# Programme summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme title</td>
<td>Continuing education for crisis-affected children in Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds request</td>
<td>US $14,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme duration</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target areas</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) areas as outlined in the 2021 HRP (both original and interim emergency response plan): Chin, Kachin, Rakhine, Northern Shan, Southeast (Kayin, Mon, East Bago), Kayah and Shan South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme objective</td>
<td>Crisis-affected girls’ and boys’ access safe, quality, and inclusive education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expected results

- 130,000 children aged 3-14 years old receive open learning materials and follow-up support for their safe and continuous learning
- 50,000 crisis affected children aged 5-17 years old receive learning kits to access basic education
- 20,000 crisis-affected children aged 3-5 years old receive early childhood education
- 10,000 crisis-affected children aged 11-17 years old receive non-formal education
- 3,250 volunteer teachers, community facilitators and caregivers’ capacity is enhanced to provide continued quality learning to and cater for psychosocial and socio-emotional needs of crisis-affected learners
- 16 local/national NGOs have increased capacity to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises and deliver continuous learning and other relevant activities

## Focus population

- Crisis-affected girls and boys
- Educators, inclusive of, but not limited to volunteer teachers, teachers employed in complementary systems, community facilitators and caregivers/parents
- Local/national NGOs

## Contact persons

- Duncan Harvey, Country Director, Save the Children Myanmar Country Office, duncan.harvey@savethechildren.org
- Krishna Palanisamy, Education Sector Lead, Save the Children - Myanmar Country Office, krishna.palanisamy@savethechildren.org
- Alessandra Dentice, Representative a.i. UNICEF Myanmar Country Office, adentice@unicef.org
- Mitsue Uemura, Chief of Education, UNICEF Myanmar Country Office, muemura@unicef.org
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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Accelerated Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>Civil Disobedience Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>Complaint and Feedback Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Coronavirus Disease 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDF</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATE</td>
<td>Curriculum Reform at Primary Level of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG</td>
<td>Child Safeguarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>Children with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHIS2</td>
<td>District Health Information Software 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNH</td>
<td>Do No Harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAO</td>
<td>Ethnic Armed Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPCG</td>
<td>Education Development Partners Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIE</td>
<td>Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Education Sector Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMT</td>
<td>Education Sector Monitoring Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETVSCG</td>
<td>Education, Technical and Vocational Sector Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCEL</td>
<td>Extended and Continuous Education and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYRS</td>
<td>Expected years of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDO</td>
<td>Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRM</td>
<td>Feedback and Reporting Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Grant Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEC</td>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIHA</td>
<td>Gender in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>Gender Parity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACT</td>
<td>Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBL</td>
<td>Home-based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNO</td>
<td>Humanitarian Needs Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRP  Humanitarian Response Plan
HRW  Human Rights Watch
HQ  Headquarters
ICT  Information Communication and Technology
IDP  Internally Displaced People
IEC  Information Education and Communications
IM  Information Management
INEE  Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies
INGO  International Non-government Organisation
IP  Implementing Partner
IPTT  Indicator Performance Tracking Table
JICA  Japanese International Cooperation Agency
KII  Key Informant Interview
KoBo  KoBo Toolbox
LAYS  Learning-adjusted years of school
LEG  Local Education Group
MC  Management Committee
MEAL  Monitoring, Evaluation, Assessment and Learning
MHM  Menstrual Hygiene Management
MHPSS  Mental Health and Psychosocial Support
MoE  Ministry of Education
MRM  Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism
MTB-MLE  Mother-tongue Based Multilingual Education
MTCF  Myanmar Teacher Competency Framework
NER  Net Enrolment Ratio
NESP  National Education Sector Plan
NFE  Non-formal Education
NGCA  Non-government Controlled Area
NGO  Non-government Organisation
NLD  National League for Democracy
NPT  Nay Pyi Taw
NRC  Norwegian Refugee Committee
NUG  National Unity Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar
OCHA  United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OL  Open Learning
ONA  Organisational Network Analysis Platform
OOSCI  Out-of-school Children Initiative
OpenEMIS  Open Education Management Information System
PDM  Post-Distribution Monitoring
PFA  Psychological First Aid
PIN  People in Need
PLC  Peer Learning Circles
PME  Programme Monitoring and Evaluation
PSEA  Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
PSS  Psychosocial Support
PTA  Parent Teacher Association
RO  Regional Office
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAC</th>
<th>State Administrative Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>Strategic Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Save the Children International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Social Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender-based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>School Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPHERE</td>
<td>SPHERE Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH</td>
<td>Sexual Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>Teacher Competency Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS</td>
<td>Teacher Competency Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Temporary Learning Centre/Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD</td>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPM</td>
<td>Third Party Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical Education and Vocational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>Village Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>Voluntary Service Overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Ws</td>
<td>Who, What, When, Where and for Whom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Strategic context

1.1 Country context

Myanmar is the largest country in mainland Southeast Asia with a diverse population of some 54 million people, with the state recognizing more than one hundred ethnic groups (World Bank, 2020). It is strategically located between China and India, well-positioned to play an influential regional role geographically, economically, and politically.

Though, for the past decades, the country has struggled with military rule, democratic reforms, civil war with ethnic minority groups, isolation from global affairs and widespread poverty. A significant portion of Myanmar’s population has experienced and coped with severe and deeply rooted humanitarian challenges, including armed conflict, inter-communal violence, and vulnerability to natural hazards. The western state of Rakhine alone is severely conflict-affected, with multiple rounds of inter-communal conflict, most recently and deadly in August 2017. At least some 6,700 Rohingya including 730 children below the age of five years, an ethnic Muslim minority, were killed during attacks between August and September 2017. Hundreds of thousands of Rohingya are presently displaced internally and nearly a million have sought refuge in nearby countries, such as Bangladesh.

However, Myanmar’s humanitarian crisis now has reached a distressed state. On 1 February 2021, the military, known as the Tatmadaw, seized power from the civilian-elected National League for Democracy (NLD) government and declared a state of emergency. The military takeover comes as Myanmar faces several intensifying challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic to multiple ethnic insurgencies which serve as a catalyst for increased violence and a deteriorating humanitarian crisis (detailed below in Section 1.2.1).

1.2 Education context

As one of the poorest countries in Southeast Asia, achieving inclusive access to quality education for children in Myanmar has been an ongoing challenge. Poverty was estimated at 24.8 per cent in 2017, with another 32.9 per cent of the population having consumption levels that put them at risk of falling into poverty. These populations are concentrated particularly in rural and conflict-affected areas, which creates an ongoing barrier to education access and strong learning outcomes. Despite this, Myanmar made some significant gains in education outcomes over the last decade, with primary net enrolment (NER) reaching 94 per cent in 2017, compared to 88 per cent in 2010. Gains that have been made are undoubtedly related to increasing funding towards education, but Myanmar has a history of under-investment in the education sector, and more progress is needed. Although public expenditure for education increased between 2011 and 2018, it remained at just 7.7 per cent of government expenditure and 2.2 per cent of GDP, which is far lower than neighbouring countries and other countries with a similar context.

---

1 In September 2018, a UN fact-finding panel released a report finding clear patterns of abuse by the military in Rakhine, Kachin and Shan States, including systematic targeting of civilians, committing sexual violence, promoting discriminatory rhetoric against minorities and creating a climate of impunity for security forces.
2 MSF, Press Release on Rohingya Refugee Crisis, 12 December 2017
However, 12.3 per cent of primary school children and 77 per cent of pre-primary age children remained out-of-school and in some parts of the country; up to 34 per cent of primary age children were not attending school\textsuperscript{5}; an approximate 1.5 to 2 million children were estimated to be out-of-school prior to the COVID-19 crisis. Data also shows significant disparities in access to education across Myanmar, with only 68 per cent of children in rural areas completing primary school education, compared to 96 per cent in urban areas\textsuperscript{6}. Preschool and early childhood enrolment is also considerably lower in rural areas. Education access and outcomes were also reported to be far worse for children of a lower socio-economic status. For example, six out of ten Grade 1 students drop out before the end of middle school; for poorer families this figure increases to seven out of ten.

Education delivery in Myanmar is supported by a variety of actors, including schools under the control of the Ministry of Education (MoE), community schools, and ethnic/indigenous education systems. Ethnic/indigenous education systems play an essential role in education service provision, especially in areas that would otherwise have no access to education. The different service providers are at various stages of development, with most only able to offer primary or basic education. The quality of the curricula, teacher professional development (TPD), learning assessments and teaching and learning materials also vary across the providers.

On the demand side, poverty, the cost of education, disability, poor health, and lack of interest are key barriers to children accessing education, especially for poor and rural households. Costs such as transport, tutoring, pocket money, as well as the opportunity cost of education (especially in post-primary levels) remain relevant. Lack of access to education in local languages and to education in conflict areas have also been noted to play a key role in poor education outcomes. Social exclusion in Myanmar, including in education, is associated with ethno-linguistic identity. Children of ethnic minorities in remote conflict-affected areas in particular face multiple inter-related barriers. They live in hard-to-reach areas, where education services are limited and acute poverty drives parents and caregivers to pull them out-of-school and into work, and the areas where they live tend to be affected by conflict and displacement. Language barriers further impede children to learn effectively, as the medium of instruction is in a different language than their own, and teachers are not trained to provide adequate support\textsuperscript{7}.

Gender differences also have an impact on education access in Myanmar, though national-level data fails to present the regional disparities. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) for primary school reached 0.98 nationwide in 2014. Despite the national achievement of gender parity in enrolment, attendance and completion, regional and economic disparities remain. In many areas, boys tend to lag in their school progression which is reflected in being over-age for the level of education in which they are enrolled. This situation in turn increases the risk of drop-out, which is associated with the high costs of post-primary schooling, and in particular the opportunity costs for boys as they age. This is even more pronounced in the context of low household wealth\textsuperscript{8}. Communities in Rakhine State experience the most significant gender disparities in the country. In 2010, more than half of boys and girls aged 10-15 in Rakhine State were out-of-school, including 51 per cent of girls and 49 per cent of boys. Women and girls bear the brunt of the crisis in Rakhine due to restrictive socio-cultural norms and high levels of sexual and gender-based

---


\textsuperscript{6} Ibid

\textsuperscript{7} Education Sector Analysis, Myanmar, 2020.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid
violence (SGBV) that have been further exacerbated by the conflict and crisis context, especially in the northern part of the state where women face higher risks of gender-based violence (GBV). During Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) conducted in 2020 with Parent Teachers Associations (PTAs) and children as part of project monitoring, Rohingya community members reported that girls in their communities tend to stop going to school after they hit puberty due to early marriage to avoid mixing with men, and so they can help their families at home. GBV plays a role in girls’ access to education in other areas as well. In Shan and Kachin states, members from various parties to the conflict have committed GBV against women, and there are anecdotal reports of families keeping girls from attending school due to fears of GBV. Evidence also suggests that improvements in infrastructure and perceived safety have a positive impact on girls’ access to education in these areas. In addition to basic concerns around access, cultural norms around gender roles can be observed throughout the county. These encourage conformity and submission in girls—two traits that are often rewarded in traditional, teacher-centred classrooms—while boys are more likely to be disciplined and less likely to be supported in the classroom, which could contribute to higher drop-out rates for boys as they get older (UNICEF, 2016). Boys and girls face strict definitions in behavioural expectations, with leadership roles generally assigned to boys.

Further challenges have also been noted in achieving inclusive education for children with disabilities (CWD) in Myanmar. In 2018, UNICEF reported that 47 per cent of CWD were out-of-school. The analysis indicated that education outcomes for girls with a disability were worse than those for boys with disabilities. Barriers to inclusive education include negative attitudes, weak implementation of relevant laws and policies and inaccessible education environment and facilities. A lack of appropriate support services and assistance for CWD, as well as weak teacher capacity and a shortage of appropriate teaching and learning materials, have also contributed to poor learning outcomes in inclusive education across Myanmar and continue to do so.

Overall, the above has led to poor outcomes in relation to learning outcomes and concerns with regards to education quality. For example, Early Grade Reading Assessments (EGRA) undertaken from 2014-2015 by the MoE reported that 10 to 15 per cent of grade two students were unable to read a single word in a level-appropriate paragraph and 27 per cent who could read didn’t understand what they read9. The World Bank’s 2020 report on COVID-19 demonstrated the challenges in quality through comparison between the expected years of school (EYRS) and the learning-adjusted years of school (LAYS). Factoring in what children learn from attending school in Myanmar, the LAYS is only 6.8 years while the EYRS is 10 years, indicating a learning gap of 3.2 years (World Bank, 2020). Various national reforms to address the issues in quality across the sector were underway prior to the military takeover, including a new KG-12 curriculum, the launching of a continuous professional development framework and teacher competency standard framework and pre-service teacher education curriculum revision. The status of the various reforms after the takeover and the MoE plans remain uncertain.

1.3 An evolving humanitarian crisis

Adding to the existing challenges of poverty and low levels of development, political unrest and COVID-19 are driving a growing humanitarian crisis in Myanmar. The COVID-19 pandemic already had a significant negative impact on Myanmar – both directly through COVID-19 infections and indirectly through the economic impact on the country. The situation further deteriorated on 1 February 2021, when the armed forces of Myanmar staged a military takeover by overthrowing the democratically elected government.

