



Operating Model Design

Table of Contents

- I. Purpose of the operating model design
- II. Strategic positioning
- III. Financing and earmarking
- IV. Innovative financing
- V. Acceleration facility
- VI. First response window
- VII. Multi-year window
- VIII. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and performance management
- IX. Secretariat
- X. Appendix I

I. Purpose of the operating model design

1. This document outlines the initial operating model design for Education Cannot Wait (ECW).
2. This design is intended to apply immediately, once adopted by the High Level Steering Group, though some elements (e.g., particular funding windows) may be implemented over time. We envision that the design will be refined as ECW learns from its operations and fund investments.
3. This operating model design is not meant to prescribe every detail for ECW's operating model. Further detail will be outlined in the fund's operational manuals and/or left to the discretion of fund management.
4. This operating model does not assume a particular hosting arrangement for ECW. While this model generally should apply regardless of the hosting arrangement, some elements may need to be revisited once a decision on ECW's long-term hosting arrangement is made.
5. As a 'learning organization', ECW aims to actively test key assumptions underpinning the operating model design and to leverage what it learns to refine the design over time.
 - a. Examples of key assumptions to test include: whether the proposed funding modalities for the First Response Window crowd in additional funding and increase the likelihood that education will be included in humanitarian appeals; and whether the balance of grantee competition and collaboration enabled by this design maximizes innovation, Value for Money, partner diversity, intra-country sustainability and alignment, and ultimately outcomes for children and youth
6. This operating model design and future amendments thereto are subject to the approval of the High Level Steering Group.

II. Strategic positioning

FUND PURPOSE, ROLES AND OBJECTIVES

1. ECW aims to provide education support and change the lives of millions of children and youth affected by crises around the world. The Fund seeks to address the \$8.5Bn financing gap necessary to provide education support to the estimated ~75 million children and youth affected by crises worldwide.
2. ECW has five key functions:
 - Inspire political commitment: Expand political commitment for education in emergencies (EiE), to draw attention, mobilize resources, and support local governments.
 - Joint planning and response: Promote crisis specific assessments and prioritized multi-year plans to connect interventions, service delivery and government support.
 - Generate and distribute new funding: Mobilize and disburse additional funding and new investments with an emphasis on additionality and sustainability.

- Strengthen capacity: Work with partners to invest in capacity strengthening for response and recovery, and fill the gaps.
- Improve accountability: Improve accountability and understanding of 'what works' through investment in data collection and analysis.

FUND PRINCIPLES

3. ECW's design is based on the following principles:
 - Impact: Provide quality education to the most at-need children and youth, aiming to serve the greatest number of at-need children and youth.
 - Additionality: Bring in new funding sources, including innovative financing and non-traditional donors, to education in crisis settings.
 - Complementarity: Reinforce and enhance existing efforts, where possible.
 - Speed and responsiveness: Respond quickly to acute crises.
 - Predictable, longer term support: Provide predictable, multi-year support.
 - Transparency: Have clear and well-known processes, and communicate broadly with stakeholders.
 - Innovation: Experiment with and pursue innovative approaches.
 - Systems building: Build capacity and systems to ensure local ownership and crisis preparedness, and work with national governments whenever they are willing and able to engage.*
 - Cost effectiveness: Show value for money and seek efficiency in its own operations and in its grantees.

* In circumstances are such that the government may not be able or willing to engage, humanitarian and development actors may need to take the lead as appropriate.

FUND SCOPE AND PRIORITIES

4. Scope: ECW's focus is on education of children and youth in crisis contexts, including new emergencies and protracted crises caused by conflict, natural disasters, and disease outbreaks. All crises will be considered within ECW's overarching scope.
5. Priorities: ECW will prioritize forgotten crises (underfunded crises with minimal political attention), marginalized groups, gender equality, and bridging the humanitarian / development gap in education. Detailed fund priorities and allocations will be set at the funding window level (Acceleration Facility, First Response, Multi-Year).

STRATEGIC PLANNING

6. The High Level Steering Group will set the Fund's overall strategy. The strategic planning process will be coordinated by the Secretariat, with third party support as needed.
7. In the beginning and while the fund is learning from early investments, this strategic planning process will happen every 3 years. Over time, the fund will aspire to have longer 4-5 year cycles to streamline Secretariat workload.
8. The strategy will determine the focus of the Fund, including any specific prioritization by region, thematic area, crisis type, and/ or recipient groups (e.g., refugees, girls). It will identify the highest priority, under-funded needs. This will inform which crises and projects are funded by ECW's funding windows.

9. This strategy will be informed by the fund purpose, core principles, scope, and priorities outlined above, as well as by an understanding of the following:
 - The current landscape of needs and interventions, including research on what works in education in emergencies
 - The current funding landscape and focus
 - The capacity of local actors and implementers
 - Global, regional, and country level infrastructure for education in emergencies
 - The unique value-add ECW can provide
10. The strategy-setting process will be a highly consultative process, with input from experts and stakeholders throughout the field of education in emergencies – including but not limited to local beneficiary governments, international and national civil society, donors, multi-laterals, private sector, universities, and other actors.
11. In addition to the Fund's overall strategy, ECW may choose to develop a strategy and/or policy focused on a specific priority of the Fund (e.g., gender equality, forgotten crises, marginalized groups), as part of its strategic planning process.

Note: Please refer to the "Strategic Planning Overview" diagram (Appendix I, at the end of the document) for a visual representation of how the strategic planning process informs ECW's funding decisions.

III. Financing and earmarking

FINANCING

1. ECW will aim to maximize its financing, in order to provide educational opportunities to as many children and youth in emergencies as possible. To do so, ECW will pursue a variety of financing strategies -- including but not limited to raising unrestricted grant funding to the pooled fund from traditional donors, non-traditional donor financing, and innovative financing instruments.
2. In the near term while ECW is growing in fund size and establishing a track record of success, ECW will raise funds on an annual cycle. ECW may consider a multi-year replenishment cycle for its pooled funds in the future.
3. The previous point notwithstanding, ECW will pursue and encourage multi-year commitments to promote predictability and lower the administrative burden.
4. ECW will also have the ability to raise funds for specific crises at any time in order to take advantage of societal and donor interest. The Secretariat will determine whether to open a fundraising window to respond to a specific crisis that emerges, outside of the regular fundraising cycle.

