

## HLSG Paper 3: Initial Investments

### EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT INITIAL INVESTMENTS

#### PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document is to:

1. Update the High Level Steering Group on the ECW Initial Investments;
2. Seek agreement from the HLSG for approval of \$15 million to Ethiopia;
3. Confirm overall allocations for the initial investments in order to trigger disbursement.

#### For consent

The Secretariat requests that the HLSG approve the following decision:

#### Initial Investments:

- i. The HLSG approves \$15m funding for Ethiopia under ECW initial investments;*
- ii. The HLSG confirms that a total of \$55.5 million be released to support the initial country investments, and that \$2.5 million be released to the Global Education Partners pending approval by the Review Panel of their final proposal, as follows:*

<b>Fund Allocation Matrix</b>			
Recipient (and grantee)	Allocation – ECW Special Account (US\$ million)	Allocation – Bilateral agreement (US\$ million)**	Total Allocation (US\$ million)
Chad (UNICEF)	6.15	3.85	10
Syria (UNICEF)	12.1	2.9	15
Yemen (UNICEF)	9.3	5.7	15
Ethiopia (UNICEF)	7.6	7.4	15
IASC Education Cluster (UNICEF)	2.5	0	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.65</b>	<b>19.85</b>	<b>57.5</b>

\*\* Funding provided to ECW initial investments directly to UNICEF

- iii. The HLSG agrees that this concludes the first round of investments to be made by ECW, and thanks the Initial Investment Task Team, the Review Panel and partners for their work.*

## Summary

- The High Level Steering Group met in September 2016 in New York, and agreed that the Task Team on Initial Investments oversee a process of securing full proposals for Syria, Chad and Yemen, as well as from the Global Partner Group (Global Education Cluster/UNHCR/INEE) under the Acceleration Facility. The HLSG approved allocations to these totaling \$42m and asked the Review Panel to approve final proposals, chaired by Ambassador Brautaset.
- The Task Team was asked by HLSG to seek a full proposal for Ethiopia for further referral to HLSG for final approval as one of the Initial investments, for a maximum of \$15m.
- The Task Team was asked by HLSG to explore a possible initial investment in Lebanon, and accordingly the Task Team initially sought a concept note.
- It is proposed that the Initial Investments Task Team continues its work until March, when all of the proposals are submitted. The Review Panel will dissolve in April/May following approval of the final initial investment proposals. Recommendations from the Review Panel will be followed up by the ECW Secretariat, supported by partners as needed, whilst the full Secretariat is still under recruitment.
- The Task Team will also undertake a lessons learned exercise.

## Status

- In early January the Recommendation Panel signed off on support of \$10m for **Chad**, the first grant for the Education Cannot Wait Fund.
- The program proposal for \$15 million from **Yemen** has in principle been approved by the Recommendation Panel but requires some adjustments ahead of first disbursement.
- The local education partners in both Chad and Yemen will receive additional technical support from the ECW Secretariat and partners during the inception period of the programs.
- In January, the ECW Recommendation Panel assessed and endorsed the final program proposal from education partners in **Ethiopia**. The Panel recommends that HLSG approve financing of \$15 million under the initial investments phase.
- The status of the remaining proposals from the identified Initial Investments is set out in further detail below:

Proposal	US\$ (m)	Duration	Status

<b>Global Partner Group (Education Cluster/INEE/ UNHCR)</b>	2.5	24 months	<i>The initial proposal is being further focused and refined. The partners are working to present the full proposal by the end of March. The HLSG will be informed of the Review Panel's recommendation at the April 2017 face to face meeting.</i>
<b>Syria</b>	15.0	24 months	<p><i>A final proposal has been submitted by the partners in Syria and is currently under review. The Chair of the Recommendation Panel will inform the HLSG of the Panel's decision at its February call.</i></p> <p><i>This has been the most complex and high profile of all of the initial investments. A group of senior officials from Whole of Syria, UNICEF, UNOCHA, ECW and the Donor Partner Group met in late January in Istanbul to agree on the strategic direction of the proposal. Excellent progress was made and the ECW proposal should be ground-breaking in partner collaboration, bridging the humanitarian/stabilization divide and leveraging system improvement.</i></p>
<b>Lebanon</b>	TBC	TBC	<i>The initial concept note from Lebanon was placed on hold by the government due to recent changes to ministerial portfolios and appointments. It will not be possible to have a proposal for HLSG consideration under the initial investments phase. However, the Secretariat has been working with the Education Ministry and partners in Lebanon to explore how ECW may be able to provide some catalytic support. Based on initial discussions, it is expected that an interesting proposal would be feasible for a second round of ECW investments under the Breakthrough Facility.</i>

## **Background**

The identification and development of the ECW initial investments has been conducted in parallel to the design of the operational and results framework, governance arrangements and establishing the Secretariat. The process has relied on the goodwill and efforts of a range of

ECW partners. The initial investments will provide an evidence base on opportunities and risks for ECW as it moves beyond its start-up phase. The Task Team will undertake a lessons learnt exercise. Some key lessons so far include:

- *Proof of concept:* potential grantees have required considerable support in order to understand ECW's objectives. Implementation of initial investments will produce evidence on the applicability of ECW's five functions, and interplay between them in different contexts.
- *Request for Proposals:* Considering very complex conditions the timeframes were short for submission of concepts and proposals and may not have initially allowed for robust engagement between different humanitarian and development partners. The quality of proposals was mixed.
- *Partnership:* bringing partners together with very different mandates and ways of operating has required significantly more facilitation than was initially anticipated. The implementation of initial investments will provide evidence on how agencies are working together to address the humanitarian-development divide.