---

9 Myanmar early grade reading assessment for the Yangon region, the World Bank, 4 June 2015
In the weeks that followed, millions of people took to the streets to peacefully protest for a return to a democratic government. In response, the police and military began to open fire on their citizens and have since killed 900 citizens (including around 75 children), forcibly disappeared over 100 persons, and tortured and raped an unknown number in custody (HRW, 2021).

The combination of the military takeover and the COVID-19 pandemic have not only caused the healthcare system to collapse, but has also led to large-scale displacement, disruption to services and ongoing civil unrest and conflict. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA) reports that about 241,000 displaced people remain in camps or camp-like situations after fleeing violence in Kachin, Kayin, Shan and Rakhine states and that violence has broken out in new areas in Chin and Sagaing – two states with little to no active conflict prior to the military takeover10. This has disrupted considerable democratic and socio-economic progress made in Myanmar over the last decade. By the end of 2020, 83 per cent of Myanmar’s households reported that their incomes had been, on average, cut almost in half due to the pandemic (UNDP, 2021). Furthermore, World Bank economic projections predicted that the national economy would contract by 18 per cent from October 2020 to September 2021. This would cause the number of people living in poverty to double by the beginning of 2022 (World Bank, 2021). The number of children living in poverty has also dramatically increased. It is expected that by April 2022 over 50 per cent of all children in Myanmar could be living in poverty (UNDP, 2021). Already 35 per cent of income has been lost across all households in peri-urban areas, and 83 per cent of households across Myanmar report some loss of income. With minimal positive coping mechanisms amongst communities, the pandemic and military takeover have forced millions of people into extreme economic vulnerability.

In April 2021, the UN estimated that the number of people facing hunger could more than double to 6.2 million in the next six months, up from 2.8 million prior to February (WFP, 2021). WFP also reported greater reliance on negative coping mechanisms, such as borrowing money to buy food (ibid).

Along with the financial crisis and widespread loss of livelihoods, Myanmar’s banking system is paralyzed, resulting in shortages of cash, limiting access to social welfare payments, and preventing much-needed remittances from reaching hard-pressed families. Protracted and emerging conflicts in parts of the country (Northern Shan, Kayah, Chin and Kayin) continue to further exacerbate food insecurity, and rural households relying on farming for basic food security are forced to leave and crops are destroyed.

Mainly between July to September, Myanmar was also afflicted with a third wave of COVID-19 cases, with 3,739 new COVID-19 cases reported on August 11, 2021 (OCHA, 2021b). According to WHO11, from 3 January 2020 to 19 November 2021, there have been 516,146 confirmed cases of COVID-1 with 18,989 deaths in Myanmar. The country’s health system continues struggling to cope with patients, testing and vaccinations. This third wave of infections is creating even greater humanitarian needs. UN OCHA further reports that at least 125,000 people have been affected by monsoon floods since 21 July across various regions and states further aggravating an already precarious humanitarian situation12.

The combined impact of poverty, political unrest, natural disaster, economic crisis and COVID-19 infections is threatening to unravel all of the previous education gains achieved in Myanmar and exacerbate the existing challenges, creating an unprecedented challenge to inclusive access to education for girls and boys, particularly those living in areas severely affected by conflict.

10 Myanmar Humanitarian Update No. 9, 30 July 2021.
1.4 The growing learning crisis

Despite implementing the National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) (2016-21) with a focus to undergo major transformation, Myanmar was continually facing challenges in ensuring quality education for all children. The learning crisis included the lack of provision of quality, healthy, play-centred pre-school and primary education for all children, including those living in remote rural areas. The physical, intellectual, linguistic, emotional and social needs of children aged 3 to 6 years were not met and there have been challenges in providing basic education which ensures that all children successfully complete their primary, middle and high school education and acquire relevant learning competencies. To add fuel to this long standing crisis, there are now three layers of crises in Myanmar: 1) the protracted conflicts in various parts of the country that have been ongoing for decades (see Section 1.2 above), 2) the COVID-19 crisis which the MoE has not yet been successful in addressing and 3) the military takeover which has had immediate impacts and will continue to plague an already dire learning crisis.

Months into the COVID-19 crisis which resulted in nation-wide school closures, it was quite evident that long-term impacts on education would be faced by children throughout the country, especially for those already marginalised. In December 2020, the World Bank reported that less than 40 per cent of children enrolled in school in February 2020 had been engaged in learning activities with lower rates for children in the bottom wealth quintile. Where children were engaged in learning, 82 per cent reported that this was carried out by parents and caregivers providing tutoring and less than 10 per cent of households could provide online learning to their children. The World Bank also reported that reduced household incomes could act as a push factor for households to keep children out of school in order to reduce expenses or in favour of paid work as school dropouts are often motivated by educational costs (Central Statistical Organisation, UNDP and World Bank, 2020), particularly in the case of poorer households who are already more likely to struggle to afford the educational costs. At the time of the report, the LAYS was expected to be reduced by one full year, decreasing to 5.8 years (World Bank, 2020).

The military takeover has further derailed the return to school, and no doubt increased the negative impacts on learning. Although schools reopened in June 2021, there is widespread resistance amongst communities to the idea of giving a military-led education system legitimacy by allowing children to go to school. In addition, teachers are amongst the many professionals participating in the Civil Disobedience Movement (CDM) against the country’s post-military takeover authorities. This activism means that many teachers cannot or will not return to school; in May 2021, it was reported that around 125,000 basic education teachers and personnel, almost 25% of the number as of the 2020-2021 school year figure, were suspended by the MoE for their connection to the CDM (Reuters, 2021). The National Unity Government (NUG) has initiated home-based learning, mainly through online modalities, while the State Administrative Council (SAC) has disabled online platforms and demonstrated distrust in online education, resulting in further politicisation of education. All this has further added to the discomfort of partners and communities in sending their children back to school or engaging in any learning activities at all. The distrust in the SAC-run schools is compounded by fears of a return to state-centred indoctrination seen in the past and the loss of quality gains that have been made over the last decade. Those operating non-state education systems - particularly ethnic/indigenous education providers saw a drastic increase in enrolment in June and early July 2021, taxing schools that are already under-resourced. Increasing

---

13 The situation is understood to be unchanged at the time of this programme document writing
demand for private schools will diversify the education landscape further while deepening socio-economic disparities.

The school closures are most risky for children from marginalised households who are more likely to be drawn into child labour. Girls and female youth are at the highest risk of dropping out due to societal norms and expectations regarding their share of the burden of domestic chores, but also due to the risk of early marriage in the poorest households. There are also heightened risks of SGBV and early pregnancy due to lockdown measures, which in turn negatively affect girls’ ability to access education (World Bank, 2020).

Fears for the safety of children going to school or any other learning initiatives have also been heightened by the ongoing conflict, particularly as schools are increasingly unavailable due to occupation or interference by the military. According to the data from the Myanmar Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM) on grave violations against children, at least 197 attacks against schools and school personnel have been reported since the military takeover as of 21 October 2021, along with incidents of military use of education facilities (187) by the security forces (UNICEF, a co-lead of the MRM country task force). In addition, attacks have been reported against teachers who do not wish to take part in the CDM, which has prevented some from returning to school for fear of reprisals. As a result, education stakeholders are observing unprecedented levels of school dropout. Reuters reported that only 1 out of 4 children returned to school on the first of June 2021. In Kayah, due to the conflict, an education official told Save the Children International (SCI) that no children had enrolled in the conflict-affected townships, while unofficial reports from other locations range from 10 to 48 per cent, largely dependent on the communities’ political leanings and proximity to ongoing conflict. Even these numbers may be overestimated, as leaders of some schools have indicated they would inflate numbers to avoid scrutiny by the military authorities. At the time of writing, the new wave of COVID-19 has led to nationwide school closure once again. There is a risk that the new crises will overshadow the previously existing needs of the conflict-affected children. Given these reasons and the overall fragility of the current situation, it is likely that millions of children will continue to remain out-of-school in 2021 and possibly 2022.

1.5 Education coordination

1.5.1 Education Cluster (formerly Education in Emergencies Sector)

The Education Cluster was activated with a country-wide scope in August 2021, along with all other sectors that were not yet activated. Cluster activation formalizes the role of education in emergencies (EiE) partners in minimizing or eliminating disruptions to education for all children. Prior to the activation of the Education Cluster, the Education in Emergencies (EiE) sector had been supporting education for crisis affected children as per the HRP, responding to conflict-related displacements in areas with protracted crises, such as Rakhine, Kachin and Shan states, as well as the stateless Rohingya in Rakhine State. Now the Education Cluster in Myanmar has been mobilized to support the continuity of education in response to the evolving humanitarian crisis in Myanmar at a broader scale with a focus on critical activities to restore access to life-saving, quality education. At the national level, the Education Cluster is co-led by UNICEF and SCI and is facilitated by a dedicated Education Cluster Coordinator. The national-level

14 The Nutrition, Food Security and Protection sectors were also activated as clusters. Health, WASH and Shelter Clusters already existed in Myanmar, but now all have a country-wide scope.

15 Co-led by UNICEF and Save the Children, the EiE sector was established in 2013 and had been coordinating the education sector partners’ humanitarian education support work for children.
Education Cluster partners and coordinator work in tandem with sub-national EiE coordination groups currently operating in the following locations: Chin State with Sagaing and Magway Regions, Kachin State, Kayah State, Northern Shan State, Rakhine State, and Southeast Myanmar (Kayin, Mon, East Bago, and Tanintharyi). Each group at national and sub-national levels holds monthly coordination meetings.

The cluster activation has increased the demands on the coordination group to fulfil its mandate to respond to the growing crises, with increasing numbers of coordination groups and increasing demands from UN OCHA. Some technical support is already being mobilized, but these increasing demands will require greater support and capacity from a range of education partners to respond to the nation-wide learning crisis efficiently and effectively, while ensuring that the most marginalised are reached, including those who were already affected by the protracted conflicts prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Education Cluster preparedness and response actions are guided by the 2021 HRP, both original and Interim Response Plan, as well as cluster-specific plans. By June 2020, the then EiE sector finalised a COVID-19 Response Strategy and provided recommendations for home-based learning materials appropriate for early childhood education (ECE) through Grade 10. Since February 2021, the then Education in Emergencies (EiE) sector agreed on the critical activities which must be prioritized for continuation [support for continued learning at home or in learning spaces considered safe by the community, along with non-specialized psychosocial support (PSS), life skills and life-saving messaging and continued financial support for volunteer educators]. It also supported partners to consult with communities on their preferences and identified needs to continue learning for children across six states and regions and developed an EiE Provisional Strategy to guide preparedness and response through May 2022 (see Annex A).

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Accelerated Funding (AF) programme will build on the existing response from the Education Cluster and will support EiE partners to meet the HRP objectives for supporting safe, inclusive continued learning that promotes protection of children, including through capacity development of educators. The programme will also have a specific focus on improving engagement and resourcing for local partners as part of EiE preparedness and response.

1.5.2 Education Development Partners Coordination Group (EDPCG)

Prior to the military takeover, the Education and Technical Education and Vocational Training (TVET) Sector Coordination Group (ETVSCG) was the highest formal coordination group led by the MoE. All sub-sector working groups report to the ETVSCG. The ETVSCG was formed for the MoE to work with the development partners (DPs) and civil society organisations (CSOs) in implementing the national education sector plan (NESP). The DPs of the ETVSCG include multilateral and bilateral donors, CSOs and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), with SCI and Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) representing the INGOs. The EDPCG worked outside the ETVSCG to provide coordination on advocacy and support to the ETVSCG. Due to the current political crisis in Myanmar, the EDPCG, long-established education sector coordination group that is open and consultative, comprised of donors, multilateral organisations, UN agencies, non-government organisations (NGOs), CSOs, education programmes and projects, has assumed the role and functions of the Local Education Group (LEG), responsible for coordination and mobilisation of the technical and financial resources for the education sector.

16 For more information on the 2021 HRP and Interim Emergency Response Plan June-December 2021, see Section 2.2.3 alignment and contribution to response plans.
2. Programme design

2.1 Engagement with GPE

Myanmar has been receiving support from Global Partnership for Education (GPE) through multiple channels. USD73.7 million was awarded to Myanmar in 2019 through GPE’s Education Sector Plan Implementation Grant scheme to support the Myanmar’s sector plan development for 4.5 years from 2020 to 2024, with the World Bank as the Grant Agent, to manage it as part of the programme, Inclusive Access to Quality Education (IAQE), funded by the GPE ESPID, along with the World Bank’s International Development Association (IDA) and funding from the European Union. GPE COVID accelerated funding of USD11 million was awarded to Myanmar in June 2020, with UNICEF as the Grant Agent, for a period up to December 2021. GPE Education Sector Plan Development Grant, USD700,000, has also been provided to UNESCO as the Grant Agent from 2020 to 2024. As for the GPE Accelerated Funding, the proposal for USD14.7 million with the World Bank as the Grant Agent was developed and submitted to GPE in late 2020. The review and decision have been put on hold as the situation in Myanmar changed following 1st February 2021.