ALLOCATING FUNDS ACROSS WINDOWS

5. Macro-level decisions about allocation of funds across ECW's funding windows will be made on an annual basis by the High Level Steering Group. *(The process for allocating funds to specific countries and recipients is not covered in this section; it is addressed below.)*
6. Initially, it is anticipated that 90-95% of pooled funds will be allocated to the Breakthrough Fund, with 5-10% allocated to the Acceleration Facility. The Acceleration Facility will likely require an amount on the higher end of that range initially, decreasing slightly in percentage terms as the fund size grows.

7. Within the Breakthrough Fund, the Executive Committee will set a minimum funding allocation to the First Response and Multi-Year Windows on an annual basis. Minimum allocations will be determined based on committed funding at the time the allocation is set.
8. In the event of a significant change in context, the Secretariat may request the Executive Committee to make a mid-year adjustment to the minimum allocation.
9. Mid-year adjustment requests will be considered by the Executive Committee if one of the following conditions apply:
 - The aggregate needs of the window have been significantly impacted by an unforeseen event. For example, a major new crisis emerges requiring additional funds in the First Response Window.
 - The total fund's aggregate resources differ significantly from expectations.
10. In order to maintain flexibility, manage complexity, and empower the Secretariat in its management role, the operating model will not require quantitative allocation targets to be set within a funding window.

EARMARKING

Acceleration Facility

11. ECW will allow earmarking:
 - To the Acceleration Facility overall
 - Toward a specific Acceleration Facility strategy (e.g., global data platforms)
 - Toward a specific Acceleration Facility project, if, as determined by the Secretariat, the project is consistent with the Acceleration Facility's strategy / scope and the earmarked funding meets a funding need. The donor may be required to fund the full project to ensure that it does not remain partially funded.

First Response Window

12. ECW will allow earmarking:
 - To the First Response Window overall
 - To a specific geography (region, country), within ECW's strategy / scope
13. Consistent with the principles of flexibility, speed, and local ownership, ECW will not accommodate other types of earmarking in the First Response Window.
14. In addition, ECW may fundraise for specific projects, countries, and/or themes in the First Response Window through innovative financing channels and instruments to ensure additionality in this window. *See Section IV – Innovative Financing below.*

Multi-Year Window

15. ECW will allow earmarking:
 - To the Multi-Year Window overall
 - To a specific geography (region, country), within ECW's strategy / scope
16. ECW will allow for thematic earmarking to programs that improve outcomes for specific marginalized groups (e.g., girls, refugees) in the Multi-Year Window, as long as the groups are a significant beneficiary but not a sole beneficiary (i.e. other at-need children and youth are not excluded).
17. ECW will not accommodate other types of earmarking in the Multi-Year Window.

18. In addition, ECW may fundraise for specific projects, countries, and/or themes in the Multi-Year Window through innovative financing channels and instruments to ensure additionality in this window. *See Section VII – Innovative Financing below.*

IV. Innovative financing

1. ECW is committed to leveraging new forms of financing as a core part of its fundraising strategy. The operating model is intentionally flexible to allow for new forms of financing and donor preferences.
2. ECW will treat innovative financing in 1 of 2 ways:
 - Innovative sources of financing – there are many cases where innovative financing sources represent a non-traditional channel, but do not require any changes to the operating model of the Fund itself. In these cases, ECW will incorporate these sources of funding into window(s) within the Fund.
 - Innovative financing instruments – there are other cases where ECW will choose to use discrete financing instruments that will require ECW to enter into legal contracts or financial agreements, or to change its approach to prioritizing crises, selecting grantees, supporting grantees, or measuring and reporting outcomes. In these cases, a distinct window outside the Breakthrough Fund will be required to accommodate the alternate operating approach.

INNOVATIVE SOURCES OF FINANCING

3. Overall pooled fund – Innovative and non-traditional financing sources will be sought to bring additional funding into the overall pooled fund. The Executive Committee will approve a target ratio for leverage of funds from innovative sources to match traditional donor sources (e.g., 1:1). These funds will be treated the same way as other funds that go into the pooled fund, and will be allocated through the same process. Similar earmarking rules will apply.
4. Specific windows – Innovative financing sources will also be sought for specific funding windows, to the extent that they meet the specified objectives and requirements of that window. An example of this is an instrument that provides liquidity and fast access to cash for the First Response Window (e.g., callable commitments, fund-level insurance schemes). These types of financing sources may require an up-front investment in structuring agreements to get the funding, but once the funding comes in it will be treated the same as all other sources of funds for the window. Innovative financing sources will only be incorporated into existing windows if they align with the window's strategy / scope, the window objective, the typical grantee profile, the application process, the existing support model for grantees, and the monitoring and evaluation system.
5. Specific projects – Innovative financing sources will also be sought for specific projects as a leveraging facility. ECW will use financing to crowd in development bank funding, private and philanthropic financing, and corporate contributions. These sources would co-finance service delivery of specific projects, rather than funding ECW as a whole. An example of this is co-financing a project in the Multi-Year Window through funding from

the region's development bank or through philanthropies and corporations particularly interested in the region.

6. For innovative financing to be accepted as an additional source of funds, the funding increase must outweigh the cost of implementation, tracking, and reporting.

INNOVATIVE FINANCING INSTRUMENTS

7. Not all innovative finance instruments will align with existing funding windows and their respective operating models, or with the fund overall. Examples include complex country-specific insurance schemes, development impact bonds, and risk-based financing. Where the funding instruments do not match ECW's standard operating model, ECW will consider opening a new window specific to the innovative financing instrument.
8. A new window will be considered if the innovative financing instrument meets one of the following criteria:
 - Requires a fundamentally different approach than the rest of the fund in terms of grantee profile, application process, proposal review and selection, grantee support, and/or monitoring and reporting outcomes
 - Requires ECW to make legally binding agreements or to take on financial risk
9. Preference will be given to opening a window when:
 - The innovative financing instrument meets substantial, unfunded need which has not been or cannot be addressed through existing windows
 - The innovative financing instrument helps ECW achieve goals besides additionality (e.g., risk management, increased performance and accountability, or bridge to long-term sustainable funding)
10. The funding increase must outweigh the cost of implementation, tracking, and reporting associated with the innovative financing instruments.

