 to make a case for existing donors to top up their contributions and collaborate to bridge the 2019 and part of 2020 funding gap.

Some conclusions and ideas for the way forward:

- 1) The RM and Advocacy group should convene before end of 2018 to initiate a planning process that takes the retreat recommendations and organize them into prioritized and timebound activities.
- 2) ECW should continue developing its case for investment and ensure that retreat recommendations, especially those from objective 4 are reflected in the case.
- 3) ECW will continue reaching out to none-traditional or emerging donors to complement the funds being pledged by existing and potential HLSG members. This point also links to the governance component that speaks to the composition of the HLSG and ExCom, because many emergent donors would like to join the ECW governance structure.
- 4) Innovative finance theories and approaches should be practically applied to start gradually contributing resources to EiE.

G. LIGHT FUNCTIONAL REVIEW

The Director briefed on the priority needs to make ECW fit for purpose in meeting the expectations and the targets set in the Strategic Plan 2018-2021. This entailed placing emphasis on quality learning and learning outcomes, capture and ensure results and impact, financial accountability, as well as resource mobilization and advocacy to reach the target of \$1.8 billion. The ECW Secretariat team retreat had conducted a light functional review and staffing requirements will be presented for approval at the next ExCom meeting.

ANNEXES:

ANNEX A: GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUPS' REFLECTIONS

TOPIC 1: MEMBERSHIP

Theme: Be more Inclusive: Create/Enhance Criteria for HLSG and ExCom Membership -

- Create a better articulation of function/purpose including:
 - Operational decisions
 - Advocacy
 - Strategic vision

Theme: Responsibilities of HLSG: Support to RM

- Approve ECW Strategy
 - Support resource mobilization
 - Endorse appointment Director
 - Keep voting to unblock tricky issues

Theme: Less Meetings More Substance

- Shorten approvals and update on impact
- Leverage membership on *resource mobilization* or another big strategic issue (one per meeting)
- HLSG membership is year-round
What happens outside of two meetings? (this needs to be further defined)

TOPIC 2. WORKING TOGETHER

- Clarify process for proposal development and approval needs
 - MYRP + FERS – Define the optimum process + criteria? clear w/ every “no objection” request
- Need clean process to:
 - Activate
 - Reach out to ExCom for participation
 - Define and agree on ToRS
- Define a consistent approach to ExCom papers
- (Create/Update) pipeline of what’s coming
- Incentivize other key providers to serve as implementing partners
- Create yearly plans for missions
 - ToRs (helps gear people up for a successful mission and better decision making at later stages)
 - Develop a clear scope of work for ECW missions
- Diversify Grantee Pool
- Engagement of women’s organizations
 - Define criteria for participation (skills and availability)

ANNEX B: OPERATIONAL ISSUES WORKING GROUPS' REFLECTIONS

TOPIC 1: FER CLARIFICATIONS

Further refine the definition of FER's Goal

- Is it catalytic? Is it to program? How is it to work optimally with government?
 - Is the goal delivery or to unblock barriers or both? We have the decision to defend where and how much?
- FERs are based on OCHA's CERF and geared at delivering rapid injection of funds towards the education sector during the onset and/or escalation of a humanitarian crisis. It also comes with an expectation of making education a priority in humanitarian crisis, catalyze humanitarian funding and be considered 'life-saving.' In doing so, it takes a humanitarian response approach.

Define Response Criteria

How is the decision made to respond? where/which crisis? How does ECW determine it will or (won't) support a crisis?

- What criteria or how is a response ranked compared to others?
 - Para 4 – what does "small" mean?
 - Eligibility criteria – HACT? list exclude other relevant organizations?

The Director has the delegated authority to assess and approve the need for FER up to \$3 million (EXCOM between \$3 million and \$20 million and HLSG above \$20 million), except where UNICEF is the grantee in which case approval or non-objection is sought from the EXCOM or HLSG. The assessment is based on whether the crisis is a UN system L3 crisis and/or there is an onset or escalation of needs, existing funding gaps in the appeal and the humanitarian imperative in relation to the need. In other words, several factors are weight in, either mutually or separately.