To address the learning crisis for children in Myanmar, particularly exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and the current crisis since the military takeover, the education partners came together around their shared commitment to every child learning and started an extensive consultative process in early 2021 to discuss key priorities to be supported and identify available funds.

One of the funding sources identified was the GPE AF. In 2020, the World Bank, the designated Grant Agent (GA) for the funding, led the process to develop a programme, which was approved by the ETVSCG, the then formal sector coordination mechanism chaired by the Minister of Education, and subsequently submitted to GPE in December 2020. After the internal consultation, the World Bank withdrew from the GA role for the AF, and a new GA selection was undertaken. SCI and UNICEF expressed interest and the DPs decided on the option to have two GAs, on the basis of various considerations, including: each agency has its own strengths to operate in the current challenging context; the volume of the work being high and yet it needs to be done urgently; and, sharing the work and responsibilities being one of the risk mitigation measures.

Upon the re-selection of the GAs, UNESCO, as the GPE coordinating agency, and the European Union (EU) and Finland, as education DP co-facilitators, prepared a document of key elements of GPE proposal development17 and shared with the GAs and partners. Based on the document, the GAs developed a proposed process with key milestones and timeframe for each and presented it to the education sector, DPs, and the Education Cluster.

Available data and information and education needs assessment and analysis that have been available at the time of this proposal development including the NESP 1 mid-term review, work done previously for the NESP 2 development, 2021 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and HRP and sector assessments after the military takeover, were used to inform the design process along with other sources and further analysis.

17 The one page document sets out key elements to be taken into account by the GAs for the programme development, including: GAs to propose the split in responsibilities and budget and get LEG approval; develop a timeline; allocate sufficient time for partners’ review on draft; need to draw upon the assessment, EiE consultations, and alignment with HRP, EiE, previous submission; risk mitigation strategy to be part of the proposal package; proposal on governance structure; proposal on monitoring.
It is the shared interest of the education sector donors and partners in Myanmar that, in addition to the programme objective to support the targeted children under this programme funded by GPE accelerated funding, lessons be drawn from the implementation of this programme, so that the evidence be made available to inform the sector’s effort to mobilise future resources and make existing resources available to address Myanmar’s deep learning crisis that is impacting over 12 million school aged children. This will go well with the sector donors and partners’ current effort to develop a Joint Sector Framework, with UNESCO being the lead along with technical support from UNESCO’s International Institute for Education Planning.

2.2 Consultative design process

Discussions at the Education Cluster meetings, both at the national and sub-national levels, as well as the discussions with education DPs, including identification of target population and geographical focus, have been considered in the proposal development process. At the same time, information of DP and EiE partners’ ongoing work and planned work has been taken into account with the view to make sure the GPE AF will be used to address the critical gaps, and not to replace existing donor funding.

To ensure no duplication of work or funding, in collaboration with UNESCO, the EU and Finland, the GAs collected the ongoing education work details for basic education in Myanmar. Since 1st February 2021, donors have stopped their bilateral engagement with the MoE. They also stopped financing partners to continue any work with the MoE. Instead, the donors continue or increase their support to work areas such as ethnic education, EiE in IDP camps and crisis-affected villages, including non-government controlled areas (NGCA) that are managed by ethnic armed organisations (EAOs) and where the Government of Myanmar has had no or limited access historically. The GAs will work closely with the Education Cluster to ensure complementarity between the GPE AF and the Cluster Strategy. The GAs will also continue engaging in the ongoing discussion with other global partners including Education Cannot Wait to benefit education support for children in Myanmar.

2.2.1 A shared roadmap

To inform the consultative process, the GAs presented a roadmap of milestones with a timeframe and an outline of the programme to the DPs and to the EiE sector in June 2021. Based on the feedback, the GAs further developed the outline, taking into account the information from the assessment and other references mentioned above, to identify key activities, and undertook a series of consultations with the education DPs and the Education Cluster. Together with traditional education sector partners, the gender in humanitarian action and GBV group participated in the consultation and provided inputs to ensure the programme adequately addressed gender-related issues.

During the consultation process, it was agreed to retain the focus on HRP target population, both 2021 original and interim emergency response plan following the February 2021 military takeover, with a priority to support those targeted children who have not yet been reached. This was based on the consensus that additional challenges, such as school closure from March 2020 due to COVID-19, the

---

18 The Gender in Humanitarian Action (GiHA) and GBV group is a member of the education sector group and offers expertise not only to the GPE AF proposal development but will also be available throughout the programme period.

current crisis due to the military takeover and the chronic challenge of out-of-school children, have created further challenges for the already marginalised children.

With the Education Cluster, in addition to the national level consultation, four sub-national consultations were organized to verify and prioritise key activities in July 2021. Among the organizations who participated in the consultation and provided suggestions regarding priority key interventions included civil society organizations (CSOs) (see Annex J for the lists of attendee organizations). On prioritization of activities from consultation – the activities were first determined and discussed at the national-level consultation on 2 July. Then, each sub-national consultation group had the opportunity to complete a survey ahead of the consultation, in which they could rank the activities by which were most critical in their locations. The survey rankings were then validated, and further detail added, in the sub-national consultations.

Comments were collected and used in the elaboration of the programme proposal. The key intervention areas that were prioritised include: provision of education kits and payment to volunteer teachers under the component of access to education; support to improve capacity of volunteer teachers, community teachers and facilitators, and expansion of Open Learning (OL) opportunities under the education quality component; and assessment, contingency planning, provision of small grants and expansion of EiE networks under the community systems strengthening. These identified priorities fed into the programme development.

Given the urgency to provide accelerated aid to support safe and continuous learning of children especially the most marginalised children, while recognizing the challenges for programme implementation in the complex operating environment, the duration of 18 months is considered appropriate for the programme implementation and has been agreed amongst the education partners.

### 2.2.2 Principles of engagement

In recognition of the dynamic context, the DPs have agreed to develop a living document to set out principles of engagement for the sector. It would consider each donor’s and agency’s internal, rigorous and continuous assessment and discussion. DPs are committed to supporting education as a fundamental human right that belongs to every child without any discrimination. To inform the development, the partners reviewed the Myanmar UN Country Team (UNCT) guidance on principles of engagement and for programme review as common references and reached a consensus around its key points. In addition, in line with the 2021 HRP and the EiE provisional strategy, humanitarian principles were considered to be upheld in the proposal development, including: humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence; human rights-based approach; gender equality; equity focus; do no harm (DNH) principle; and accountability to affected population (AAP). Recognizing the importance of an inclusive approach, the GAs ensured to engage and consult with key education stakeholders (e.g., CSOs, donors and DPs) and take into account available evidence from the previous consultations (with communities) as part of the commitment to fulfil accountability to the key education stakeholders.

---

20 Four consultations were held in: (1) Chin; (2) Rakhine; (3) Southeast; and (4) Northeast.
21 Although there was no activity for cash support included in the survey, there was an option for partners to add any activities that were missing.
22 An education DPs’ principle of engagement does not exist yet. At the time of this proposal development, donors are drafting one for education which is expected to play a key role in defining education DPs’ work, coordination, and engagement with the MoE for the overall sector.
For the education sector specifically, provision of support to the government school teachers and conducting other activities in and with the schools is considered as system strengthening; therefore, to uphold the humanitarian principles, support to the formal system was adapted to support community systems and provision of learning opportunities at community levels. Further, the GAs reviewed the outcomes of a series of community consultations, undertaken by some of the EiE sector partners between March and April 2021, whereby the communities provided a response as to the type of education they want for their children, taking into consideration gender issues to the extent possible, and specific support they want to receive for their children’s learning. Across the three partners’ community consultations, the biggest support requested by communities, was student kits and hygiene kits, and teaching and learning materials. Respondents further shared other options in place of providing learning kits to support children’s education, the responses received were: home-based learning kits (paper-based materials and educational games to complete at home); community libraries (run by volunteer librarian); reading clubs (led by a volunteer); learning clubs (led by a volunteer); audio lessons for children to complete some learning activities while listening; educational Television shows or videos.

As part of consultation to identify key priority interventions of the programme, the GAs also engaged with the EDPCG partners in July, based on the programme’s main components of Access, Quality and Local Systems strengthening, and facilitated the discussion to identify key interventions that are urgently needed under each component. Main proposed interventions included: provision of access to early learning; provision of teaching and learning materials; incentives to volunteer teachers; assessment of educators’ capacity gaps and needs, and training for them, capacity building and support for partner organizations (details found in Annex K). The results of the EDPCG consultation work helped in the identification of priority key interventions.

To respond to the EDPCG and EiE partners’ request for teaching and learning materials, the GAs first looked at the ongoing work by the education development partners’ work on ‘open learning’ (OL), previously known as home-based learning (HBL), with the view to provide resources and support to assist children’s learning continuity as they remained outside of organized learning opportunities. Within the broader education DP work (not focused on GPE AF exclusively), a task force was established, led by the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom (FCDO), with participation of education DPs, including SCI, UNICEF and Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The task force led the reconceptualization of HBL to fit in the changed context; development of a risk management strategy; and mapping of the existing HBL resources, which helped identify gaps in HBL. During this period, the term ‘HBL’ was changed to ‘OL’ (aligned to a well-understood Burmese translation), in order to avoid confusion and misunderstanding that it is linked to ‘home-learning’ which the NUG announced as its strategy to deliver education services to children and people in Myanmar.

Under the GPE COVID-19 programme (worth US$ 11 million), approved in June 2020 and managed by UNICEF as the GA, there is a dedicated focus on HBL, including development, printing and distribution of copies and follow-up support to children and their families. In collaboration with JICA, who assisted the MoE to develop short term HBL materials for primary education children, the EiE sector developed EiE HBL guides for parents and caregivers and educators in 2020 and EiE sector partners have been using

---

23 During SCI led community consultation, the cash support was requested specially in the communities in camps where they wanted cash for transportation to the MoE schools. But they all prioritised T & L materials as the main priority. Also taking into consideration that this project will adapt community based education, transportation needs will be minimum the budget for T & L materials increased largely. Due to the current crises, there are income related challenges hence we have included educator/volunteer incentive to reduce such burdens at the community level to support children’s access to education. Only in Rakhine, we considered some support to transportation costs to children who would attend the post-primary or middle schools.
those materials. These materials were designed to support children’s learning in the short-term (a few months). The gaps, confirmed by the HBL resource mapping, are around resources to assist children’s learning in the medium to long-term (6 months and beyond).

OL is one of the specific areas for which partners are making sure to avoid duplication. As per the task force that was established to look at the area of OL, the World Bank led the mapping of existing resources of OL, both for children’s short-term and medium to long-term. The group has been able to identify critical gaps which are considered in this proposal. DPs discussed the opportunity to use some of the GPE AF allocation to support ongoing priority work, OL, especially for the medium to long-term learning identified as a critical gap.

2.2.3 Alignment and contribution to response plans

This accelerated program, including prioritization of activities to be supported by GPE AF, is developed with a view of aligning the following documents and guidelines, taking into consideration cross-sectoral priorities, such as sustainability, presented in the next section 2.3:

a)  GPE Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations
b) The Education cluster’s need assessment
c) Previously submitted GPE proposal by World bank
d) HRP for 2021
e) Interim emergency response plan HRP for June - Dec 2021
f) Education cluster’s EiE provisional strategy

In alignment with the GPE Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations that emphasizes that there should be collaboration with the LEG and the Education Cluster and that the proposal must be based on the ‘Education Cluster’s needs assessment’ (GPE Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situation), the GAs reviewed the previous proposal for GPE AF (submitted in December 2020) and the education sector assessment, both prepared by the World Bank, and reviewed Myanmar’s 2021 HRP (OCHA, 2021a).

The HRP, launched in January 2021, identified more than one million people in Myanmar being “in need of humanitarian assistance” (ibid). For education, this includes 271,902 conflict-affected displaced and stateless children, primarily in Kachin, Northern Shan, Rakhine, Chin, and Kayin states. The 2021 HRP targets 206,500 children, of which the vast majority are in Rakhine (157,000) followed by Kachin (35,000).

24 GPE Guidelines sets out eligibility criteria for Accelerated Funding: (a) Eligible for education sector programme implementation grant funding; (b) affected by a crisis for which a humanitarian appeal has been launched and published by the UN Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs, with education as a part of that appeal; and (c) able to demonstrate that GPE funds will not displace government and/or other donor funds, but will be in addition to other resources.

25 The proposal must be: (a) based on the education cluster’s emergency needs assessment and/or an assessment of early recovery needs; (b) provide information on the sources of financing for other emergency and early recovery activities planned and information demonstrating that GPE funds will not displace government or other donor funding; and (c) contain an operational plan indicating activities, budgets, implementation strategies and a description of how activities will be sub-contracted to other organisations as appropriate.

26 ‘People in need’ include internally displaced people (IDPs), including IDP returnees/resettled/local reintegrated/other vulnerable crisis-affected people. Further, estimated disaggregation by age (including children (3-10 and 11-17 years), adults and elders) and disability are considered.