To consider opening a new window, The Secretariat will make a recommendation to the Executive Committee after consultation with sector experts. The High Level Steering Group will determine whether to open the window, evaluating the opportunity based on the requirements above.

V. Acceleration Facility

ROLE OF ACCELERATION FACILITY

1. The goal of the Acceleration Facility is to advance the delivery of high-quality education services in crises by making targeted investments in global and regional public goods.
 - Global and regional public goods are defined as products that can be used in a wide array of countries and crisis contexts to improve responses, build capacity, and deepen the field of education in emergencies.
 - Examples of public goods include setting up rapid response global coordination mechanisms (e.g., education clusters, education working groups, refugee coordination groups), collecting country-level data around crisis needs (including those targeted to under-represented groups, such as refugees), and building an

- evidence-base around potential interventions (including those that are not funded by ECW).
2. Through this facility, ECW will make catalytic investments that are aligned with ECW's five functions – political commitment, planning and response, financing, capacity, and accountability. While exact investments will be based on an understanding of global needs and the strategy set for the facility, and thus will evolve over time, some example investments may include:
 - Political commitment – building an evidence base that can be used to shine the spotlight on the importance of education in emergencies, incentivizing the activation and funding of an education appeal (e.g., building an evidence base for needs and responses in conflict contexts to highlight the need for immediate intervention in education)
 - Planning and response – building regional connectivity to support cross-country collaboration, preparedness, and response
 - Financing – conducting research or pilots to inform how ECW and the field more broadly might raise and channel additional resources for education in crisis affected contexts
 - Capacity – investing in strengthening the skills and capacity within the existing global architecture to improve coordination and responsiveness (e.g., the global education cluster, refugee coordination group, INEE, START, IIEP, and GAD3RES)
 - Accountability – investing in global and regional data platforms with a focus on improving the collection, analysis, and aggregation of education results and financial flow data (e.g., building data on the impact of crises for marginalized groups, such as refugees or girls), and fund efforts to disseminate knowledge and good practice to the EiE field
 3. The Acceleration Facility will fund efforts at the global, regional, and country levels, as long as a successful outcome will yield benefits at the regional or global level. This includes initiatives piloted at the country level with the aim of scaling more broadly, and evidence collected at the country level with regional or global implications.

GRANTEE ELIGIBILITY

4. ECW will maintain broad eligibility in this facility, allowing all types of organizations and entities to apply, where applicable to the project (e.g., academia, civil society, private sector).
5. Some RFPs may be more applicable to a select group or organization (e.g., specific organizations with particular mandates such as the education cluster, refugee coordination groups, and INEE may be most applicable for capacity strengthening). RFPs will specify the qualifications required.
6. All applying entities will need to demonstrate that they have the necessary capacity and capabilities to deliver on proposed projects.

STRATEGY SETTING, PRIORITIZATION, AND SELECTION

Setting strategy and establishing desired objectives

7. The strategy for the Acceleration Facility will be set every 3-5 years by the High Level Steering Group as part of ECW's overall strategy. *See section Strategic Positioning: Strategic Planning section for details.*

8. The Acceleration Facility's strategy will be informed by an understanding of current needs in the EiE field, a review of current activities that are underway in the field, and an assessment of the Acceleration Facility's impact to date toward its intended objectives.
9. Once a strategy for the Acceleration Facility has been set, the Secretariat will translate the strategy into a set of desired objectives. It will do so through a consultative process with input from experts and consultation with the field.

Requesting and selecting proposals

10. The Secretariat will issue an RFP and launch a proposal process for the objectives that have been identified. This will be done on a rolling basis.
11. The Secretariat may also issue a targeted RFP in response to a specific need that has been identified outside of the strategic planning process, if it is in the Acceleration Facility's scope.
12. In order to provide ample time for applicants to prepare applications, the Secretariat will share RFPs as early as possible, and also share forecasts of potential RFPs when possible (e.g. via website).
13. The Independent Proposal Review Panel will review proposals for RFPs exceeding US\$500,000 and the Secretariat will review RFPs of US\$500,000 or less in value. RFPs reviewed by the IPRP are recommended to the Executive Committee for approval. The Director approves RFPs reviewed by the Secretariat.
14. The duration and maximum funding level of each grant will differ by RFP, and will be clearly defined in the RFP.
15. The criteria used to evaluate proposals will differ by RFP and will be defined in each RFP. These criteria will be informed by a set of clearly defined principles, including:
 - Potential for impact at a global or regional level
 - Likelihood of implementation success
 - Value for Money
 - Past performance of the applicant
 - Capacity and capabilities of applicant
16. The Secretariat will not accept unsolicited proposals, but will share promising ideas included within unsolicited proposals with EiE partners.

Funding proposals

17. The Secretariat will retain the management flexibility to vary the grant design based on the specific needs of proposals – including but not limited to varying:
 - The grant duration (e.g., 1-5 years)
 - The fund disbursement frequency and requirements (e.g., upfront disbursement only, multiple stages based on results)

GRANTEE SUPPORT

18. ECW's support in the Acceleration Facility will be focused on serving as a connector between grantees and other partners. It will leverage its network and provide relevant contacts where helpful.
19. Other Secretariat support (e.g., capacity building) will be limited in this facility to prioritize Secretariat support to the Breakthrough Fund. The Acceleration Facility's proposal process will be designed to ensure that the grantee has the capacity and capabilities to deliver on the project proposal with limited further support, or has a clear plan to use the funds to build required capacity.

20. Beyond serving as a connector, ECW will also partner with private sector consortia (e.g., with the Global Business Coalition for Education, leveraging its REACT database) to marshal in-kind support from the private sector for EiE. To facilitate this, the ECW Secretariat will share information on in-kind support opportunities with its network.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER ACTORS

21. Setting strategy: During the strategic planning process, ECW will conduct a broad consultation process with stakeholders such as local governments, multilaterals, INGOs, and local civil society networks. This will ensure complementarity with existing efforts and a focus on the highest priority needs in the field.
22. Translating strategy to target outcomes: The Secretariat will work closely with technical experts to develop specific outcomes and RFPs that tie to the Acceleration Facility's strategy.
23. Disseminating information re: calls for proposals: During the Acceleration Facility's RFP process, global and in-country partners will be engaged to ensure wide advertising of the opportunity, aiming to increase the size and diversity of the applicant pool.
24. Implementing projects and scaling solutions: ECW will encourage Acceleration Facility grantees to work with ECW partners and Breakthrough Fund grantees during implementation and scaling, where there is overlapping interest or focus.