Grantees

- Transparent guidelines needed in writing for selection of grantees which ensures diversification of grantees (not spelled out in Operations module).
 - There is a need for an efficient and cost-effective approach
 - 13 – no rule regarding the number of organizations
- Prepare a memo for how each crisis is selected and how UNICEF is selected as a grant agent (grantee), in addition to current written justification?

Although not required, the Secretariat shares all First Emergency Response approvals with ExCom to ensure all members are aware of the situation on the ground and ECW's response. These communications are accompanied by a written justification. All UNICEF requests for no-objection/approval are likewise submitted to ExCom for no-objection/approval, along with a written justification.

TOPIC 2: FER ADDITIONS

Funding

- How to unlock long term with catalytic (e.g. break down barriers)
 - Why was the concept of matching funding not included?
 - Map pledges/existing funds before going in to decide if effective/good use
 - How to identify non L-level crisis for \$
 - Give permission to use funds to unblock obstacles or address issues that could transition to a MYRP where relevant
 - A decision tree that guides ECW on how to apply L \$3m in FERS to be catalytic with this money

The Operations/Governance Manual should provide guidance on the decision-making process, including the delegated authority of the Director and the need for approval by ExCom or HLSG as concerns UNICEF being the grantee. The First Emergency Response considers all criteria prior to approval, as these are intertwined. L3 crisis are defined and determined by the multilateral UN system (Inter-Agency Standing Committee), which includes UNICEF and UNHCR, among others.

- Increase transparency of selection (access to funding) and develop a guide/manual on funding
 - Be clear about formula
 - Clarity of the 25% funding through FER
 - Clear timeline (is it 3 weeks, 1 month...?)

The selection is accompanied by a justification by the Director. The 25% is not a rule, but a suggestion that is not proving to be adequate. The time-line needs improvement, and a faster turn-around for FER may be warranted.

Best Practices

- Add examples of activities that could be supported in various scenarios:
 - When there is an appeal vs. when there isn't
 - Mapping of other actors before activating MYRP + FERS
 - ECW could require proposals be submitted alongside notes/minutes from coordinating group
 - FER can serve as basis for MYRP but are not a condition for MYRP
 - Should include that project proposals be based on humanitarian appeals

Above best practices need to be documented in the revised Operations/Governance module.

TOPIC 3: FER EDITS

- Define parameters on FER
- Better separation between the windows
- Need to standardize language e.g.:
 - "First Emerging Response" or "First Response"
 - "Beneficiary" vs. "organization"
 - "Grantee"

Edits to be taken into account during realignment process.

TOPIC 4: FER Summary Comments

- Need to revisit Goal, Purpose, Process and Criteria
 - Will it always be small? Need to look at growth model e.g. for a really large emergency
 - Need clearer criteria for how decisions on FERs are made both to respond in the first place (the triggers) and then on the level of the financing agreed as well as the selection of grantees
 - Need to explicitly de-link the FER from the MYRP (i.e. not a prerequisite for MYRPs)
 - Should we be able to select a range of grantees, not just those that are HACT approved
 - Can we have a dual entry point (applies to MYRPs as well) i.e. through the Cluster and the LEG and formalize this
 - Need to clarify what's happened to the original four modalities
 - Need consistency of language throughout and more precision on the process
 - Need to define the importance of evaluations in the process

There should be scope for FER to grow, in line with CERF allocations (which at times are up to \$50 million), but it will depend on availability of resources (CERF is a \$500 million /year emergency fund). FER does not need to

be linked to MYRPs – this applies especially to natural disasters where countries may not need a MYRP. There is a need for a combined humanitarian-development nexus coordination, as this is how ECW works. However, it needs to be designed in such a way that it does not cut ECW off from the established multilateral coordination mechanisms for emergencies and protracted crisis, as this would cut ECW from accessing and advocating for resources from humanitarian funding envelopes. The points raised above, all valid, need to be codified in the realigned Operations/Governance module.