27 Calculation of the HRP target was done per township of the States by the then EiE sector on the basis of considerations including the sector’s knowledge of partners present to deliver an EiE response, the likelihood of partners who operate within the EiE sector to provide an EiE response to the identified population, etc. For 2021, on average, 76 per cent of the children identified as ‘in need’ was decided to be the HRP target (e.g., 76 per cent = 206,520/271,902*100).
and Shan (7,000). Kayin and Chin also have a combined target of 7,000 children. In 2020, humanitarian providers facilitated access to education for approximately 72,000 children aged 3-17 and provided capacity support for 2,200 teachers across these areas\(^{28}\) (OCHA, 2020). However, the HRP funding for education has been steadily decreasing, from 49.5 per cent funded in 2019 (US$ 8.43 million of the US$ 17 million requested) (OCHA, 2019) to 14.5 per cent (US$ 3.8 million of the US$ 26.1 million requested).

The GAs also reviewed the interim emergency response plan from June to December 2021 which was developed to enable prioritized emergency response activities beyond the scope of the 2021 HRP (OCHA, 2021a). This covers areas with new crises and displacements since February 2021 – such as Kayah State and areas around Mindat in Chin State - and the impact of the political situation on peri-urban townships of Yangon and Mandalay. At this time, there is no calculation of people in need (PIN) available for these new areas (a country-wide PIN will be presented in the 2022 HNO, now under development). However, four projects with an education response were submitted with the interim emergency response plan, targeting 56,000 children with the financial requirement of USD 1.4 million. For this GPE AF proposal development, the GAs will include areas with new displacement as much as possible.\(^{29}\) Yangon and Mandalay are not considered to be the priorities with limited resources because they are in better situation with regards to access to resources such as learning materials and services like internet access (while recognising that internet cuts across the country have been frequent and even scheduled at times).

The HRP and Interim Emergency Response Plan’s EiE objectives are to increase access of crisis affected girls and boys aged 3 to 17 years old to continuous, protective, quality and inclusive learning opportunities; improve the quality of education; and strengthen the education sector capacity. These three objectives remain relevant, with a change in the focus for the system which originally emphasized the government education system and the MoE, now changed to the non-governmental partners’ capacity and systems. Accordingly, the GAs took them as the programme components. The GAs also used the *Education Cluster’s EiE provisional strategy, June 2021 to May 2022* (see Annex A) to structure the overall design of the proposal, making the geographic scope and objectives aligned.

The EiE provisional strategy largely retains the objectives in the 2021 HRP and builds upon the Education Cluster COVID-19 Response Strategy (originally developed in April 2020 and updated in October 2020), with some minor adjustment, namely the inclusion of youth, community facilitators, and caregivers. The EiE provisional strategy, June 2021 to May 2022, sets out the following objectives (OCHA, 2021a):

1) Crisis-affected girls and boys, adolescents and youth (ages 3-24) have continued access to protective, quality and inclusive learning opportunities that promote their health and wellbeing.
2) Volunteer teachers, community facilitators and caregivers’ capacity is enhanced to provide continued quality education to and cater for psychosocial and socio-emotional needs of crisis-affected learners.
3) The education cluster (local/national NGOs and education spaces) has increased capacity to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises.

\(^{28}\) The current emergency programmes align with the NESP I and provide activities that support continued access to protective, quality, and inclusive learning opportunities, including the set up and running of the TLC’s for stateless children. Programmes also target both formal and non-formal teachers through capacity building to support the quality of education and to be able to cater for psycho-social and socio-emotional needs of crisis-affected children.

\(^{29}\) The Education Cluster provided estimated of children in need due to displacement since February 2021. This includes 4,445 in Chin State, 2,730 in Kachin State, 945 in Northern Shan State, 42,490 in Kayah State and two townships of Southern Shan State, 16,660 in Kayin State, 385 in Mon State and 829 in East Bago Region; totalling 68,484 children and last updated in July 2021.
As per the EiE provisional strategy, the populations targeted by the Education Cluster in the HRP and the interim emergency response plan are proposed to be the main target for the GPE AF with adjustment to the age group to make it focused on 3-17 year olds. This 2021 HRP includes communities affected by conflict, displacement and statelessness in Kayin, Kachin, Northern Shan, Southern Chin, and Rakhine States. The interim emergency response plan includes communities in peri-urban areas of Yangon and opens the door to rapid responses in other areas which face new humanitarian situations, such as conflict-related displacement in Kayah and Chin States.

With the Education Cluster now activated nationwide as of late August 2021, the cluster will develop a multi-year Education Cluster Strategy, tentatively looking at 2 years as a minimum, building upon the current strategy. It will also consider the sector response framework under development by the DPs’ group (as led by UNESCO). Recognizing that the situation remains fluid, regular and continuous review of the unfolding situation and discussion among the relevant education stakeholders is critical.

2.3 Cross-cutting priorities

During the process of programme development, several key considerations were identified as key priorities that the programme should ensure are addressed throughout the program life cycle. These include:

- Sustainability;
- Risks and mitigations;
- Humanitarian-development nexus; and
- Adaptive programming.

To address sustainability, the GAs, in consultation with the Education Cluster, prioritised the work to strengthen the community systems which is among the programme’s three components. A detailed table on risks and mitigations has been developed and included as Annex C. Humanitarian-development nexus is being addressed as the programme aims to support both the urgent and immediate education support to children in humanitarian context, and the work to build the capacity of key stakeholders to support medium-term work relevant to the development context. Given the current situation remains fragile and fluid, the GAs will prioritise monitoring work and regularly assess the situation to allow the programme to adapt to the context as needed.

With regards to the technical cross cutting areas, this GPE AF will continue to address challenges to gender issues, including girls’ access to education through specific measures such as menstrual health management and community engagement around the importance of girl’s education. In addition, together with CSO partners, this program will raise awareness on inclusive education and assess the situation for children living with disabilities to provide them with appropriate education materials and support. At community level, planning will help establish safe and conducive learning environments for girls and boys, including those living with disabilities. This includes initiatives like the child-centered code of conduct, designed with active participation of girls and boys.

Under the quality component, the capacity building will reinforce educators’ ability to apply teaching methodologies that promote inclusive, learner-centered and disability/gender-sensitive learning.

---

30 These are some of the ideas the program is planning but the actual implementation also depends on feasibility given the reality on the ground in the dynamic and challenging context
Educators/volunteers and teaching methods are instrumental to improving vulnerable groups’ educational outcomes. With the right training and capacity, educators can become positive change agents and role models, especially for girls. Gender-sensitive and disability sensitive teaching materials will be developed for training teaching staff to promote gender equality. Additionally, educators will be encouraged to use teaching methods that have proven to be most effective for girls and boys participation, including group and activity-based learning. The GPE program will engage with technical working groups and other platforms at appropriate levels to ensure gender programming is harmonized and coordinated with other actors.

3. Programme scope

The scope of the programme proposed by SCI and UNICEF for the GPE grant focuses on delivering inclusive and quality education to ensure crisis-affected girls and boys access safe quality education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing. To achieve this, a key consideration is the prioritisation of children who are the worst impacted by the current interplaying crises in Myanmar. This includes children affected by the protracted crises, children affected by increasing instability and violence created by the military takeover and children facing barriers to education created by the ongoing and escalating COVID-19 crisis in Myanmar (see section 1.1 on context for more detail).

To ensure that the most marginalised children are appropriately supported through programme activities, SCI and UNICEF have developed a programme that aligns with the HRP, as well as the education needs identified by key stakeholder groups, including the Education Cluster and EDPCG. Based on consultations with these groups and other key education actors in Myanmar, the proposed programme constitutes of 18 months of activities, with commencement aimed for December 2021 and programme closure in May 2023. These consultations have also helped to define the geographic scope and beneficiary prioritisation for the programme, which are outlined below.

3.1 Geographic focus

The geographic scope of the programme is based on identified Education Cluster needs and capacity at the sub-national level. In each area, a lead agency has been defined to deliver the key interventions based on relative capacity, experience and strengths of each GA (see Annex E for details on the roles and responsibilities of each GA). Across the programme, there are two levels and stages of implementation. The national-level design of activities and resource development or consolidation will contribute to the immediate quality of the programme, as well as the sustainability through contributions to the Education Cluster. At sub-national levels, capacity building initiatives and implementation of local priority activities in each geographic location will be led by the different GAs. Both agencies will contribute to knowledge sharing, learning and capacity building through existing mechanisms, such as the Education Cluster Task Teams.

The map in Figure 1 below presents the prioritised states for the programme. The focus areas are based on the highest areas of need based on the PIN data as provided in the 2021 Myanmar HRP (original and interim emergency response plan) and include: Chin, Kachin, Rakhine (Central and Southern), Northern Shan, Southeast Myanmar (Kayin, Mon, East Bago) and Kayah and Southern Shan. Children in Mandalay

---

31 Same as above
and Yangon are better equipped to access resources online. Therefore, efforts will be made to ensure partners responding in these urban areas are able to benefit from the OL resources developed through this programme, but these geographic locations will not be prioritized for the full implementation of the programme. Figure 1 below highlights the prioritised states.

*Figure 1 Map of prioritised states*

3.2 Beneficiary focus

The programme scope has also been defined in terms of beneficiary selection. Once again, this focus has been developed in consultation with the Education Cluster, EDCPG and other key education stakeholders at the national and local level (see Section 2 on programme design for more information on the design process). Based on these discussions, the programme includes three key beneficiary groups within the areas of geographic focus:

1) Crisis-affected girls and boys (ages 3-17). This refers to the children affected by the protracted conflicts as well as the crisis since the military takeover in February 2021 as defined in the 2021 HRP and HRP interim emergency response plan.
2) Educators, inclusive of but not limited to volunteer teachers, community facilitators and caregivers
3) Local/national NGOs and other actors delivering education and other relevant activities

---

32 At the time of this proposal writing, the main target for this is educators working outside the government system. During the course of programme implementation, the question on whether to include government school teachers or not during the course of programme implementation will be discussed and analysed by the education partners, and the decision is proposed to be made by the Steering Committee.
The HRP 2021 and interim emergency response plan identify 1,958,884 girls and boys in need nationally (including the figures for Yangon and Mandalay)\(^3\) and the Education Cluster is targeting 206,100 girls and boys. Through the GPE AF programme activities, the aim is to reach\(^4\):

- 130,000 children aged 3-14 years old (targeting 65,000 girls, 65,000 boys and 19,500 children with disabilities) receiving OL materials and follow up support for their safe and continuous learning,
- 50,000 crisis affected children aged 5-17 years old (targeting 25,000 girls, 25,000 boys and 7,500 children with disabilities) received learning kits to access to basic education,
- 20,000 crisis-affected children aged 3-5 years old (targeting 10,000 girls, 10,000 boys and 3,000 children with disabilities) receiving early childhood education,
- 10,000 crisis-affected children aged 11-17 years old (targeting 5,000 girls, 5,000 boys and 1,500 children with disabilities) receiving non-formal education,
- 3,250 volunteer teachers, community facilitators and caregivers’ (targeting 1,825 women, 1,825 men and 160 people with disabilities) capacity is enhanced to provide continued quality learning to and cater for psychosocial and socio-emotional needs of crisis-affected learners and
- 16 local/national NGOs and other actors delivering education and other relevant activities.

Targeting of children will prioritise the populations as defined in the HNO and HRP: displaced persons, displaced persons who have returned, resettled or integrated; stateless non-displaced persons and other vulnerable populations (this means vulnerable members of host communities). Clarity on exact locations and targets must remain flexible in this increasingly complex crisis, but the noted typologies will guide the prioritisation, alongside the prioritisation for children insufficiently supported by current education partner initiatives. Targeting children who are on the move will be facilitated by the community and volunteer teachers who are most likely to be moving with them in some locations, and those who know where such children are as they are in the same areas. Further, it is important to note that the HNO 2022 has not yet been finalized at the time of this document development, and the GAs will work closely with the Education Cluster to align this programme with the priorities and children identified in an updated report. It is also worth noting that the Education Cluster has been taking into account the proposed work under the GPE AF programme and the funding in the 2022 planning under the HRP. Finally, the information management (IM) system developed through key intervention 3.1 will further serve to ensure the targeting represents a confluence of HNO typologies and current access to learning.

This programme takes an inclusive approach ensuring that all interventions consider and address the barriers to learning for girls, boys and children with disabilities. To ensure meaningful participation of girls and children with disabilities, specific attention will be given to them in the targeting process to ensure they are not left behind.\(^5\)

4. Programme outline

4.1 Overall objective

\(^{3}\) The HRP interim emergency response plan includes new displaced figures that are based on UNHCR documentation of displacement since 1 February 2021 and with Yangon (1,162,440 children) and Mandalay (456,886 children) children in need figures for information settlements in peri-urban townships, the total number of children in need increases to 1,958,884 children.

\(^{4}\) These targets are aggregated from the estimated targets and are not yet adjusted to account for potential double counting.

\(^{5}\) All targets include an aim of ensuring 50 per cent are girls and 7 per cent are children with disabilities.
The programme has been designed on the premise that:

- **If** crisis-affected girls and boys access safe learning spaces with basic materials to continue their learning, including the provision of non-formal education (NFE), life skills and early childhood education (ECE), with supportive and compensated educators and strengthened parents/caregivers and community members, and
- **If** the quality of learning is improved through educator capacity building, development of OL modalities and materials and community engagement and support for OL, and
- **If** community systems are strengthened to improve monitoring and IM and the Education Cluster via evidence generation, development of joint contingency plans and increasing the capacity of local partners to coordinate EiE responses,
- **Then** crisis-affected girls and boys (ages 3-17) will access safe, quality and inclusive education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing.