VI. First Response Window

ROLE OF THE FIRST RESPONSE WINDOW

1. The goal of the First Response Window is to provide early support at the onset or escalation of a crisis, and to reduce the impact of the crisis on education.
2. The First Response Window will provide early support in a crisis through 4 modalities:
 - Provide a small initial provision of funds to an appeal at the onset of a crisis
 - Provide matching funds for crises with a coordinated humanitarian response
 - Fund specific project proposals from pre-accredited organizations
 - Fund needs assessments
3. Once ECW determines that it will support a crisis, the Secretariat will determine which modalities will be most appropriate to address the need.

Initial provision of funds

4. ECW will provide a small initial provision of funds to an education appeal, with the aim of rapidly deploying funds to meet immediate education needs and support upfront costs of establishing an education response. This modality is also designed to incentivize the inclusion of education in humanitarian appeals. Funds will be limited to reduce the risk of displacing existing funding.
5. Following the decision to fund a country / region, the Secretariat will determine whether to provide an initial provision of funds toward the appeal. This modality will be applied when:

- There is a clear immediate need for funding to ensure continuation of services (e.g., temporary education facilities immediately after a natural disaster), and
 - There is a coordinated humanitarian response / appeal, which is able to absorb a rapid provision of funds
6. ECW will aim to distribute this initial provision within 3 weeks of the onset or escalation of a crisis.
 7. The funding formula will be set and routinely revised by the Secretariat in a process laid out below.
 8. Funds will be provided to pre-accredited organizations only, and allocated based on existing prioritization efforts and/or guidance from an appropriate coordinating entity (e.g., education cluster, refugee coordination group).

Matching funds

9. ECW will provide matching funds to a coordinated humanitarian response, with the aim of deploying additional funding to major crises without displacing existing donor funding.
10. Following the decision to fund a country / region, the Secretariat will determine whether to provide matching funds. This modality will be applied when:
 - There is a coordinated humanitarian response, which is able to absorb matching funds earmarked to education (i.e., there is financial tracking data that clearly delineates funding to education), and
 - There is likely to be a minimum level of funding flowing to education, such that matching will be impactful
11. Matching will only be applied once the coordinated humanitarian response has reached a minimum threshold of requested funds, to be determined at the time of an appeal's launch.
12. The matching ratio (the percentage at which ECW will match donor funds) will be set and routinely revised by the Secretariat in a process laid out below.
13. ECW will match funds that are raised within the first few months of the appeal to encourage early commitments and disbursement. The exact timing will be determined by the ECW Secretariat on a crisis-by-crisis basis (e.g., 3 months).
14. To ensure additionality, ECW will aim to raise non-traditional sources of funds (e.g., private sector co-financing) and use innovative financing instruments (e.g., callable commitments) for this matching function. ECW will aim to conduct a large portion of the non-traditional donor fund raising in advance, by raising funds for an emergency response reserve, while some will be done at the time of crisis to capitalize on donor interest.
15. ECW will play an active advocacy role for crises where ECW is providing matching funds, in order to crowd-in funding for a coordinated humanitarian response and ensure ECW's matching funds are triggered.
16. Funds will be provided to pre-accredited organizations only, and allocated based on existing prioritization of an appeal and/or guidance from an appropriate coordinating entity (e.g., education cluster, refugee coordination group).

Fund project proposals

17. ECW will fund project proposals, with the aim of supporting underfunded crises that require an immediate and targeted response.
18. Following the decision to fund a country / region, the Secretariat will determine whether to make a call for proposals. This modality will be applied when:

- There is no or limited coordinated humanitarian response, and the situation is likely to be a "forgotten" crisis, or
 - The coordinated humanitarian response is not set up to effectively absorb matching funding to education
19. ECW will fund pre-accredited organizations through a highly streamlined grant proposal process, in order for this modality to be responsive and to reduce the burden on grantees and the Secretariat. (e.g., should take less than 1 month from the time of issuing a call for proposals to disbursing funds)
 20. Once a call for proposals is made, proposals will be accepted and reviewed on a rolling basis.
 21. Coordinating entities (e.g., education clusters, working groups, refugee coordination groups) will be consulted during the application process whenever applicable, to ensure the highest priority interventions and activities are funded.
 22. There will be no rule regarding the number of organizations that can be funded per country / region through this approach.

Fund needs assessments

23. ECW will fund needs assessments that help actors implement an informed EiE response. This funding modality will be open to funding various types of needs assessments, with the ECW Secretariat partnering with local actors to determine what type of needs assessment would be most appropriate for a given crisis. Needs assessment archetypes ECW could fund include:
 - Rapid needs assessments: A rapid, single-sector needs assessment would supplement the immediate, multi-sector needs assessment, and inform the following where applicable: Cluster and agency-specific response plans, the revision of a flash appeal, a Humanitarian Response Plan, a Refugee Response Plan, and/or a Strategic Response Plan. This assessment would be conducted at the immediate onset or escalation of a crisis (e.g., complete within first ten days), and could further incentivize the inclusion of education in an appeal / coordinated response.
 - Comprehensive needs assessments: A comprehensive, single-sector needs assessment would provide a more robust understanding of both immediate humanitarian needs and how to enable the transition to longer term education systems-strengthening work. The assessment would be conducted at least one month after crisis onset or escalation, to allow actors to prioritize the immediate humanitarian response. The assessment could help inform the transition to development after one-time crises such as natural disasters and disease outbreaks. If a country / region has undergone a comprehensive needs assessment and is selected for the Multi-Year Window, the joint proposal for the Multi-Year Window should be informed by the needs assessment. To the extent that complete or partial needs assessments and response plans have already been created (e.g., PDNA, transitional country plans), ECW will only provide funding if supplementary assessments or plans are required to understand a broader set of needs or to diversify the implementation partners (e.g., ensuring civil society is part of the response plan). ECW will not support duplicative efforts.
24. ECW will only fund pre-accredited organizations to conduct these assessments.

25. These plans should be developed with engagement from the national government, and humanitarian and development actors, to ensure diverse expertise and perspectives are incorporated.