TOPIC 1: MYRP CLARIFICATIONS

• Funding

- How to transition to long-term financing options?
 - ECW applies direct execution/DEX and funds implementing partners on a 3-year basis as per the Multi-Year Resilience Plan (MYRP)
 - Renewed (and updated) as required every three years.
 - Once the government is both able and willing to accountably manage the education sector (Minister of Education, Minister of Planning and Minister of Finance), ECW hands over.
 - The World Bank, GPE and the International Finance Facility for Education will build government's capacity for financing through national execution/NEX and concessional loans.
- Is this hard-wired into the process?
- Can we clarify MYRP is the plan/platform for funding?
 - The MYRP builds on best practices in the development sectors and practices in the humanitarian sector, where the multi-year plan (renewable) is based on actual needs on the ground and set a target for resource mobilization at global level, regional level, in-country over three years.
 - Lessons learned show that donors are more inclined to fund a plan that shows what they will get for the money (activities, results, impact) than to only put money into a trust fund at headquarters. The MYRP thus becomes a tool for mobilizing new resources, leveraging and aligning resources around the humanitarian-development nexus.
 - Some donors (ECHO/EU) cannot fund pooled funding mechanisms, so a MYRP allows them to contribute directly in-country. In advancing the humanitarian-development nexus, it also helps reinforce coordination in-country, as new funding goes to a coordinated plan, rather initiatives outside it.
- Can you clarify how funding for the plan by ECW is determined?
 - Financial projections developed by ECW Senior Economist, discussed with EXCOM, circulated and approved by EXCOM in July 2018.
- Seed funding: How are ensuring the model is appropriate for each context?
 - Financial calculations based on the grand total, needs, other funding sources, and availability of ECW funding.
- Can we map existing pledges/analysis existing funds + whether it is effective?
Yes, reporting and evaluation.

• Grantees

- Transparent process
 - Selection of grantees:
 - Selection of grants-manager (grantee) takes place through established coordination mechanisms for education in emergencies and crisis, such as the Cluster, the Education in Emergency Working Group, Inter-Sectoral Coordination Group, which is chaired by Government, and also brings in Development Actors/Local Education Groups/LEGs to ensure

joint planning and joint selection. Sub-grantees are selected through call for proposals managed by Steering Committee.

- Co-chaired by the government and the designated UN system cluster leads: UNICEF and Save the Children. Local Education Groups/LEGs are invited from the outset to play a substantive role. This might be the future NEXUS Group.
- Humanitarian Response Plan, which is led by the Humanitarian Coordinator
- Selection of grants manager (grantee) is based on comparative advantage, added value and a clear division of labor.
- Ability and capacity to serve as grants manager (grantee). Comparative advantage refers to technical capacity, mandate, expertise and geographic coverage, based on division of labour in humanitarian response plan, UN development assistance frameworks or other collectively agreed plans.
- Selection of lead grantee, clean process (competitive) Set Criteria! How does the nomination happen? Minimum criteria that can be adapted at country level See above. Criteria and process should be codified in Operations/Governance module.
- How can the commitment to diversity of grantees be put into practice?
 - ECW has diversified from 1 agency (UNICEF) to 40 in 18 months. Before the ECW Secretariat became operational, only UNICEF served as grantee.
 - Since ECW team set up and operational in May 2017, diversification has reached close to 40 partners.
 - It is already in practice. If EXCOM members would like their national NGOs to benefit, these should be encouraged to participate in the multilateral coordination system.
- Process Improvements
 - Discourage silos, parallel structures and promote both the new way of working and support for UN structures, UN reform and multilateralism.
 - MYRP, How can we add competition into the MYRP process?
 - FER<> MYRP
 - External Review Panel: What's the situation at the moment?
 - A Task Team was established to develop ERP way forward. Recommendations should be forthcoming this year.
 - What role dose gender play in ensuring gender prioritized MYRP's?
 - As per ECW's Strategic Plan 2018-2021, Gender is one of two priorities, the other being Protection.
 - The ECW team has initiated and produced a comprehensive Gender Strategy to guide all MYRP investments.
 - The proposal template and process sets criteria for gender as condition for approval, which is further reinforced by ECW guidance during mission planning for MYRP, so to prioritize gender.
 - In terms of results, gender is today addressed close to 50% of all First Response and MYRPF funding.
 - ECW has also entered a memorandum of understanding with PLAN International to focus specifically on gender at the country level, and has established a gender Task Team to reinforce collective effort to advance gender.
 - Why just humanitarian structures that review proposals and not dev?
 - The humanitarian structure is the established multilateral structure for the UN, NGOs and governments in countries affected by emergencies and conflict.
 - ECW uses it as an entry point and consistently ensures that the government and development actors play an equal role in coordinating and implementing ECW investments through joint

review, joint planning and joint implementation. This is one of ECW's added values: it brings humanitarian and development partners together in crisis.