As outlined above in the Programme Scope Section 3 and illustrated below in Figure 2 (a summarised schematic overview of the programmatic structure) the purpose of the proposed programme is to ensure that the most marginalised crisis-affected children, including those out-of-school or at risk of dropping out, access quality learning opportunities to acquire the relevant skills and resilience to continue their learning and reinforce their wellbeing (see Annex B for a detailed Theory of Change).

**Figure 2 Programme structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall goal</th>
<th>Enhanced learning and wellbeing for crisis-affected girls and boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core components</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main interventions</td>
<td>Established safe learning with materials &amp; educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded ECE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded NFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened PTAs/SMCs/VECs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Programme components and outcomes

The programme proposed for GPE incorporates three major components:

1. Improve safe and inclusive access to education for crisis affected girls and boys.
2. Enhance the quality of education for crisis-affected girls and boys.
3) Enhance the capacity of the Education Cluster, especially local partners, to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises.

The programme components align with the key objectives of the education component of the 2021 HRP. The immediate and urgent needs of the children in crisis contexts will be served through Component 1, with a particular focus on major geographical and sub-sector gaps that have chronically faced the Education Cluster partners. Component 2 will improve the quality of education services for the increased numbers of children reached by partners in Component 1, as well as those who are already benefiting from the existing EiE response, mainly through OL and educator capacity development. Component 3 will serve to strengthen and invest in the partners’ ability to respond in an effective and coordinated manner in the future, maximizing the impact of the Components 1 and 2, including the elements that relate to technical resource development, consolidation and strengthening.

All aspects of the programme will consider the importance of cross-cutting issues, integrated emergency response and localisation. This approach considers communities as partners, empowering them to lead in decisions and actions taken to ensure education continuity and child wellbeing. Key life-saving messages will be mainstreamed throughout, especially those related to COVID-19 and child protection (CP). Further, guidance will be provided to educators, volunteers, and communities to identify and refer children in need of case management and mental health resilience, and social emotional learning (SEL) will be mainstreamed into relevant learning activities. Adaptations and consideration for supporting children with disabilities will be mainstreamed throughout the activities and the needs of girls and boys will be considered and incorporated depending on the varying needs identified by geographic location (see Context Section 1).

4.3 Key activities and outputs

For each programme component, a series of indicative activities have been developed to support achievement of the outcomes. The activities for each component are outlined below.

Component 1: Access

Component 1, on education access, will improve safe and inclusive access to education for crisis affected girls and boys in Myanmar through responding to basic, immediate needs for education service provision. Safe learning spaces and basic service provision for primary and lower secondary education (sub-component 1.1) will be complemented by the engagement of education committees to ensure the protection and wellbeing of children in sub-component 1.4. Sub-components 1.2 and 1.3 will address key gaps in the sub-sectors of early childhood education and non-formal education, but elements from the other sub-components will inform the design of these comprehensive packages, especially related to safety, protection and wellbeing. Children targeted in component 1 will subsequently be supported by interventions in component 2 related to teacher quality and OL initiatives. More information on targeting and the importance of flexibility can be found earlier in Beneficiary Targets Section 3.2.

1.1. Provision of safe learning spaces and basic materials to ensure continuity of education services

As described in the strategic context above, there are significant immediate and urgent needs for the most basic education requirements of children in the most marginalised communities in Myanmar. It is evident
that the Education Cluster partners are unable to reach all children targeted within the HRP (an annual challenge) given the deteriorating context:

- An expanding crisis places additional burdens on existing learning spaces.
- An increasing economic crisis is increasing the economic barriers to education, such as teacher stipends, especially in NGCAs supplemented by communities.
- The contextual volatility and displacements are increasing the challenge to set-up quality education services both quickly and in the short-term.
- A lack of experience and evidence-base for digital mobile education, combined with extremely low-resourced environments (lacking electricity and internet) and the short-term nature of displacements, makes it challenging to identify immediate, flexible, and durable learning solutions.

The basic provision of education services to ensure continuity of access includes support for improving the safety of the learning environment, a reduction of demand-side barriers to accessing education, and support for educators who are not teaching within the formal MoE system. School, and/or teacher kits and student kits (including umbrellas, stationery, bags, etc.) will be provided, including COVID-19 prevention materials for classrooms, educators, and students, to reduce the economic barriers while enhancing safety measures, as well as menstrual hygiene management (MHM) kits where relevant. Consultation with girls and women to identify the needs for MHM materials will be undertaken. Kits will be in alignment with the Education Cluster standards. Support for safe learning spaces and/or classroom infrastructure (e.g., furniture, partitions, etc.), including sufficient numbers of latrines for girls, will be supported in this intervention, with safety assessments conducted to ensure child safeguarding (CSG) remains central, as well as a DNH approach.

To address the chronic teacher gaps, a reduced student-teacher ratio, reduced economic burdens on communities and teacher and educator salaries will be provided for a period of 12 months. The standardization of volunteer teacher salaries has been undertaken in Rakhine State and Kachin State, and workshops will be conducted in the remaining HRP locations.

Recognizing that the frequency and number of displacements are likely to increase, this intervention will also pilot mobile classrooms through a blended digital classroom approach that will include the provision of hardware and technical support that is appropriate to the extremely low-resource settings in which the programme targets. Evidence from this pilot can inform the Education Cluster partners and other education initiatives in the future, contributing to the sustainability and capacity of the Education Cluster partners (Component 3).

To ensure the programme is addressing critical and urgent gaps, this intervention will target girls and boys that are not currently being reached by Education Cluster partners, those that have been displaced due to the most recent crisis and those who are currently being reached by partners, but particularly have urgent needs related to safety.

1.2 Expand access to Early Childhood Education

Early childhood education (ECE) is more than preparation for primary school and as it aims at the holistic development of a child’s social, emotional, cognitive and physical needs in order to build a solid and broad foundation for lifelong learning and wellbeing. ECE has the possibility to nurture caring, capable and
responsible future citizens. Given this rationale, this programme recognizes that ECE is a key investment in a child’s future - especially for children from the poorest communities - and can have a substantial impact on the life-long wellbeing of the child. For young children in Myanmar, the realities, and challenges around quality ECE include:

- High numbers of out-of-school children at pre-primary levels;
- Critical gaps in ECE reach, both in the demand (awareness on the benefits) and supply (resources dedicated to pre-primary education); and
- A diverse landscape of ECE providers, with most children enrolled in pre-primary outside of the government system.

To address the gaps in ECE services, a problem prevalent throughout Myanmar, this programme will support holistic ECE interventions integrated with other suitable components, with priority for locations without any type of ECE opportunities currently available. The modality of ECE opportunities appropriate to the different contexts will vary, including kindergarten classes linked to primary education learning spaces, faith-based centres, community-based centres, as well as small group home-based and parent-led initiatives. According to mapping exercises conducted through the Education Cluster and the EDPCG, there are several resources available to support these different forms of ECE provision. The first step for the technical partners, including the GAs, will be to review, consolidate and strengthen the existing resources, both learning materials as well as availability of caregivers and caregiver/facilitator capacity development modules, to better serve Education Cluster partners in the future. This can include a decision-making tool to assist partners in the most appropriate model for the communities they serve. Disability and gender inclusion mainstreaming, as well as CP referrals and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) will be integrated into resource strengthening and caregiver capacity development will be a key focus of these technical reviews.

In identified locations, safe spaces for learning will be established, and the provision of ECE kits to help create a quality learning environment will be provided. The ECE kits will include educational games, emergent literacy storybooks and materials that support SEL. Recruitment of caregivers and facilitators as well as minimum standards of capacity building will ensure quality teaching and learning; this capacity building will be linked to the national technical review of resources described above. Exploration and recommendations for addressing the burdens on female caregivers will be considered during recruitment to reduce turnover and improve quality.

It is essential that communities play an active role in ECE for sustainability, as understanding on the importance of early learning remains a key barrier to enrolment, and support for ECE by the government has long been insufficient. This local stakeholder engagement will also vary, ranging from the more simplistic community mobilisation initiatives to capacity building for more formalized ECE committees. Engagement of fathers and other male caregivers in ECE will be part of the community mobilisation efforts, building on experiences of the Education Cluster partners, for consideration during the technical discussions in the first stage. Guidelines for supporting gender equality and inclusion of people with disabilities and youth in ECE committees will be part of capacity building for the establishment or strengthening of committees. Additionally, in locations where centre-based models could continue beyond the life of the programme, a revolving fund mechanism will be established to support ongoing costs for continued provision of ECE. This revolving fund is initiated through the provision of seed funding

---

36 GAs, together with implementing partners, will work with the community and local leadership to identify the right people with positive attitude and to be trained on basic ECE skills and working with young children
to the ECE committee, as well as training on how to manage the account and the microfinance loans that are used to generate income for the centre. Depending on the continuously evolving situation, these ECE committees can be supported to link to township-level and/or the nationally federated ECE network group.

1.3 Provision of non-formal education and life skills education for adolescent girls and boys

This intervention will target adolescents in the age range of 10-17 years who have been out-of-school before the COVID-19 induced school closures and those who dropped out-of-school after the February 2021 military takeover. In addition to academic content to improve literacy and numeracy, adolescents will also receive life skills education, covering protection, safe migration and prevention from trafficking, sexual reproductive health, MHM and effects of substance abuse. The intervention will include elements of the Extended and Continuous Education and Learning (EXCEL) model, with one cohort and a single cycle.

EXCEL is conceptualized as an approach to equip adolescents with personal and interpersonal competencies to overcome the various challenges they face in everyday life through informed decision making. It aims to promote expanded learning opportunities for out-of-school children to continue to learn, with attention to life skills, developing safe behaviours and preparation for adult roles. EXCEL builds social connectedness among out-of-school adolescents and contributes to their social protection. The EXCEL model also allows adolescents to participate in society and contributes to their full development. A strong partnership with the community is a prerequisite to the success of the EXCEL intervention.

Existing NFE and life skills materials will be printed and distributed in different locations for use by learners and facilitators. These materials include literacy and numeracy workbooks, story books and facilitator guides. Delivery modes will include face to face and home visits. Identification of eligible children will be done at community and township level through sensitisation and community mobilisation. Specific attention will be paid to ensure inclusion of girls, the poorest, those with disabilities and children on the move. Community mobilisation will be crucial to generate awareness of NFE opportunities and their benefits within the communities in which they will be implemented, and to enlist and encourage support and ownership of NFE activities by communities.

Facilitators will be recruited from local communities through coordination by local CSOs. Facilitators will be trained to strengthen their capacity to deliver NFE and life skills education, including MHM and sexual reproductive health (SRH) for adolescent girls. A training of trainers’ approach will be adopted, starting centrally, followed by training at the sub-national level. Monthly financial incentives/allowances will be provided to facilitators to retain and motivate them. Quality assurance for this intervention will be provided by locally recruited township monitors, UNICEF as well as CSO staff at field level.

1.4 Support Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), School Management Committees (SMC) and/or other village education committees (VEC) to ensure protection, safety and wellbeing of children

This intervention seeks to address the main concerns around the protection, safety and wellbeing of children, including:

- Increased CP risks in the current context;
- Continued disruptions to the continuity of education, due to conflict and COVID-19; and
Limited guidance and action to promote safe and healthy journeys to and from school, such as to address girls being harassed on the way to and from school.

In the schools, temporary learning centres (TLCs), and community learning spaces targeted above in intervention 1.1., GPE partners will work with PTA, SMC, VEC or other education committees to build their capacity in safety, protection and the wellbeing of children. This activity will build on existing capacity building initiatives from the Education Cluster partners on topics most relevant to the areas targeted. To identify relevant topics, a consultation mapping will be conducted. Topics are likely to include: COVID-19 mitigation, CP, CSG, SEL, mental health and psychosocial well-being and psychological first aid (PFA).

In addition, it will be important to integrate gender-responsive parenting and caregiving messages, sensitisation and outreach in the capacity building initiatives to promote positive gender norms and socialization and to raise awareness about the importance of the engagement of male spouses and other male family members in the education of children. This is particularly important given the impact of COVID-19 on gender and parenting as evidence shows that women are bearing the brunt of increased caregiving and domestic responsibilities. Through the initiatives, parents and caregivers can be made aware that gender stereotypes are harmful for child development, and of the importance of equity, respect and the recognition of individual strengths. Parents, especially fathers or other male caregivers, can be engaged in children’s learning and developmental activities that promote positive gender-responsive parenting – such as sharing household duties; engaging in learning through play; using positive discipline – to increase understanding of the impact of harmful gender socialization on children, and the value of modelling gender-equitable behaviours at home.

Activities could also include support to establish more comprehensive school/centre management mechanisms such as the establishment of School/centre Safety Teams, responsible for developing safe schools policies and procedures such as through participatory risk analysis, school improvement plans (SIP), CP mechanisms, school codes of conduct, education and protection continuity plans, etc. In some areas, safety on the way to and from schools is a significant concern, and education committees will be mobilized to initiate plans to reduce risks (e.g., an escort system for girls in Rakhine). This will ensure the safety of at-risk girls and female teachers in selected locations. Materials for COVID-19 prevention will also be distributed, including information, education, and communication (IEC) materials such as child-friendly posters and vinyl.