STRATEGIC PLANNING, CRISIS SELECTION, AND MATCHING RATIO

Strategic planning

26. As part of ECW's overall strategic planning process (every 3-5 years), the Secretariat will develop a strategy to inform the First Response Window's focus, approach, and the crises eligible for selection (e.g., thematic, regional, and/or beneficiary focus).
27. This strategy will be informed by an evaluation of First Response Window activities and impact to date, and an updated understanding of the landscape of needs.

Crisis selection

28. A review of a crisis, to make a decision on whether a crisis is eligible for First Response Window funding, will be triggered through existing classifications / standards.
- In the near-term, ECW will leverage the humanitarian emergency level system to serve as triggers for crisis review. A crisis review can be triggered in two ways:
 - i. All crises escalated to an L2 or L3 will be reviewed
 - ii. Organizations pre-accredited by ECW can request a crisis review in the case of a crisis onset or escalation for crises classified as L1, L2, or L3
 - ECW will use the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's L3 classification. To start, ECW will use UNICEF and UNHCR's lists for L1 and L2 classifications.
 - The Secretariat and the Executive Committee will revise the trigger system over time as needed (e.g., add and remove lists)
29. When a crisis review is triggered, the Secretariat will quickly evaluate the crisis according to the following crisis selection criteria. (Note: the criteria are consistent across both funding windows in the Breakthrough Fund, but the decisions and decision processes will be distinct between the First Response and Multi-Year windows)
- Need: ECW will give higher preference to crises with a greater need, both in terms of scale (e.g., large number or large proportion of children and youth affected), and in terms of vulnerability (e.g., more out-of-school children and youth).
 - Gap in support: ECW will give higher preference to crises that currently have less of their needs met and are less likely to have their needs met in the near future, whether via other funding sources or via country government support (e.g., lower-income countries).
 - ECW value-add: ECW will give higher preference to crises where ECW is more likely to be able to make a difference (e.g., where the First Response Window funding modalities could be most impactful).
 - Alignment with ECW's strategic priorities: ECW will give higher preference to crises that align with the strategic focus areas outlined in the strategy-setting process.
30. For a country / region in crisis under consideration for First-Response funding, the Secretariat will simultaneously develop a recommendation on which First Response funding modalities to trigger for the country / region. The Director will approve recommendations when the maximum funding threshold is kept at US\$3 million and UNICEF is not a direct beneficiary (while UNICEF is the Fund Custodian and Administrator). The Executive Committee will approve recommendations when the

maximum funding threshold is higher than US\$3 million and/or UNICEF is the direct beneficiary (while UNICEF is the host).

31. ECW will target making the crisis selection decision within one week of a crisis review being triggered.
32. Operationally, the Secretariat retains management discretion to manage the crisis review and selection process (e.g., what materials an organization would submit to trigger a crisis review, how to develop a recommendation on which funding modality to trigger).

Initial provision modality funding formula

33. The Executive Committee will, on an annual basis, approve a funding formula for the initial provision modality. The fund governance and management will retain the discretion to determine the funding formula – e.g., absolute funding level, standard percentage / proportion of an appeal.
34. Crisis-specific adjustments to the initial provision level will require approval from the Executive Committee.

Matching ratio

35. The First Response Window will have a standard matching ratio for the matching funds modality (i.e., it may choose to match all raised funds at 100%, or it may choose to match them only at 50%).
36. The Executive Committee will approve the standard matching ratio on an annual basis.
37. Additionally, the Executive Committee will set an absolute cap to matching (e.g., no more than \$50M will go into any given country / region), to ensure a few crises do not take up all available funding.
38. Country / region-specific adjustments to the matching ratio and absolute cap will require approval from Executive Committee.

GRANTEE ELIGIBILITY

39. Pre-accredited list: ECW will maintain a pre-accredited organizations list for this window to maximize responsiveness.
 - In the near-term, ECW will employ a low-burden and practical approach of leveraging existing lists of pre-accredited organizations (e.g., existing lists managed by donors). The Secretariat and Executive Committee will determine which specific lists to leverage and how it will manage them.
 - Over time as the fund grows, ECW will set up and conduct its own accreditation process, to allow ECW to vet and promote the quality of education interventions, and to enable new actors (e.g., national NGOs) to be eligible for direct funding in this window.
40. Grantees and sub-grants: For all funding approaches, ECW will only disburse funds to organizations on the pre-accredited list. A pre-accredited organization may sub-grant to additional agencies, and will be encouraged to sub-grant to local civil society where appropriate.

GRANTEE SELECTION AND FUND DISBURSEMENT

Initial provision of funds and matching funding

41. ECW will work with the appropriate coordinating entity (e.g. education cluster, refugee coordination group) in-country to determine the prioritization of projects. Funds will be disbursed directly to pre-accredited implementing agencies when funding is allocated to their project.

Project proposals

42. Request for proposal: Once a country / region is selected by the Executive Committee, pre-accredited entities operating in the country / region will be contacted and given the option to submit a proposal.
43. Proposal development: The proposal development process should be highly streamlined to allow funding to be responsive, and to minimize grantee burden during an emergency. ECW will provide a standard application template and guidelines to be used for this modality.
44. Proposal review – criteria: the decision to fund a proposal and the decision of how much funding will be allocated will be based on the following criteria:
- A clear understanding of the education needs in the crisis-affected area, including the needs of marginalized groups
 - A compelling plan to address the education needs, including how the grantee will pursue the intervention's sustainability
 - The technical soundness of the proposal and its activities, and alignment with ECW's results framework
 - A plan that is likely to maximize the impact of ECW's resources
45. Proposal review – process: The Secretariat will review proposals and make a recommendation. The Executive Committee will make the final decision to approve a proposal within two weeks of receiving the application.

Needs assessments

46. The grantee selection and fund disbursement process and criteria will vary based on the type of needs assessment that is funded (e.g., a rapid assessment will have a more streamlined process compared to a comprehensive needs assessment), and fund management will retain the flexibility to determine details around the process and criteria for various needs assessment types.

