



HLSG Paper 1: Operational Model and Results Framework HLSG Paper

To Approve the ECW Operating Model Design and Results Framework (with reference to Annex Papers 1A and 1B)

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

Education Cannot Wait – a fund for education in emergencies – was launched in May 2016 at the World Humanitarian Summit. Two meetings of the High Level Steering Group (HLSG) have since been held, on June 30th and September 19th, 2016. The purpose of this paper is to brief HLSG members on recommendations for the design of the Fund's operating model and results framework, for their approval. This includes the design of the funding modalities and a detailed results framework.

FOR CONSENT

Proposed decision:

The HLSG approves the proposed Operating Model Design and Results Framework for ECW.

SUMMARY: OPERATING MODEL DESIGN

- ECW provides funding through three funding windows:
 - The First Response Window provides early support at the onset or escalation of a crisis, and consists of four possible funding modalities: an initial provision of funds to an appeal, matched funding for a coordinated humanitarian response, funding for specific project proposals from pre-accredited organizations, and funding for needs assessments.
 - The Multi-Year Window provides sustained funding support for 3-5 years to help bridge the divide between acute emergency response and longer-term education systems strengthening work, and to provide multi-year funding in high need, protracted crisis contexts. Funding will be provided to joint proposals developed by a broad coalition of actors, and ECW will provide coalition-building and pre-grant application support to help facilitate the development of these proposals.
 - The Acceleration Facility makes targeted investments in global and regional public goods to advance the delivery of high-quality education services in crises. Targeted investments will be made by conducting a focused Request for Proposal (RFP) process informed by ECW's strategy.

- ECW's focus is defined by its purpose, core principles, scope, and priorities. It is further narrowed every 3-5 years through a highly consultative strategic planning process, which informs the priorities across the Fund and by funding window. Within the Breakthrough Fund, crises are selected based on need, gap in support, potential for ECW value-add, and alignment to the Fund's strategic priorities.
- ECW allows earmarking to each of its three funding windows, to a specific geography within ECW's strategy / scope, and to a thematic focus in the Acceleration Facility and Multi-Year Window.
- ECW is committed to leveraging innovative and non-traditional sources of financing as a core part of its fundraising strategy.
- ECW Secretariat will need to have capabilities in grant making and grant management, fundraising (incl. pursuit of non-traditional funding sources), strategy, and political advocacy. The design may require a larger Secretariat than originally envisioned (7 FTEs).

SUMMARY: RESULTS FRAMEWORK

- The Theory of Change (TOC) proposed by ODI has been refined to clarify the linkages between the ECW platform's five strategic functions, activities/outputs, systemic outcomes, beneficiary outcomes, and overall impact.
- A comprehensive set of indicators has been developed to test each element of the TOC, drawing on best practice from partner organizations. Measurement effort is shared across the ECW Secretariat, grantees, and partners, leveraging existing data where possible. Grantees are required to report against four indicators; five others are encouraged where grantee context and capabilities allow.
- Three core results (and corresponding indicators) have been prioritized to assess the general success of the ECW platform, particularly in terms of HLSG focus and external communication. These core results and indicators will evolve over time as ECW and its partners invest in improved data for education in emergencies.
 - In the near-term, these are: 1) Support children and youth: Number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school settings reached with ECW assistance (disaggregated by gender, education level, disabled persons, refugees, IDPs, and minorities, according to context and where possible), 2) Raise funding for ECW, including leveraging non-traditional donors: ECW financing (total and non-traditional), and 3) Bridge the humanitarian-development divide through joint coordination and planning: Number of ECW-supported countries with inclusive, quality humanitarian and development plans.
 - In the longer-term, core results will incorporate greater focus on equity, learning outcomes, and overall funding to EiE. This assumes improvement in data collection and measurement capabilities, potentially funded through ECW's Acceleration Facility.
- ECW will invest in "pushing the envelope" over time in areas where improved data quality, new indicators, or new data platforms will be required. ECW's Acceleration

Facility will make phased investments over time, prioritizing improvements to indicators of core results, equity, and quality in the near-term.