Component 2: Quality

This programme component is designed on the recognition that continuous access to quality learning is a right and priority for children affected by conflict. Component two will ensure that quality learning opportunities start with supporting and strengthening the capacity of educators and recognizes the value of quality teaching and learning materials and engaged parents, caregivers and community members, who are able to support their children’s learning progress – all in an effort to yield quality learning outcomes.

2.1. Strengthen educators’ capacity, targeting competencies identified in capacity gaps assessment
The target population for this proposed key intervention is educators defined as (inclusive of, but not limited to) volunteer teachers, teachers employed in complementary systems (e.g. ethnic, monastic), education facilitators, and community education volunteers\(^{37}\).

It is proposed that, in collaboration with other relevant education sector partners, the GPE GAs will establish a TPD model aligned to SCI and UNICEF’s established TPD approaches and the MoE’s Continuous Professional Development Framework (CPDF).

- (1) One of the most important steps in TPD is a needs assessment as it frames what professional development actions should be considered. Undertaking a teacher assessment will help define the collective learning needs of the teachers and educators supported by partners and identify their needs for PSS.
- (2) A Teacher Competency Survey (TCS) for the programme will be established to help align TPD content and activities to relevant competency objectives. The Myanmar Teacher Competency Framework (MTCF) and ethnic systems TCFs will be used to help frame the questions, and a consultation process targeting educators, Education Cluster partners, and other key stakeholders will be conducted to gather information to inform the development of the survey tool.

A TCS will be conducted across different educator types, and is expected to cover topics including OL, subject knowledge, language, teaching skills (or pedagogy), child development, CP, gender, inclusion, social emotional wellbeing and PSS\(^{38}\). It will also consider educator motivation, wellbeing and safety. The TCS tool will be made available to all Education Cluster partners and will be considered as an option for capacity development planned in Key Intervention 3.4. After the tool is developed, it will be rolled out through partners, with the results analysed by geographic location. During the consultation process conducted for the design of this programme, some Education Cluster partners already highlighted the needs for curriculum-based training for the teachers depending on local context; CP/safety training/mentoring; child rights and child development relevant training; teaching methodology; stress management; and prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) training. Other possibilities include gender equality and GBV.

Using the results of the assessment, the GAs and partners will identify, consolidate, and adapt TPD resources available. These resources will include facilitator guides and training materials for face-to-face training, self-study materials including practical activities for educators to engage in self-directed learning, and guidelines for supporting peer learning circles (PLCs) and coaching among educators. All materials and content align with the Myanmar Continuous Professional Development Framework, and consideration for the humanitarian context targeted within this programme will necessitate adaptation. There are some digital and/or multimedia education materials for educators available within the Education Cluster, and an analysis of learnings and recommendations for expansion of such materials will inform the development of key modules. All hard-copy materials (i.e. facilitator guides and training materials, self-directed activities, peer learning and coaching guidance) will be translated into ethnic languages that are used in the curricula of the major Ethnic Basic Education Providers. All educators will be provided with a Teacher Competency Profile (TCP) pack that will enable them to track completion of their TPD activities and progress against the relevant competencies for their role.

\(^{37}\) Whether to include government school teachers, see the earlier footnote in the Section 3.2 Beneficiary focus.

\(^{38}\) The final decision on specific topics will be made by the education partners, including and support from GAs
Subsequent to the development of the key modules, a capacity development plan for partners will be developed for each region, and training of trainer sessions will be conducted for partners to support their roll-out of the training for their educators with a focus on maximising fidelity while also adapting elements as necessary to the regional context.

2.2. Support Open Learning for children’s safe and continuous, long-term learning

This intervention will target crisis-affected primary and lower secondary school aged girls and boys, as well as overaged students up to the age of 17, that have not yet completed basic education, with an equity focus on marginalised groups, including children with disabilities, that have limited access to formal learning opportunities. Flexible OL interventions, that are designed to be used across a variety of learning settings, including at home, in community learning groups and/or as part of a partial return to community learning centres or formal schools will be provided for both immediate, short-term learning needs as well as longer-term ongoing needs.

To ensure successful OL interventions that can meet existing and new challenges that may arise, three key elements will be put in place. The first is the provision of adequate quality learning materials for students. Second, the ability to teach new material and concepts to children, as well as ensuring that timely follow-up and support is provided, even in situations where the possibility for learning facilitators or volunteer teachers to hold regular formal lessons is restricted or reduced. Thirdly, adequate support to parents or caregivers, to ensure there is a good understanding of how their children are expected to learn and the crucial importance of their support and encouragement for their children’s learning.

In terms of the provision of quality resource materials, at the time of proposal development, whilst there are a range of short-term OL materials that will be printed and distributed in the short-term to meet immediate needs, there is a real lack of medium (over 4 months) to long-term (up to a full academic year) paper-based and/or audio materials. Under the GPE COVID-19 response programme, and in cooperation with JICA-CREATE (Curriculum Reform at Primary Level of Basic Education), primary school level materials for the longer-term were being developed in cooperation with the MoE. However, these were not finalised. The MoE had been developing new lower and upper secondary education curricula (including the development of textbooks, teachers guides, student assessment-related guidelines and other materials) with support under the Equipping youth for Employment Project (executed by the MoE and financed by the Asian Development Bank). As of January 2021, the MoE continued to prioritize preparation for in-person delivery after school reopening. Following 1st February 2021, it has become necessary for development partners to ensure development of new learning materials in longer term. Whilst some medium to long-term materials will be developed under the GPE COVID-19 grant, it is envisaged gaps will remain due to the time frame required to develop these materials. Hence, this is considered as a high priority under the GPE AF grant and it will be important to ensure the allocation of sufficient funds.

Education stakeholders have decided that in the current context, it will be important to prioritise foundational numeracy and literacy skills and that the focus for the GPE AF will be a combination of paper

31 Non-governmental partners to implement Open Learning, once selected, have the responsibility to provide adequate human resources to support with teaching and provide them with safety and protection measures, in coordination with the GAs.
and audio-based materials, in the interests of making resources available to the most disadvantaged groups. Therefore, readily available shorter term numeracy and literacy materials, including: age-appropriate storybooks, including those incorporating life skills and safety awareness messages; local language and local knowledge materials to support the use of mother-tongue based multilingual education (MTB-MLE); and NFE and life skills, especially for out-of-school adolescents, will be made available to partners in both soft and hard copies to be utilised from the start of the programme. And, as longer-term paper/audio materials designed to be used for a full year become available, these will be further distributed in both hard and soft copies.

In terms of the need to teach new concepts to learners, as well as ensure adequate follow up, OL interventions will seek to ensure maximum flexibility in delivery methods, whilst keeping the provision of resources to no-tech and low-tech solutions. Facilitators will be recruited from local communities through coordination by local CSOs. Monthly financial incentives/allowances will be provided to facilitators to retain and motivate them in their follow up support to children. Scripts for audio lessons to accompany children’s workbooks will be made available, as will recordings of these lessons, to ensure flexibility in terms of modes of delivery to make them more accessible for children with disabilities, as well as possibilities to adapt the delivery method according to changing needs. This will allow for local community members to teach a small group, for radio or loudspeaker broadcasts or to share and transfer audio files on phones or tablets. Likewise, follow up support, which will be key to ensuring that ongoing learning takes place, can be provided in numerous ways, including face-to-face, home-visits, phone, text or small group support. The amount of support offered can also be prioritised according to the differing needs of children and the support available to them at home or in the community. A guide specifically explaining how the new materials are meant to be used will also be disseminated.

Whilst the priority intervention for this programme is to reach those targeted under the HRP, with paper-based materials, the production of audio files to accompany the paper-based materials will help to ensure that needs of children with disabilities are catered for, as well as help to make materials easier to use in areas with low levels of literacy. All teaching, learning and caregiver materials developed will be made freely available through neutral online platforms, including the Learning Passport, a UNICEF-supported digital education platform delivered through partnership between UNICEF, Microsoft and Cambridge (for which the Myanmar version is expected to be developed during 2021-2022, with a long-term view of being handed over to an education stakeholder group, or the government, should the situation allow, although this will be likely beyond the timeframe of this proposed programme). This will also include other recommended OL materials. Hence, there is potential for both formal and non-formal partners, as well as those working outside the formal programme framework to also benefit from the use of these materials. Again, there will be a need to ensure that related materials in ethnic languages are provided for and made available in both soft and hard copies.

The final key element to the OL intervention will be the support to be provided to parents or caregivers for ensuring that learning is able to take place. As such, building on the mobilisation of communities through parent teacher groups and other community education groups outlined in intervention 1.4, specific support will be provided to parents and caregivers to ensure they know how to effectively support their children’s learning, as well as provide feedback and encouragement. This will emphasise the importance of both males as well as females being involved in the support of children’s learning. In addition to general guidance, the Education Cluster home-based learning guide for parents being made available and a caregivers guide, particularly aimed at supporting children with disabilities as well as those with additional needs being piloted under the GPE COVID-19 grant, will be available in paper, audio and
video formats. To complement the new paper-based materials that are being developed, specific guidance on how parents and caregivers can support their child will also be developed.

As noted in section 7.3 below, given the importance of the Open Learning intervention, GAs will commission an independent evaluation of the open learning element of this programme, to ensure that lessons learned are well documented and evaluated. This will include tracking of the learning outcomes.

**Component 3: Community systems strengthening**

Component 3 aims to strengthen the preparedness and response capacity of community, civil society and national organisations, as key stakeholders in EiE. This will be done through the Education Cluster coordination mechanisms, including improving cluster engagement with local partners. Intervention 3.1 will provide capacity to understand where needs exist for education support, and intervention 3.2 will generate evidence regarding why the needs exist and good practices to address them. Intervention 3.3 supports improved planning and joint response across partners, and intervention 3.4 aims to provide specific and appropriate support to local organisations. These interventions were identified during consultations with the Education Cluster partners at national and sub-national levels; these consultations include participation from over 20 local and national organisations (see Programme Design Section 2). Additional required resources to strengthen cluster coordination and IM following activation were identified with the Education Cluster coordinator. Cluster activation has increased demands on the Education Cluster and this component has been designed to supplement existing initiatives and with the consideration for sustainability as a key focus.

**3.1. Strengthen EiE monitoring and information management**

Key aspects for this intervention to address include these limitations:

- Limited to no ability to collect data on education needs for crisis-affected communities, considering both the structure within the Cluster (e.g., data collection systems) and capacity among the Cluster members.
- Few standard or harmonized data collection tools. For the ones that do exist, partners lack the knowledge and understanding to utilise them.
- Unable to safely share and utilise sensitive information (e.g. where are children in need, what are the greatest needs, etc.) amongst partners for their planning and response.

The basis of effective emergency preparedness and response is the use of data and assessments. The EiE Cluster has had limited ability to collect and use data, with limitations due to both EiE staffing and capacity to contribute to joint efforts among EiE partners. The most significant data collection effort is the collection of quarterly 5Ws (who, what, when, where, and for whom), but even here it contributes more to reporting than planning, and not all partners are able to contribute. At a time when disruptions in education affect the whole country, this intervention will strengthen capacity and mobilize the EiE Cluster network to contribute to a regularly updated and fuller understanding of the situation in existing HRP locations and beyond.

A main output of this intervention will be the creation of an IM site for the EiE Cluster, including a platform which hosts information products produced by the Cluster. The platform will be available to EiE partners
and other education stakeholders, although sensitive data will have restricted access. It will be regularly updated and maintained with the support of an EiE Cluster IM Officer.

The EiE platform will host an Education Cluster data dashboard providing all Cluster partners with visual representation of the process and outcome data being collected. The dashboard will be aligned to the anticipated activities and results in the HRP and the GPE plan and, as appropriate to the changed context, will take into consideration the data fields which had been agreed in the pilot of the national Education Management Information System (EMIS). Partners will be able to drill-down to look at data at the regional level, indicating at minimum which communities report to be having access to learning, in which geographic locations, and through which sorts of learning (school-based, online, paper materials, etc.).

Data feeding into this dashboard will be collected through data collection tools and processes to be developed at national level, engaging and training EiE partners at sub-national levels and then supporting partners’ regular reporting. Data collection through a mobile-based monitoring application will be considered in consultation with EiE partners. EiE partners, especially local and national organisations, will be the best arbiters of what constitutes a secure and conflict-sensitive approach, particularly given the highly contentious nature of communities’ choices for education in the current context.

Other efforts to improve sector-wide use of data will include additional standard data collection tools and/or harmonized reporting on other key EiE preparedness and response measures. This may include further data and regular updates on EiE partner capacity mapping, post-distribution monitoring (PDM) of EiE kits and learning materials and more. Throughout all intervention efforts, SCI and UNICEF will seek to ensure:

- **Interoperability:** Data collected through EiE systems will, as much as possible, be harmonized with data already being collected in Myanmar education system to strengthen coordination efforts and improve humanitarian-development coherence. This will include developing shared terms and indicators, with standardized definitions and methodologies, and ensuring their consistent use within national data systems and across partners, as well as harmonizing tools and facilitating data sharing. Data safeguarding and DNH will be key considerations.