- ECW benefits from crisis-designed multilateral structures that are conducive to access, security conditions in difficult contexts and humanitarian funding envelopes, allowing it to reposition education in humanitarian contexts, while also reinforcing the development dimension of education towards systemic changes and sustainability. In doing so, ECW facilitates the humanitarian-development nexus, the new way of working (joint programming) and hence UN reform in which all EXCOM member's HSLG members are investing.
- What are the criteria for evaluation for MYRP at each stage?
- Regular mid-term evaluations and end-of programme evaluations. This is established practice. Documented in Operations module and grants agreements.
- Does the current proposal process yield the best results?
- ECW moves faster and deeper into the field, engages more stakeholders/agencies and NGOs, and is gaining ground in the multilateral UN system that will change the way education is prioritized in emergencies and protracted crisis, in humanitarian prioritization.
- The UN General Assembly week saw education in crisis moving from the margins to the center in visibility, profile and political commitments.
 - Although only operational for 18 months, the ECW Annual Results report in April 2018 captures major progress and significant results, welcomed by HLSG. This is now translated into donors scaling up engagement and funding in ECW.
- What is the proposal of development process?
- Standardize language and terminology throughout doc
- The difference in attitude and perceptions, prioritization, language, culture, mind-sets, sense of speed, approaches, coordination mechanisms and partners mark the humanitarian-development divide.
- Through ECW's nexus approach, it is ECW's priority to bridge that gap both in writing and in doing, and to bring humanitarian and development actors together in a mutually reinforcing, coordinated, collaborative fashion to optimize quality education in the most difficult contexts, such as conflict, displacement, natural disasters.

- Country Level Considerations

- MYRP's: Who is responsible at the country level for ensuring quality of purpose?
- Collectively: the grantee (grants manager) as well as the steering committee (jointly set up by the cluster coordinators, EiE working groups, development partners, governments).
- The grantees (grants manager) receiving the funds are coordinated by them and reporting to them and ECW.
- Clarify Form
 - Independent evaluations.
- Clear MOU/SOP's between ECW and GPE in countries where they overlap?
 - ECW would welcome an agreed financing architecture in which complementarity between ECW, GPE and IFFED is clarified. ECW's mandate is outlined in its five core-objectives and its focus on education in emergencies and protracted crisis. Its added value is described in the ECW Added Value Note endorsed by HSLG in September 2017 and in the ECW's Strategic Plan endorsed by HSLG in April 2018. However, ECW looks forward to participating in any exercise that can further clarify complementarity through MOUs and/or SOPs. This will also serve strategic donor partners who are making the financial investment.
- Does the PTC need ministry official where possible?
- ECW enjoys a close contact, partnership and coordination with the Ministry of Education

in all its MYRP countries, and the ministry is involved in all MYRP programmes so far.

- What system is in place to incentivize inclusion of local civil society?
- The established humanitarian coordination system is composed of UN agencies and local NGOs (civil society). This is very important to ECW, as it is to the humanitarian coordination structure, since local NGOs have more access and closer contact with the communities.

TOPIC 2: CLARIFICATIONS

Challenges

- Development community does not use the multilateral coordination mechanisms for education in emergencies and are not familiar with the processes or language.
- It is specifically designed and enjoys political endorsement of 193 UN member states to advance coordination and collaboration.

This is part of the challenge in the humanitarian-development divide: the humanitarian community is not familiar with the development community, and so different structures of coordination emerge. ECW seeks to address this by bringing humanitarian and development structures together. This might be one cause for the humanitarian underfunding of education in emergencies and protracted crisis, since humanitarian funding envelopes and appeals are attached to the multilateral coordination mechanisms for education in emergencies and protracted crisis. Strengthening the IASC Cluster, which lacks resources, and bringing in the Local Education Groups, so that all work together to plan and jointly implement mutually reinforcing humanitarian and development interventions is at the core of the nexus and a top priority for ECW.

