



LONGER-TERM FUNDING PARAMETERS & PROPOSED ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY (SEPTEMBER 2016)

The purpose of this briefing note is to provide next steps on two aspects of funding via the Education Cannot Wait Fund:

- 1. Longer-term funding parameters:** Update the High Level Steering Group on the process for developing the fund's longer-term parameters and grant-making mechanisms.
- 2. Initial fund investments:** Propose parameters for initial ECW investments that could be explored, with a view to announcing these in September 2016, in the margins of the UN General Assembly in September 2016.

1) Education Cannot Wait Fund's Longer-term Parameters and Grant-making Mechanisms

The ODI proposal sets out the overall framework for the proposed fund mechanisms but further work is needed to determine how this will work in practice, taking into account ECW's commitment to speedy and transparent decision making processes to address the provision of education at the onset of an emergency. The funding mechanisms will become the foundation for future grant making for ECW.

In preparation for the High Level Steering Group Meeting in September 2016, we propose that the Secretariat undertake technical work develop the acceleration and breakthrough fund mechanism proposal. This work will be undertaken with the support of a consultancy¹ with a view to making recommendations to the High Level Steering Group. The recommendations should address:

- Eligibility and criteria for Acceleration and Breakthrough mechanisms including allocation formula;
- Grant making process and tools (including application processes and application forms, grant reporting tools);
- Options for country and/or regional-level operationalization and fund flow including approach to operating through 'Grant Agents' and ECW's interaction (and value add) with existing humanitarian, development and government architecture;
- Results framework including options for a results-based financing framework that clearly links financing with well-defined outputs and outcomes developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders, donors and implementers.

¹ Funded by USAID, commissioned by UNICEF and supported by a working group comprising officials representing members of the HLSG.

2) Parameters for Initial ECW Investments

While the longer-term funding parameters are being established, the High Level Steering Group has expressed interest in announcing 2-3 initial investments at the UN General Assembly in September 2016. These would not replace the need developing the long-term funding mechanism, but would allow for ‘proof of concept’ investments which will make an immediate contribution to address the interruption of education and learning, and provide evidence of the Fund’s value added at global and country/regional levels.

Criteria for determining an initial suite of investments could include some or all of the following:

- **Geography:** Select approximately 2-3 investments with geographic diversity (e.g. Middle East, Africa, Latin America and/or Asia)
- **Leveraging new resources and political mobilisation:** Bring in and leverage new resources; marshal high level political support to address neglected aspect of delivering education in emergencies
- **New partners:** Demonstrate that the private sector and/or non-traditional donors can play a role
- **Immediate impact:** Demonstrate an impact on children underserved by the current system
- **Innovation:** Demonstrate a new approach to funding and/or delivering education in crisis
- **Strengthening predictability:** Support the transition from short-term responses to medium-term planning
- **Strengthened capacity to respond:** Build on and strengthen capacity of existing mechanisms to respond to emergencies.

In order to develop initial proposals to be agreed by the HLSG in September – taking into account the fact that it will take a few months to establish the Secretariat – initial proposals are likely to include suggestions for which there is already some support.

Examples of potential investments might include:

1. **A Syria Initiative, which could potentially address refugees** (leveraging larger impact across countries hosting refugees, including in Lebanon through accelerated learning, matched funding, new partners) and **inside Syria** (support to the cluster and local education group to develop and fund priority actions over a 3-year timeframe, under whole of Syria approach).
2. **African refugee crisis, which could potentially address an example such as Chad** (a top-up grant to support the hosting of refugees where development funding has been displaced, allowing a longer-term sector plan solution) or other countries.
3. **Identification of an under-funded emergency**
4. **A global or regional investment to strengthen response and planning**
5. **Others, to be suggested.**

In order to bring proposals to the HLSG in September, it is proposed that a small senior-official sub-group of no more than 6 (Special Envoy's Office, UNICEF, UNHCR, GPE, one donor rep, one CSO rep) will issue some invitations to a selected group of partners in the first week of July to submit proposals against the criteria for preliminary investments. Proposals would need to demonstrate alignment with one or more of the agreed functions of the fund (political commitment; joint planning and response; generate and disburse new funding; strengthen capacity; improve accountability) and demonstrate some of the proof of concept criteria as agreed by the High-Level Steering Group. Proposals would also need to demonstrate adherence to best practice in humanitarian situations, including 'do no harm' principles. A panel of 8 senior officials representing the wider HLSG membership would assess the proposals against the agreed criteria and recommend a prioritised list of investments to the HLSG in September. The panel could not include a representative of an organisation with a proposal under review.

For Discussion During HLSG Meeting

1. Is there agreement to advance the longer-term funding agreements and establish a small Task Team with one delegate from interested HLSG members to support the process?
2. Assuming agreement to proceed with initial investments to be brought to the HLSG in September, are there additional criteria which should be considered in the process of selecting initial investments to present to the High-Level Steering Group?

Pledges Summary – Fund

US\$ equivalent using UN Exchange Rates as of 15 June 2016 (next update 30 June)

Contributor	Year 1 (US\$)	Year 2 (US\$)
UK DFID	21.4 million	21.4 million
US Government	20 million	
Norway	10 million	
Netherlands	7.89 million	
EU	5.64 million	
Total Pledges	64.93 million	21.4 million
Target	153 million	383 million
Gap	88.07	361.6

Pledges summary – Secretariat

Contributor	Year 1 (US\$)
Dubai Cares	2.5 million
USAID	1 million
Total	3.5 million