- **Capacity:** Importantly, these joint efforts will be underpinned with capacity development for EiE partners, and especially local partners, to collect, report and use high quality data either in person or remotely. This will include training of partners and possible in-kind support. Local partners will also be engaged to understand what their specific barriers are to participation, and how to ensure information reaches them in a timely manner.

- **Coordination:** The complexities of delivering education in emergencies and protracted crises and the number and variety of stakeholders involved make all the more pressing the need for information sharing, harmonization of tools, joint assessment, agreement around indicators and shared definitions and clear lines of responsibility.

### 3.2. Generation of evidence for Education cluster

Few EiE actors can produce studies regarding barriers to education and good practices to improve access and quality of education—where such studies do exist in the education sector, there is limited focus on crisis-affected children. This is also the case for Myanmar. Thus, this intervention seeks to create a better understanding of the causes and the dynamics behind a range of key challenges for crisis-affected learners in accessing safe, inclusive, and quality education.
**National situation analysis of education:** Evidence generation will begin with a nationwide situation analysis to describe the situation of education in Myanmar since COVID-19 and the military takeover using nationwide primary data. The design of the situation analysis will be created in consultation with technical working groups, and is likely to include surveys, focus group discussions (FGDs), and other quantitative and qualitative assessment tools targeting children, educators and community members. It will require close analysis of conflict sensitivity and DNH principles and will be reviewed by an ethical review board.

**Small/medium scale studies:** Evidence generation will then proceed at the sub-national level. Working with EiE partners and other education stakeholders at state and regional level, priority topics for research will be identified, leading to at least one study per state or region included in the 2021 HRP and interim emergency response plan. Coordination of these studies will be managed at the national level by the GAs, ensuring consolidation of topics that are relevant to multiple geographic locations, while allowing for the specific studies that are only relevant in specific areas. While some EiE partners in each location may take a leading role in the research, others will be encouraged to also participate through consultations, data collection and sense-making or validation, etc. All studies will be supported with technical assistance provided from a national level (both within each GA, as well as through technical support from new positions within the Education Cluster structure).

Indicative topics for studies include:

- Effective approaches to improve education access and quality for traditionally marginalised, populations such as children with disabilities and girls;
- Drivers of enrolment and protection risks at boarding houses; and
- Good practices for community engagement in EiE.

The results of the studies will be made available to all partners and shall be posted on the Education Cluster website. They may also lead to proposals to work further on these topics, especially through the small grant mechanism in intervention 3.4.

**3.3. Support contingency planning at sub-national level**

While critical activities are agreed for the Education Cluster to prioritize in any response, there are not yet agreed preparedness activities nor roles and responsibilities for EiE partners and those with whom they work. Further, many locations do not yet have enough contingency stock of student kits, school kits, teaching-learning materials (TLM), and other essential items to support rapid and efficient response to future crises and emergencies.

This intervention for contingency planning at sub-national level will lead to improved preparedness and a more efficient response at sub-national levels, across all 2021 HRP and interim emergency response plan areas. It will build on the ongoing development of two sub-national level contingency plans in Kachin State and Southeast Myanmar, supported by the Global Education Cluster (GEC). In most locations, the principal actors in the contingency plans will be the EiE partners working in tandem with community leaders, as well as other humanitarian partners.40

---

40 As for now, there is no MOE engagement in this initiative and there is immediate future plan to bring in MoE sub-sub-national offices (such as State Education Office, Township Education Office). The Education Cluster partners at the sub-national level will continue to assess the need and value, as well as challenges and risks for engaging with MoE at any level, in consultation with the Education cluster at the national level which is in close coordination with the donors and other partners.
Using workshops (online or in-person) for EiE partners, and ensuring the participation of local partners especially, contingency plans will be developed for four additional locations and will include at minimum: agreed hazards and emergency scenarios, planning assumptions, minimum joint actions for preparedness and response, registry of actors and assigned roles and responsibilities and linkages with other clusters. Standard tools will also be agreed, such as an updated joint education needs assessment and a 5W/3W (who, what, where) template. Data produced from these tools will feed into the Education Cluster platform to be developed in intervention 3.1.

Development of the contingency plans will be followed by their operationalization. Understanding and ability to carry out the contingency plans will be improved through training workshops for EiE partners and other relevant stakeholders. The training itself will be made available for any new EiE partners or EiE partner staff who later participate in the cluster; this may occur through digitalization of the training, roll-out of a training of trainers or both.

Operationalization will also occur by improving the pre-positioning of EiE contingency stock, at state/region level where possible. This may include a variety of materials, with a focus on student kits and TLM, as well as items to support COVID-19 prevention and items which meet gender-specific needs.

### 3.4. Strengthen local partners' capacity to provide coordinated education response in emergencies

Globally, humanitarian actors and donors committed to a much stronger focus on financing local actors in the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS); localization is an integral component of the Grand Bargain. In Myanmar, access to remote and conflict-affected communities has always required a strong reliance on national and local partners. The crises resulting from COVID-19 and the military takeover further underlined the need for improved engagement with and support to local actors, but also highlighted the real risks they face.

This intervention seeks to strengthen engagement and capacity of local partners. To improve engagement, activities will include a consultation process for understanding local organisational needs, reduction of barriers for their access to and increasing the relevance of coordination and technical support provided through the Education Cluster.

As a first step, local partners working in EiE will be identified and consulted about their key challenges to engagement as well as what strengths they may like to share. The results of these consultations will inform activities to make the Education Cluster more inclusive, such as a cluster coordination improvement plan, so that it better serves the interest of local partners.

It will also lead to the development of several standardised capacity development opportunities and resources, to be delivered through the GPE AF programme but also institutionalized within the Cluster. These trainings will be delivered in person or remotely across the states/regions included in the 2021 HRP and interim emergency response plan. Some training will also be made available in digital formats to support capacity of staff and partner organisations that are new to the Education Cluster. Resources will be hosted on the Education Cluster site to be developed under key intervention 3.1 (see above). Possible trainings may include:
● Technical aspects of EiE (including an introduction to EiE, gender and disability inclusive EiE responses, safe learning spaces and professional development for EiE educators, etc.) and
● Broader topics on humanitarian action and organisational development.

They will be developed alongside the trainings for: improved information/data production, management and use (see Section 3.1) and contingency planning (see Section 3.3).

Capacity to deliver also requires financial resourcing, and this intervention will establish a mechanism to provide small grants to local partners, ranging from 25,000 to 50,000 USD. These grants will provide financial or in-kind assistance for partners seeking to improve their organisational capacity, to engage in preparedness activities for EiE or to respond to disruptions in education. Improving access, safety, quality and inclusion in EiE will be key considerations for receiving a grant. The awarding of grants will involve the Education Cluster, especially through the involvement of EiE partners at sub-national level for their expertise in ground-level implementation. Local partners awarded grants will be expected to participate in sub-national EiE coordination. The small grants will be designed so that there is no undue burden on local partners, and support is available to assist with any challenges in implementation, monitoring and reporting.

The aim of this intervention is a more effective and efficient response for continued learning in crisis settings, including through an expanded and better-supported EiE network. Whether small grants can be used to respond to community needs with the view to improve children’s education, through interventions such as cash support, might be considered if a case is made by the local partner taking into account risks, sustainability and other factors considered necessary by the education partners, and if there is an agreement of the education partners.

5. Operational and implementation arrangements

5.1 Overview

The programme proposed here will be implemented in Myanmar by SCI and UNICEF as dual GAs. In addition to the close working relationship in our capacity as co-leads of the Education Cluster in Myanmar, the two GAs have been collaborating actively since June 2021 to design the activities outlined in this proposal, while also ensuring robust consultation with relevant stakeholders in Myanmar. This has created a strong foundation for collaboration in the implementation of the programme and best practices from this process will be adapted to support ongoing implementation of the programme.

SCI and UNICEF have identified key principles that will guide ongoing collaboration during the implementation of this programme, these are:

● To establish a robust and inclusive governance structure for the programme to support regular interaction, open exchange and discussion on programme implementation, performance, contextual analysis, risk management and adaptation to challenges, as they arise.
● To ensure that EiE actors and stakeholders in Myanmar have visibility and engagement in the programme, including opportunities for dialogue on programme implementation, knowledge sharing and development of opportunities for shared learning.
• To support localization by mobilizing local actors in Myanmar to support the implementation of components of the humanitarian programme proposed here, including ongoing capacity building to enhance local capacity to deliver EiE programmes in the future.
• To build on existing education structures in Myanmar and the strengths of existing education and EiE actors to support improved education access and outcomes for children.
• To accomplish the harmonization of technical approaches through use of the existing coordination structures, as well as the leveraging of existing resources and capacity building. Each GA will take leadership on specific key interventions. Though, it is expected that both GAs will contribute technical inputs and leadership through the forums used for the finalization of approaches. SCI will lead on key interventions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 3.2 and 3.4 while UNICEF will lead on key interventions 1.3, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.3. Geographic implementation of all approaches will be led by each GA in their respective target areas (see Annex E for details).

5.2 Steering Committee

The implementation of the programme proposed will be guided by an overarching governance structure, which includes appropriate engagement of EiE actors and other relevant local stakeholders in Myanmar (see Strategic Context Section 1 for more information on the coordination in Myanmar).

The programme Steering Committee (SC) will be established for the GPE AF programme’s overall management. The SC will play a crucial role, especially in the current context where DPs are not engaged with the MoE of the Government of Myanmar under the de facto authorities.

The SC’s main purpose is to be accountable for the GPE AF programme implementation and achievement of the objectives, in accordance with the principles set out by Myanmar’s education DPs and within the GPE, in coordination with the EDPCG. The SC will be expected to play a crucial role to provide strategic and risk-informed direction to ensure the programme achieves the planned targets within the fluid, fragile and unpredictable situation in Myanmar.

The SC’s proposed main functions are as below:

1) Provide strategic direction for the GPE AF programme.
2) Make decisions, within a set boundary, on changes to the targets, key interventions, activities and budget allocation, or proposes such decision to the hierarchy in consultation with the GPE Secretariat.
3) Ensure overall coordination, coherence, and complementarity within the programme.
4) Provide strategic and risk-informed solutions to address high level challenges in the programme implementation and in achieving programme objectives.
5) Advise the GAs on risk management of the GPE AF programme (see Annex C).
6) Advise the GAs on programme communication and visibility, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
7) Receive and endorse reports prepared by the GAs before submission to GPE.

The SC is the primary decision-making body and has intentionally been designed to be streamlined and nimble while also being closely engaged with the key EiE actors in the country. Wider DP consultation is expected to take place under the DP co-facilitators’ leadership, before the SC meetings. CSOs are engaged in the EDPCG; however, given their increasing role to support children’s education in the current situation,
the CSO engagement on the SC and details, such as the CSO selection, is currently under review at the
time of this programme development.

The frequency of the SC meeting is determined based on the education DPs’ consensus. The SC will meet
every two months as a minimum. To ensure the programme stays relevant to the rapidly changing
situation, the SC meeting will be convened as needed. The SC’s detailed Terms of References (TOR) will
be developed and finalised before the programme implementation starts.

The membership of the SC will be determined in consultation with a wide range of partners, including
CSOs, as part of the sector coordination reform process under the leadership of the DP co-facilitators,
currently Finland and the EU. As a minimum, it is proposed to have membership of development partner
co-facilitators, GPE Coordinating Agency, GPE AF GAs, Education Cluster coordinator and a CSO
representative. Chair and deputy of the SC in anticipation of absence of Chair will be selected within the
SC through consensus. Communication and updates of the SC to the wider education sector development
partners’ group will be ensured, with leadership of the DP Co-Facilitators and the Coordinating Agency,
with inputs from the GAs. As for the CSO representation including the number of CSOs, decisions will be
made within the broader sector coordination group under the leadership of the DP co-facilitators with
close support from Coordinating Agency. The proper selection of CSO representative will be based on
standard criteria to ensure fair and transparent selection of the most appropriate CSO representation.

The same SC is expected to serve for the GPE COVID-19 programme, if there is any overlap in
implementation time between the two GPE programmes. The GPE COVID-19 programme had the
Management Committee (MC) which was chaired by the MoE and has not met since the last MC meeting
in January 2021, before the military takeover.

5.3 Grant Agent coordination

5.3.1 Grant Agent management approach

Each GA will ensure adequate institutional human resource capacity to jointly manage the GPE AF
programme implementation and ensure achievement of the objectives and the targets. Both agencies'
heads of education section/programme will take the overall responsibility for the programme, including
the joint programming and programme coherence.

The two agencies’ leads will work closely with each other to coordinate joint work at all levels of
programming: detailed planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and to ensure the overall
programme coherence. Regular meetings will be organized between the two leads, along with the
participation of other staff as relevant.

Both agencies will take the office-wide and organisation-wide approach to fully support the programme
implementation. While the main work will be led by the education team in both organisations, other
programme sections and the operations, as well as the field offices within the Myanmar offices will be
fully mobilized. The GAs’ regional offices (ROs) and headquarters (HQs) support will be critical, especially
to address issues that are hard to be resolved inside the country.