TOPIC 3: MYRP ADDITIONS

- Should be based on gap analysis
- Forgotten crises is missing from the agenda
- 10) Needs codifying and outlining in Annex – explaining how they work together.
- Capacity development strategy for MYRP is needed
- Double entry point – CLUSTER & LEG – or development partner group.
- 11) Needs to be more guidance on this, policy/guidance mitigating (C01)
 - 30) C01 challenge – “Makes recommendations to the grant management agency and the SC for endorsement.”
 - ECW to reinforce co-ordinated capacities on the ground (cluster/leg) info/data etc.
- Activation of external review panel.
- Evaluations needed.

Noted and should be taken into account in the realignment of Governance/Operations module.

TOPIC 4: MYRP EDITS

- Goal statement should be focussed on results for children/youth
 - Needs to start w/impact.
 - Aim statement is procedural? Why?
- Several lines are repeated in section 30.
- 2a) there is a specific reference to Afghanistan that needs removing.
- Set principles for devt. coop. actors integration (to translate into country guidelines?)
- 8) Remove ‘up to’ from ‘up to one joint proposal’
- Edit MYRP. The MYRP is to increase access to quality ed. NOT to bridge the HAV PEV divide
- MYRP clarification: Titles and roles of the different actors should be defined.

Noted and should be taken into account in the realignment of Governance/Operations module.

TOPIC 5: MYRP SUMMARY NOTES

- Need to show how MYRPs are adding value and not just filling the gap
 - How are they supporting doing things differently?
 - Should be aligned with existing opportunities for learning through evaluations
 - Needs to link to results rather than processes (through a greater usage of the Theory of Change?)
 - Need to clarify mechanisms and structures for financing, coordination and accountability and explain issues around conflict of interest

Noted and to be reflected in Operations module realignment.

- Selection process of grantees needs to be better explained and transparent
Existing practices need to be codified in the Operations module.
- Need to make sure Independent Review Panel is functional
Top priority
- The MYRPs need to speak to both development and humanitarian aspects.
 - The process feels too biased in favour of humanitarian processes/approaches Noted that there is a need to dispel this perception. Humanitarian context differs starkly from traditional development contexts, and the context does have a major impact on the how and the what. At the same time, education is a development sector and this needs to be fully understood by all involved. ECW recognizes this challenge and optimizes the opportunity to set an example for the humanitarian-development nexus.
 - Can we make MYRPs more of a competitive process so that we get the best (and most cost effective) organisations? ECW's third strategic objective is that of collaboration, complementarity and joint programming, and thus ECW works actively to reduce competition. Through inclusive consultations, MYRP partners are required to justify how they contribute to the larger good and teamwork towards a shared goal, i.e. a collective outcome. The grants manager/steering committee then launches a competitive process for calls for proposals. ECW encourages all in-country education organizations to participate in both processes.
- Need to look carefully at having multiple grantees in terms of transaction costs, accountability and admin/overhead costs. ECW is expected to diversify grantees and bring partners together. This inevitably requires more than one partner. The EXCOM expectation on ECW has up to now been to diversify grantees and multiply these (see above comments on the Initial Investments, which revolved around one grantee).
- How can we build capacity to support the development of MYRPs?
- Don't create parallel structures for MYRPs - use existing one where possible ECW combines humanitarian and development coordination structures. Because the humanitarian coordination structure is grounded in the consensus of 193 UN Member states (host-governments and donors), ECW uses this as its most legitimate entry point for humanitarian crisis (ECW's operating environment).
- Need to elaborate proof of concept at some point as well as capture lessons learned to date
This has to be balanced with the need to meet the targets of the Strategic Plan 2018-2021. ECW's current work draws on existing practise of development sector programming in crisis context, where the ECW applied concept proved to yield results. ECW looks at decades of experience and lessons in advancing development in the midst of crisis environments, as well as ongoing multilateral efforts in-country. An ECW specific lessons learned will be produced first quarter of 2019, when ECW has been operational for about 20 months.