GRANTEE SUPPORT PRE- AND POST- DISBURSEMENT

47. Given the need for quick action in the First Response Window and given the constraints on Secretariat size in the early years, ECW's support in the First Response Window will be highly targeted and relatively limited.
48. ECW will provide capacity building and facilitation support on an as-needed basis for grantees conducting the needs assessment. It will not provide post-disbursement support (e.g., capacity building or facilitation) to grantees that are funded through initial provision, matching or project proposals modalities.
49. Beyond the targeted support outlined above, ECW will also partner with private sector consortia (e.g., Global Business Coalition for Education, leveraging its REACT database) to marshal in-kind support from the private sector for EiE. To facilitate this, the ECW Secretariat will share information on in-kind support opportunities with its network.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER ACTORS

50. Setting strategy: During the strategy-setting process, ECW will conduct a consultation process with a broad set of stakeholders such as geographically representative groups of local governments, multilaterals, INGOs, and local civil society networks. This will enable the strategy to be developed based on needs on-the-ground, and ensure complementarity with existing efforts.
51. Grantee selection: For initial provisions or matching of funds, ECW will take the guidance of the relevant coordinating entity (e.g., education cluster, refugee coordination group) in determining which projects or organizations to fund. For funding project proposals, ECW will consult with appropriate coordinating entities (e.g., working groups) to get input and ensure alignment to other efforts.

VII. Multi-Year Window

ROLE OF THE MULTI-YEAR WINDOW

1. The goal of the Multi-Year Window is to help bridge the divide between acute emergency response and longer-term education systems strengthening work, and to provide multi-year funding support in high need, protracted crisis contexts.
2. The Multi-Year Window will provide sustained funding support for 3-5 years in both rapid onset crisis and protracted crisis contexts.
3. The Multi-Year Window aims to improve how work is conducted in the EiE sector, by:
 - Enabling experimentation and innovation
 - Engaging a broader set of actors
 - Improving value for money
4. It is expected that recipients of Multi-Year Window funding will transition to longer-term financing options (e.g., domestic financing, GPE funding) after the completion of the grant whenever possible, in order to improve financial sustainability.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND CRISIS SELECTION

5. Strategic planning: As part of ECW's overall strategic planning process, the High Level Steering Group will set a strategy to inform the Multi-Year Window's focus, approach, and the crises eligible for selection (e.g., thematic, regional, and/or beneficiary focus). This strategy will be informed by an evaluation of Multi-Year Window activities and impact to date, and an updated understanding of the landscape of needs. *See Strategic Positioning: Strategic Planning section for details.*
6. Crisis selection: Every year, ECW will undergo a crisis selection process to determine the crises for which the Multi-Year Window will solicit proposals. This will be done in conjunction with annual fundraising cycles and will take ECW's strategic priorities as a starting point. Countries / regions will be prioritized and selected according to the following crisis selection criteria (Note: the criteria are consistent across both funding windows in the Breakthrough Fund, but the decisions and decision processes will be distinct between the First Response and Multi-Year windows):
 - Need: ECW will give higher preference to crises with a greater need, both in terms of scale (e.g., large number and/or large proportion of children and youth affected), and in terms of vulnerability (e.g., more out-of-school children and youth).

- Gap in support: ECW will give higher preference to crises that have less of their needs met, whether via other funding sources or via country government support (e.g., lower-income countries).
 - ECW value-add: ECW will give higher preference to crises where ECW is more likely to be able to make a difference (e.g., in-country actors that could particularly benefit from joint planning and facilitation support).
 - Alignment with ECW's strategic priorities: ECW will give higher preference to crises that align with the strategic focus areas outlined in the strategy-setting process.
7. Maximum funding level: For each selected country / region, the ECW Secretariat will determine the maximum funding level that prospective grantee(s) could apply for. This level will be determined based on objective criteria such as the number of children and youth affected, with some flexibility to adjust based on ECW's overall fundraising and the number of crises that it chooses to fund.
 8. Decision rights: The Secretariat will make a recommendation to the Executive Committee on a list of countries / regions in crisis where proposals should be sought in the Multi-Year Window, and the Executive Committee will review and approve the recommendation.

GRANTEE ELIGIBILITY

9. Generally, ECW will fund up to one joint proposal per selected country / region in crisis. In some contexts and with the mutual agreement of ECW and county-level actors, ECW may solicit and fund multiple aligned proposals for a selected crisis and country (e.g., if political considerations make multiple proposals more effective).
10. This joint proposal will be developed by a coalition of actors working in education in emergencies in the crisis-affected area.
11. Generally, ECW will fund proposals from country-level coalitions. In the case of a regional crisis (e.g., a regional refugee crisis), ECW will consider funding regional EiE efforts across multiple countries, in addition to country-level coalitions.
12. Grantee(s): One or several grantees nominated by the coalition will be responsible for managing funds if a proposal is selected. Grantees will be screened as part of the joint proposal process to ensure they are able to fulfill ECW's fiduciary requirements and risk management protocols. As a Fund, ECW is committed to funding a diverse set of grantees across its investment portfolio.
13. Implementing partners: Each joint proposal should include a diversity of implementing partners, with the aim of including national governments, multilaterals, international NGOs, local civil society organizations, and private sector partners.
 - National government: Where it is reasonable to do so, ECW will have a preference for coalitions to include national governments and/or to be aligned with country education plans. Among refugee contexts, preference will also be given to coalitions with governments that are including refugees within the national education system. Local civil society: In the interest of increasing the diversity of implementing partners, ECW will have a strong preference for coalitions that include local civil society organizations (e.g., national NGOs, community and religious organizations), including coalitions that conduct a robust local civil society consultation as part of the joint proposal process and coalitions that include local civil society actors as grantees or sub-grantees.