- Grant-specific log frames, including those for the initial investments, will need to be linked to the ECW results framework. The ECW Secretariat will need to assess grantees' ability to report on desired results and support them to develop a monitoring plan that builds reporting capacity over time.

BACKGROUND

HLSG Agreed to Action (30th June 2016): *HLSG members nominated working level officials for Task Team on long term fund parameters [by 8th July 2016];*

In June 2016, the HLSG agreed to establish a Task Team to undertake work to determine how ECW funding mechanisms (the Acceleration Facility and the Breakthrough Fund) will work in practice. The HLSG Task Team #2 was established in July, and an external firm, The Boston Consulting Group, was engaged starting October, to develop recommendations around a proposed operating model design and results framework for ECW.

PROCESS TO GET TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The Operating Model Design and Results Framework were developed via three phases:

Input gathering (October 10-21, 2016): Input was collected to inform the design, including a synthesis of existing analysis and assessments (e.g., recommendations from ODI paper, emerging lessons from ECW's initial investments), an analysis of unmet needs in education in emergencies, a comparative analysis of existing funds' operating models and peers' results frameworks, and interviews with stakeholders and experts in the humanitarian, development, and monitoring & evaluation fields.

Development (October 24 – December 16, 2016):

- Two two-day design workshops were conducted (the first on November 10-11 in New York, and the second on December 15-16 in Brussels) with a broad set of stakeholders, including representatives from Task Team 2, UN/ multilaterals, bilateral donors, civil society, universities, and the private sector. The workshops addressed key design decisions and the participants provided feedback and recommendations for the design.
- A Technical Working Group (TWG) nominated by Task Team 2 was established to offer technical guidance on the development of the results framework; monitoring & evaluation experts were convened from 12 distinct organizations, including UN agencies, donors, and civil society representatives.
- A broader consultation was conducted with global and local civil society representatives, as well as local country governments. This consultation consisted of an online input form and two Web conference calls. In total, input was collected from ~70 and ~30 local country governments; over 60 countries were represented.

Refinement (January 3-27, 2016):

- Further refinements to the design were made, with input from the ECW Senior Officials Group, Task Team 2, and additional targeted stakeholder consultations.
- An additional meeting with the TWG was held to refine the technical elements of the results framework.

STAKEHOLDERS AND EXPERTS CONSULTED**Task Team #2 – 29 ECW stakeholders across 14 organizations**

- UN agencies: UN Special Envoy for Global Education, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF
- Donors: DFID, Dubai Cares, European Commission, Norad, USAID
- Civil society: INEE, Norwegian Refugee Council, Save the Children (UK and Norway)
- Other: Education Cluster, GPE

Workshop participants & bilateral interviews – 40 ECW stakeholders across 22 organizations

- Donors: Canada, Denmark, DFID, Dubai Cares, European Commission, Norway, USAID
- Local country government: Lebanon
- UN agencies: OCHA, UNDP, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, World Bank
- Civil society: INEE, IRC, Plan International, Save the Children
- Other: Education Cluster, GBC for Education, GPE

Comparative analysis interviews – 24 experts representing 15 funds and peer organizations

- Global funds: GAVI, Global Fund, GPE, START fund, UNITAID
- UN / UN funds: OCHA CERF & CBPF, One UN, UNDP MPTF, UNICEF, UNICEF EPF
- Civil society: IRC, Save the Children
- Other: EU Trust Funds, GBC for Education

Results Framework Technical Working Group – 14 TWG members, across 12 organizations

- Donors: DFID, Dubai Cares, European Commission, Norad, USAID,
- Civil society: IRC, MSI Inc. (TWG representative formerly from Save the Children)
- UN agency: UNESCO Institute of Statistics, UNHCR, UNICEF
- Other: Global Education Cluster, GPE

Broad consultation – 70 civil society respondents, 30 local country government respondents