- Goal of the MYRPs needs to focus on quality education
 - Need to ensure principles in the MYRP are better expressed and implemented so as to concretely tackle the NEXUS
 - Need to better explain the rationale for having multiple grantees and the interpretation of the Grand Bargain
 - Go back to the BCG report which had many of the answers to these questions following extensive consultations, yet mindful of the gaps that need to be addressed to reduce confusion and ensure codification.

Noted and will be addressed and reflected in the realignment process of the Governance/Operations module.

ANNEX C: QUICK WINS – RESOURCE MOBILIZATION MOMENTS

- World Cup Qatar
- An event on the NEXUS > MYRP
- October 2019 General Conference, Paris UNESCO
- World Bank, Human Capital Project, Minister of Finance
- Expo 2020
- African Union Conference
- Dubai International Humanitarian Aid and Development Conference and Exhibition
- Islamic Development Bank Annual Meeting
- G7
- Membership Briefing on Em. – June and November
- Humanitarian Segment
- GEM > Brussels and Berlin
- HLPF
- GPE Rep 2021 - High risk/high reward
- HLSG meeting
- WISE 2019, UNGA 2019
- European Development Days > June
 - Yasmine is invited
- Country level rep/events

ANNEX D: ECW ExCom Retreat Agenda

Date: 8 – 9 November 2018

Location: Tarry Town House Estate, 49 East Sunnyside Lane, Tarrytown, New York 10591, Front desk Tarry Town House phone: 1-914-591-8200

The objectives of the retreat are to provide clarity, as needed, and agree on the way forward regarding the following three areas:

1. Stocktaking;
2. Governance, and;
3. Operational Issues.

Meeting Topic	Time	Strategic Question / Expected Outcomes of session	Agenda	Session Lead(s)
Thursday, 8 Nov 8:30 – 17:30				
Welcome and Overview of Day 1	8:30-8:45		Welcome and review of objectives of retreat	Chair
	8:45-9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of retreat objectives and ground rules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the retreat content • Ground rules and best practices for optimal outcome of retreat 	Facilitator
Stocktaking				
1. Orientation on ECW	9:00-9:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocktaking 	ECW – Stocktaking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming remarks • An overview of how far ECW has come since its inception and its vision • Acknowledging and sustaining collective efforts 	Chair Director
2. ECW’s big thing: Humanitarian - Development Nexus and ECW’s contribution	9:30-10:15	Strategic Question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have a common understanding of Nexus and ECW’s contribution? Outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ExCom understands and supports ECW’s contribution to the Nexus 	Humanitarian/Development Nexus and the role of ECW <i>Papers: OCHA-The New Way of Working, MYRPs Afghanistan and Uganda, Director’s Presentation to HLSG</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Way of Working (as agreed by multilaterals) • Models: Afghanistan and Uganda • Required alignments in ECW 	Director Facilitator Plenary Discussion
Coffee Break	10:15-10:30			
Team work session	10:30-11:00		Mindset Shift Exercise: “From Start-Up Initiative to Scale-up Global Fund”	Facilitator
Governance				