GRANTEE APPLICATION PROCESS

14. Request for proposal: Once a country / region is selected by the Executive Committee, ECW will make a publicly-announced call for one or multiple proposals (e.g., announce via website, directly contact actors on the ground, including humanitarian and development actors and relevant government ministries where appropriate). Once a country / region is selected, ECW will announce it as soon as possible to allow actors to begin planning (e.g. 3 weeks before formal call for proposals is made).
15. Needs assessment: Proposals will be informed by needs assessments that provide a comprehensive understanding of 3-5 year education needs in the crisis-affected area, including the needs of marginalized groups. Actors may leverage any needs assessments that achieves the above goals, including needs assessments funded through ECW's First Response Window.
16. Proposal development: A broad set of actors will come together to develop a streamlined joint proposal. This process should take roughly 3-4 months. ECW will provide pre-grant application support as needed to improve the likelihood of a proposal meeting the standards outlined below.
17. Proposal – financial guidelines: Proposals will have clear financial guidelines, including guidelines around matching requirements, overhead cost recovery rates, and ineligible costs if applicable. These guidelines, which will be consistent for all Multi-Year Window grants, will be developed by the ECW Secretariat and Fund Support Office and approved by the Executive Committee.
18. Proposal review - approval: ECW aims to work with actors in selected countries / regions to get to a proposal that meets standards for ECW funding. Operationally, ECW retains governance and management discretion to manage the proposal process in furtherance of ECW objectives and principles (e.g., to determine how many countries / regions to solicit proposals from, to request applicants to reapply with a revised proposal, to reject proposals that do not meet standards).
19. Proposal review – criteria: Proposals will be reviewed based on whether they exhibit the following criteria:
 - Understanding of needs: A comprehensive understanding of 3-5 year education needs in the crisis-affected area, including the needs of marginalized groups.
 - Comprehensive plan: A comprehensive and inclusive plan to address 3-5 year education needs (including the needs of marginalized groups inclusive of gender equality) in coordination with existing actors, including the national government wherever appropriate. This plan should be reflective of humanitarian principles and rights-based approaches while adhering to the principles of conflict sensitivity and do no harm and include initial ideas around how sustainability will be pursued for this plan.
 - Technical soundness and alignment with results framework: Technical soundness of the proposal and its proposed activities, to ensure the proposed activities are likely to achieve the desired outcomes. Clear alignment with ECW's results framework.
 - Grantees with capabilities and capacity to execute: Proposed grantees that have the capabilities and capacity to execute the project plan and can take on the fiduciary and operational risk associated with sub-grants and management of implementing partners.
 - Broad and inclusive proposal: A diverse set of grantees and/or sub-grantees in proposal. Fair and open process for determining grantee(s) and sub-grantees. Broad set of consultations to understand needs and develop joint plan.

- Value for Money: A plan that is likely to maximize the impact of ECW's resources.
 - Innovation: A plan to experiment and pursue something different from the status quo, which could address a challenge or help drive greater impact.
20. Funding disbursement: Funding will be disbursed to the grantee(s) over multiple disbursements (e.g., one disbursement per year). The frequency of disbursement will be determined by the context and activities of the proposal.
21. Proposal review – level of funding: The level of funding a proposal receives will be determined by the following factors:
- The maximum funding level determined during the crisis selection process
 - The scope of activities included in the plan
 - An evaluation of the technical soundness of the proposal and its proposed activities
22. Grantees will also have opportunities during the grant implementation to request for funding adjustments to be made.
23. Proposal review – process and responsibilities: Proposals will be reviewed on an annual basis. At this time, the Secretariat, the Independent Proposal Review Panel and the Executive Committee will work together to evaluate and approve proposals. Responsibilities within ECW will be the following:
- The Secretariat: Conduct general review of proposals. Provide project management support for the process, including the review process with the Independent Proposal Review Panel and Executive Committee. Recommend funding approval to the Executive Committee.
 - Independent Proposal Review Panel: Review proposed activities to stress-test its technical soundness and provide feedback to the Secretariat and/or to applicants as needed.
 - Executive Committee: Approve proposals.

GRANTEE SUPPORT PRE- AND POST- DISBURSEMENT

24. ECW will provide support to grantees, on an as-needed basis. Support will be triggered by the ECW Secretariat when deemed necessary. Requests from potential and current grantees will trigger a review of the request and will require approval by the Secretariat.
25. For each category of support, ECW will establish a set of priorities and support will be focused on the established priorities. Priorities will be refined over time based on what ECW learns through grant making.
- Pre-grant application coordination and technical support:
 - Will be based on needs from the field, but activities could include the following – e.g., coordination, coalition building, technical support in developing a joint proposal, and establishing necessary financial controls for grantees
 - Grantee capacity building:
 - Will be based on needs from the field, but activities could include the following – e.g., training and support on resilience and preparedness, evidence building and data, project management, coordination, and EiE standards
 - Field cultivation and readiness
 - Provide support to improve the readiness of country actors to apply for a Multi-Year Window grant and to cultivate a pipeline of potential countries to be funded in the future.

- Will be based on needs from the field, but activities could include the following – e.g., needs assessment support for grantees that were not part of the First Response Window, coalition-building support
26. These supports may be provided through a variety of channels including:
 - Directly by Secretariat staff
 - By third party partners, funded by the Secretariat
 - By third party partners, funded as part of the Multi-Year Window grant
 - Through in-kind support from the private sector
 27. Beyond the established set of support priorities, ECW will also partner with private sector consortia (e.g., Global Business Coalition for Education, leveraging its REACT database) to marshal in-kind support from the private sector for EiE. To facilitate this, the ECW Secretariat will share information on in-kind support opportunities with its network.
 28. In situations and in areas where ECW does not have the funding, capacity, or capability to provide support, ECW will provide guidelines on best practices to help on-the-ground actors, to the extent they are available or have been developed through the Acceleration Facility.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER ACTORS

29. Setting strategy – When ECW sets the Multi-Year Window's strategy as part of the overall strategic planning process, ECW will conduct a consultation process with stakeholders such as multilaterals, geographically representative groups of local governments, INGOs, and local civil society networks. This will enable the strategy to be developed based on needs on-the-ground, and ensure complementarity with existing efforts.
30. Selecting crises – ECW will conduct targeted consultations with stakeholders and experts on an as-needed basis as part of the crisis selection process.

VIII. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and Performance Management

OBJECTIVES

1. ECW will monitor, evaluate, and manage the performance of grants, in order to achieve the following objectives:
 - a. Ensure grants achieve desired results (aligned with grant-specific results frameworks and ECW's overall results framework), and conduct timely interventions when necessary
 - b. Enable reporting on ECW's overall impact and contribution to supporting EiE across grants
 - c. Facilitate decision-making by the Executive Committee, the Secretariat, and other ECW stakeholders
 - d. Stimulate learning and improve ECW's performance, as well as inform efforts across the EiE field more broadly
 - e. Ensure grant implementation practices abide by all necessary rules and requirements (e.g., legal, fiduciary)