3. Governance Overview	11:00-12:30	<p>Strategic Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What governance structure best serves ECW's scaled up position? <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions to TORs and process for updating advanced 	<p>Governance Structure</p> <p><i>Paper: Governance Overview (integrated ToR ExCom and HLSG (Section III and IV))</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ToR of HLSG including structure, re-election and constituency • ToR of ExCom including composition, role of task teams, modus operandi, as well as voting rights or consensus-building 	<p>ECW Senior Advisors</p> <p>Facilitator Plenary discussion combined with breakout groups</p>
Lunch Break	12:30-13:30			
Operational Issues				
4. Operating Models	13:30-17:30 Coffee-break 16:00	<p>Strategic Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the revisions reflect a conflict/crises approach and ECW's scaled up position? <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to the Operations Manual advanced 	<p>A deep dive on operations</p> <p><i>Paper: Operating Model, original and proposed, work-in progress revision</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First emergency response: current experience, challenges/opportunities and way forward • MYRPs: current experience, challenges/opportunities and way forward • Acceleration Facility: current experience, challenges/opportunities and way forward 	<p>ECW Senior Advisors</p> <p>Facilitator Plenary discussion</p>
Group dinner	19:00-20:30			
Friday, 9 November 9:00 -16:30				
Welcome and Overview of Day 2	9:00-9:15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Icebreaker (Meditation/Breathing/Stretch/Yoga) 	Facilitator
Operational Issues-continued				
5. Financial Management	9:15-10:15	<p>Strategic Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the next steps in optimizing ECW's Value for Money (VfM)/improved efficiency from ECW's financial host? <p>Outcome:</p>	<p>ECW Financial Management and FSO</p> <p><i>Paper: Draft note on maximizing the relationship between ECW and FSO</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach to earmarking and attributing results. • Potential revision of Standard Contribution Agreement (SCA). • Maximizing value for money service from UNICEF. 	<p>ECW Senior Advisors</p> <p>Chair Facilitator</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved efficiency and VfM from UNICEF identified. Steer on earmarking provided by ExCom. 		Plenary discussion
Coffee Break	10:15-10:30			
6. Financial Targets	10:30-12:30	<p>Strategic Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Now that targets are determined what is ECW's strategy for fundraising at global and in-country level (MYRPs)? <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different scenarios for replenishment identified. 	<p>Resource Mobilization -how are we going to fund this!</p> <p><i>Paper: Financial Update on Targets</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very brief Financial Update on Targets Update on the Case for Investment Open discussion to determine way forward on replenishment (define future plan) ExCom's support to resource mobilization advocacy 	<p>ECW Senior Advisors Presenting the CFI Advocacy Group</p> <p>Facilitator Plenary discussion</p>
Lunch Break	12:30-13:30		Lunch Briefing on Portable Learning Passport	Jo Bourne, UNICEF Associate Director- Education
7. Staffing/Capacity to deliver	13:30-14:30	<p>Strategic Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the ECW Secretariat fit for purpose? <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing needs defined. 	<p>ECW Secretariat- Fit for Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do we have the capacity to deliver ECW's mandate? Update on light functional review How are partners contributing? 	<p>Director Facilitator Plenary discussion</p>
8. Coffee Break	14:30-14:45			
9. Next Steps and Wrapping Up	14:45-15:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear post retreat action plan to be followed up and acted upon 	Retreat Follow-Up: actions, timelines and responsible persons	Facilitator

ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



List of participants ExCom Retreat Nov 8-9, 2018

Organization/Country	ExCom Representative +1 Support Staff (optional)
Department of Global Affairs /Canada	Nancy Smyth supported by Alice Birnbaum
Education Cannot Wait	Yasmine Sherif
Dubai Cares/UAE	Annina Mattsson
United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education	Justin Van Fleet
Save the Children	Joseph O'Reilly
Plan International UK	Ben Sadek
SIDA/Sweden	Anna Rosendahl supported by Tomas Lundstrom
BMZ/Germany	Rudolf Huber supported by Jan Svihlik (GIZ)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Denmark	Thomas Ostermann
NORAD/Norway	Camilla Fossberg supported by Randi Gramshaug
Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Netherlands	Eline Ruisendaal
DFID	Alicia Herbert
European Commission	Annica Floren supported by Stijn de Lamailleure
UNESCO	Svein Osttveit supported by Kerstin Holst
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade/Australia	Neryl Lewis
USAID	Nina Papadopoulos supported by Ashley Henderson
UNHCR	Ita Sheehy
UNICEF	Jo Bourne supported by Linda Jones
Global Partnership for Education	Padraig Power
Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies	Dean Brooks
Dutch Postcode Lotterie	Margriet Schreuders
The World Bank Group	Keiko Miwa
Global Education Cluster	Maria Agnes Giordano Anthony Nolan
UNICEF FSO	Diana Kepler (on day 2)
US State Dep/PRM	Kelly Loewer
ECW Staff	All units

Facilitators: Scott Tavis and Robin Uchida

ANNEX F: COLLAGE OF PHOTOS