KEY ACTIVITIES

2. Results monitoring: The ECW Secretariat will track and report on key indicators to measure progress at each level of ECW's Theory of Change. Tracking indicators at the impact, beneficiary outcome, institutional outcome, and output levels will enable ECW to assess the extent to which results along the Theory of Change are being achieved. Collected data will be made publicly available through an online database and disseminated every year through ECW's Annual Report.
3. Grant monitoring: The ECW Secretariat will monitor ECW grants to ensure grants are achieving aspired results, and to flag instances where a timely intervention is needed.
 - a. During the proposal application period, applicants will propose a grant-specific results framework and target indicators to be used to measure results. These will be vetted as part of the proposal review process. (In the case of funding modalities without a proposal process – e.g., matched funding – the Secretariat will consult with grantees to set a grant-specific results framework and target indicators.)
 - b. Throughout the duration of the grant, the ECW Secretariat will regularly monitor ECW grants / grantees. This will be achieved primarily through regular self-reporting of data by grantees, augmented as needed with additional input (e.g., household surveys, site observations, grantee stakeholder interviews) and direct Secretariat involvement.
4. Performance management interventions: The ECW Secretariat will manage performance interventions for grants / grantees that have been flagged as at-risk of not achieving aspired results (results framework and target indicators). ECW's performance management will consist primarily of:
 - a. Establishing and implementing a performance improvement plan
 - b. Providing grantee support (e.g., trainings, technical or advisory support from experts, coordination and coalition facilitation support)
 - c. Adjust grant funding disbursement (e.g., increases / decreases, changes in disbursement schedule)
5. Evaluation: ECW will conduct three levels of evaluations to build an objective understanding of *why, how, and how well* ECW is achieving its aspired results. Evaluations will be conducted by independent, third-party evaluators, with day-to-day oversight and support provided by the Secretariat. Evaluation plans will dictate the specific evaluations that ECW will conduct, and will be developed as part of ECW's strategic plan. The Executive Committee must approve all proposed evaluation plans and any proposed mid-cycle adjustments to evaluation plans. The three levels of evaluation are the following:
 - a. ECW evaluation: A summative evaluation at the end of each strategic planning period, to provide objective findings on ECW's performance overall and to inform the next strategic planning cycle
 - b. Programmatic and thematic evaluations: Routine evaluations conducted to assess the effectiveness of specific ECW programs (e.g., the First Response Window, the Acceleration Facility), and ECW's thematic focus areas across funding windows (e.g., gender, refugees). The evaluation plan will determine which programmatic and thematic evaluations will be conducted.
 - c. Grant-level evaluations: Evaluations conducted to assess the effectiveness of individual ECW grants. The evaluation plan will determine for which grant types ECW will conduct grant-level evaluations and the level of robustness /

comprehensiveness of the evaluations (e.g., ECW may choose to conduct a more streamlined evaluation for grants in the First Response Window).

6. **Dissemination and learning:** The ECW Secretariat will manage the dissemination of learnings from ECW's monitoring and evaluation efforts. In addition to dissemination strategies codified in the operating model design (below), ECW will retain discretion to conduct additional dissemination efforts in furtherance of ECW's objectives. Dissemination will be aimed toward the following stakeholders:
 - a. With grantees, implementing partners, and other in-country stakeholders: Relevant grant-level evaluation results will be shared with in-country stakeholders, to promote continuous improvement and learning.
 - b. With the Executive Committee: Evaluation results will be shared with the High Level Steering Group, to inform ECW strategy and decision-making
 - c. With the general public / a broad set of stakeholders: Collected data will be shared with the public through an online database on ECW's website, and disseminated every year through ECW's Annual Report. Learnings will also be shared via external relations efforts such as conferences and international forums.
7. **Compliance:** The ECW Secretariat, under the oversight of the Executive Committee, will develop a clear set of standard expectations for grantees with regards to grantee obligations related to relevant rules and regulations (e.g., ethics and conflict of interest, fiduciary oversight, legal compliance). The Secretariat will also require regular reporting from grantees on these aspects of ECW's terms and conditions and, with the Executive Committee will reserve the right to audit grantees at any time (either directly or through a contracted third party).

IX. Secretariat

ROLE OF THE SECRETARIAT

1. The Secretariat's role is, in partnership with the High Level Steering Group, to help ensure that ECW achieves its five key functions.
2. The key Secretariat activities, as outlined below, will be conducted by Secretariat staff and/or implemented through the support of third-party contractors.

KEY SECRETARIAT ACTIVITIES

Political advocacy and external relations

3. Support and amplify the High Level Steering Group's political advocacy efforts
4. Represent and support EiE efforts for the field more broadly (e.g., represent ECW in conferences, share technical expertise with the field)

Strategy

5. Facilitate ECW's strategic planning process (e.g., conduct analyses, engage stakeholders, conduct consultations, develop recommendations to High Level Steering Group).

Fundraising, financial management, and innovative financing

6. Mobilize new resources from traditional donors and non-traditional funding sources (including co-financing)

7. Steward current donors and investors, provide regular reporting as appropriate
8. Manage and report on donor earmarks
9. Design, pilot, establish, and manage innovative financing instruments

Grant making and management

10. Acceleration Facility: Translate strategic desired outcomes into RFPs; manage project selection process
11. Breakthrough Fund: Manage the full grant making process:
 - Assess crises and make recommendation on which crises to prioritize; for First Response, recommend which modality of funding to use for selected crises
 - Disseminate information about proposals to potential grantees and in-country stakeholders
 - Support grantees in proposal development including in-country facilitation support where needed
 - Assess proposals and make recommendations on whether to accept the proposal and at what level to fund
 - Support grantees in implementation (e.g., capacity-building)
 - Share information on in-kind support opportunities with grantees
12. Monitor and evaluate the project / grantee's progress toward desired outcomes (e.g., review grantee reports, flag issues, intervene if necessary, capture learnings from each project/ grant at completion)
13. Support the Fund Support Office in managing risk (e.g., fiduciary, financial, political, programmatic), and managing due diligence and fund recovery processes
14. Synthesize learnings across grants and investments, identify trends for future investments

Other Secretariat activities

15. Support Executive Committee activities
16. Support High Level Steering Group activities
17. Manage marketing and communication for ECW (e.g., annual report, website)
18. Manage ECW's budget (e.g., develop annual budget, manage spending)
19. Manage ECW's data, including data sharing and knowledge management platforms
20. Manage third party contractors
21. Ensure ECW is compliant with fiduciary and legal requirements (e.g., taxes, reporting, contracts)

Appendix I

Strategic planning overview