UNICEF
UNICEF will maximize the existing education staff based in Yangon, Nay Pyi Taw (NPT), Rakhine, Chin, Kachin, Shan and Kayin, who take well defined roles and responsibilities to make sure that the programme will be delivered, utilizing and leveraging upon the strengths, including technical expertise, networks and local knowledge and trust from partners. To manage the UNICEF part of the programme, UNICEF’s recently recruited senior international education manager will be responsible for the programme planning, implementation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, under the direct supervision of the Chief of Education. The education manager will be UNICEF’s lead person for the GPE AF programme and regularly interact with the SCI’s GPE lead person. To support the programme delivery, new national education staff (under recruitment) will work closely with the existing education staff in all locations—Yangon, NPT, and field locations—to support the programme planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. UNICEF field offices, headed by the Chief of Field Office, will support the programme implementation (see Annex D for an organogram and description of key roles). The Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) section will provide support for the planning and monitoring and evaluation, including quality assurance for reporting.

Save the Children

Building on Save the Children’s existing capacity and leadership in key technical and geographic areas, SCI will lead components of the programme at national level and ensure quality implementation in specific geographic locations. SCI will recruit a dedicated programme lead that will report to the Education Lead within the SCI education programme team. There will be particularly close collaboration between the SCI GPE Programme Lead and the Head of Programme for Education who is in charge of the overall implementation of the SCI education programme, as well as a strong collaboration with the advisors and specialists, including the EiE advisor, the Basic Education advisor, the Education Research, Evidence, and Learning manager, the Disability and Inclusion coordinator, and the Teacher Education and Training team (see Annex D for an organogram and Annex E for a description of GA roles and responsibilities). Additionally, a dedicated Monitoring, Evaluation, Assessment and Learning (MEAL) coordinator will be recruited within the SCI team for the consolidation and reporting of indicators. In each geographical location in which the GPE programme will be led by SCI, a dedicated Programme coordinator and Partnerships and Grants coordinator will be recruited to support the partners throughout the implementation. In any locations that necessitate direct implementation by SCI, project officers will be recruited as well.

Programme coordination unit

To support the division of labour and coordinated joint work between the two grantees, a programme coordination unit (PCU) will be set-up, composed of the three dedicated UNICEF and SCI programme staff. The coordination unit will consist of the coordination leads, the SCI programme lead and UNICEF programme manager, and SCI’s dedicated MEAL coordinator and UNICEF’s Monitoring and Evaluation specialist as a minimum. Under the guidance of the SC and GAs, the coordination unit will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and successful programme implementation by the selected implementing partners (IPs) as well as for overall monitoring and reporting. The coordination unit will be responsible for streamlining: (i) overall coordination, (ii) coordination of and participation in SC meetings, (iii) overall monitoring, review and reporting processes of the programme, (iv) ensuring a harmonized approach across the entire programme, including on joint visibility as per the advice from the programme Steering

---

41 The details will be worked out later.
Committee (section 5.2) and (v) consolidation and harmonization of progress updates and reports from both grantees on implementation to present progress to the SC and GPE.

Above all, the coordination unit will ensure all efforts towards implementation are coordinated, harmonized and aligned with both the GPE AF requirements and commitments and the Education Cluster strategy and ensure consistent communication flows between the GAs, SC, Education Cluster and local communities as illustrated in Figure 3 below. To initiate a successful programme, it will be important to prioritize the staffing for each grantee and the establishment of the PCU.

\textit{Figure 3 Governance diagram}\footnote{As per the GPE guidelines regarding the roles and responsibilities of each, GA, CA, and LEG.}
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\caption{Governance diagram\footnote{As per the GPE guidelines regarding the roles and responsibilities of each, GA, CA, and LEG.}}
\end{figure}

5.3.2 Key areas of Grant Agent coordination

The Grant Agents are key in ensuring the GPE AF is appropriately managed and fully aligned with the broader education and Education Cluster developments and value add to the country processes and results. Each GA will be responsible for managing their funds, partnerships and the implementation of interventions in their respective regions, including but not limited to: (i) overall management of partnerships, (ii) compilation and oversight of annual work plans, (iii) joint reporting as per the condition of the GPE AF and the PME framework, (iv) monitoring programme implementation, sharing and consolidating reports and information with the PCU and SC.

The explicit monitoring and evaluation accountabilities, will be led by the PCU, under the leadership of the GAs, including but not limited to (see Monitoring approach Section 7 for further details): continuous performance tracking, including risks and mitigation, adaptation, quarterly reporting to the LEG, two
reports to GPE (end of year one and end of programme) and mutual accountability, to be promoted through the quarterly, yearly and end-point reviews.

5.3.3 Grant Agent implementation areas

SCI and UNICEF both have a wide footprint across the country and operational presence across the proposed GPE AF operational areas which provides a direct knowledge of the programme context. Both GAs have existing partnerships across the country and extensive experience in working with and managing a range of local partners.

At the time of the programme development, the geographic division of labour reflects the existing strong connections of both GAs with local entities and contexts to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in programme implementation. The geographic division of labour will also demonstrate good value for money as grantees will utilize their already functional organisational and administrative structures at the sub-national levels which allows grantees to provide direct support to partners in their geographical focus areas.

Similarly, the division of labour to assign programmatic leads across key intervention areas reflects the complementary technical strengths and comparative advantages of the two grantees. SCI will serve as the main lead for the access component, except for the NFE and life skills intervention given UNICEF’s key contributions in the intervention area. For the quality component, UNICEF is the main lead, except for the capacity strengthening of educators given SCI’s advancement in capacity gaps assessment and capacity building. The community systems strengthening component is equally distributed between the two grantees. SCI will attend to the evidence generation for the Education Cluster and strengthening of the local partners’ capacity using small grants. Meanwhile, UNICEF will lead the set-up of an updated Education Cluster IM platform and the contingency planning effort at the sub-national level.

While each key intervention area has a GA lead, as relevant, to enhance consultation and draw-on existing sector expertise, both grantees are committed to the convening of reference/technical working group(s) to support quality programming (convened under existing coordination structures, e.g., the Education Cluster). The working group(s) serves to build on and strengthen existing coordination mechanisms. They may be tasked to, for example, agree on minimum standards, formulate technical practices, draw on lessons learned, find solutions to local issues and advise the GAs and PCU. For supporting partners to implement the programme, SCI and UNICEF will be responsible for different locations. SCI will take the lead in Central and South Rakhine, Northern Shan, Kayin and the Southeast. UNICEF will ensure quality implementation in Chin, Northern Rakhine, Kachin, Shan South and Kayah. Though the leadership in these geographic locations is thus defined, we recognize that some of our IPs may be supporting in various locations and we will therefore need to continue to work closely at the sub-national level to ensure coordination.

For further details on the roles and responsibilities of each GA by geographical locations and estimated targets refer to the Programme Scope Section 3 and Annex E and for an indicative workplan refer to Annex G.

43 As an example, OL already has a task force set-up under the GPE COVID-19 grant to support the standardization and harmonization of the continuity of learning approach and resources, etc.
5.4 Education stakeholder engagement and strengthening

5.4.1 Engagement with EDPCG

In the absence of the ETVSCG, due to the current political crisis in Myanmar, the EDPCG, long established education coordination group that is open and consultative, comprised of donors, multilateral organisations, UN agencies, NGOs, CSOs, education programmes and projects, has assumed the role and functions of the LEG. This includes reviewing and endorsing the programme proposal before submitting to GPE. Its role started with the oversight and assurance during the design stage, ensuring that the programme addresses the most urgent needs of children in Myanmar during this crisis. It will continue to provide guidance and oversight to the two GAs, ensuring coherence of this programme and complementarity with the collective and individual initiatives of the different DPs to avoid overlaps. It will serve as the policy forum, giving directions to the two GAs in close liaison with the Education Cluster. SCI and UNICEF will keep the EDPCG informed on implementation progress through monthly/quarterly reports. They will also consult with the EDPCG on key policy matters. In turn, the EDPCG through the co-facilitators and the coordinating agency will ensure the submission of regular updates to GPE on the programme and any changes in country context. EDPCG will also be engaged in advocacy with GPE for any significant adjustments to the programme. EDPCG will lead in addressing policy level and strategic challenges and bottlenecks to create an environment that allows the GAs to successfully implement the programme. It will offer recommendations to strengthen the programme’s inclusivity for the benefit of all children affected by the current crisis in Myanmar, bringing together the views of the various sub-sectors. EDPCG will also be involved in monitoring, ensuring that achievements are in tandem with the proposed objectives of the programme. Overall, EDPCG will support the GAs throughout the implementation period for the achievement of planned results.

5.4.2 Engagement with the Education Cluster

The GAs will work closely with and through the Education Cluster to ensure a coordinated approach that strengthens existing mechanisms. The Education Cluster coordinator at national level will take part in the GPE AF SC. The GAs, already regular participants in national and sub-national EiE coordination meetings as co-lead agencies, will provide updates on the GPE AF programme during each meeting, and may take key discussions (technical approach, challenges, etc.) forward within the Education Cluster meetings.

The Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) for the Education Cluster (comprising UNICEF, SCI, NRC, and People In Need, plus one open seat for national NGO participation) will be a key reference group for discussions about the GPE AF.

Technical working groups will be formed for most key interventions. These technical working groups will have the participation of EiE partners who can contribute expertise and/or existing resources. Many of the activities in the “community systems strengthening” component will go forward with leadership of the Education Cluster coordinator at national level, and the coordinators for state-level clusters. All activities will be conducted with the GAs.

5.5 Work with partners
The programme will be implemented in strong collaboration with all Education Cluster partners, international, national, and local CSOs. Work with local partners is not only to support localisation, but to recognise and support the strong existing capacity within Myanmar. Moreover, working with local partners will also enhance the systems strengthening aims of the overall programme proposed here. Local partners within the EiE network in the respective areas will operate as sub-grantees to either UNICEF or SCI, with roles, responsibilities, deliverables, budgets, and other key aspects of the partnership outlined clearly in appropriate funding agreements. Local partners will also be supported to meet all compliance and quality standards as outlined in this proposal, as well as those utilised by UNICEF and SCI; for example, guidance will be given on the guidelines for PSEA, CP and the prevention of fraud and the misappropriation of aid funding. The key aspects of engagement with local partners supported through this programme are outlined below.

Both GAs don’t envisage to support or partner with any private/for-profit entity/organization to directly deliver education services under this grant in Myanmar. However, if exceptional circumstances arise, GAs will inform and seek guidance/approval from GPE through a consultative process.

Considering the existing context, GAs anticipate some collaboration with informal financial institutions for fund transfer mechanisms (agencies like Hawala etc.), who might charge a commission for their service delivery. A proposed partnership with Microsoft by UNICEF to design and roll out Learning Passport to facilitate open learning pathway.

As mentioned above, both SCI and UNICEF have identified key principles that will guide ongoing collaboration during the implementation of this GPE AF programme, including that of supporting localization by mobilizing local actors in Myanmar to support the implementation of components of the humanitarian programme proposed here. Both GAs will continue to support ongoing capacity building to enhance local capacity to deliver EiE programmes in the future.

The implementation of the proposed programme will be guided by an overarching governance structure, which includes appropriate engagement of EiE actors and other relevant local stakeholders in Myanmar. The programme Steering Committee (SC) will be established for the GPE AF programme’s overall management. The SC’s main purpose is to be accountable for the GPE AF programme implementation and achievement of the objectives, in accordance with the principles set out by Myanmar’s education DPs and within the GPE, in coordination with the EDPCG. The SC will be expected to play a crucial role to provide strategic and risk-informed direction to ensure the programme achieves the planned targets within the fluid, fragile and unpredictable situation in Myanmar. Below are the details of organization specific procedures and approaches followed by each GA.

**Save the Children International:** From Save the Children’s allocation, in addition to SCI’s direct implementation of all components in selected locations, SCI, in coordination with UNICEF, will seek guidance and support from the Education cluster for partnering with other local CSOs for implementing the program in other locations. The proposed method of partner selection will include calling for Expression of Interest (EoI) in an open competitive and transparent manner. The Education cluster through the GPE AF program will support the technical and institutional capacities of local organizations, and by actively identifying local CSO partners for implementation through the GAs implementing partner selection process. Further, local CSO partners will be engaged in decision-making through the GPE Steering Committee.
The selected implementing CSO partners will assume full programmatic and financial accountability for funds disbursed by the Grant Agents. They will directly implement GPE AF program activities, as defined under sub-award agreements signed with the GAs and contribute to the achievement of common targets within the programme. Implementing partners will contribute towards achieving the results and to some extent to the advocacy and coordination efforts. The Implementing CSO Partners will conduct field-level monitoring and provide reports as stipulated by the respective agreements and based on the agreed program specific results and M&E frameworks.

**UNICEF**: UNICEF’s partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs) follow the *’Guidance for Civil Society Organizations on Partnership with UNICEF’*. As a standard practice and to promote transparency and fairness, UNICEF will utilize United Nations Partnership Portal (UNPP) to solicit expression of interest (EoI) from interested CSOs using a tailored template for the GPE AF programme. Verification of CSOs will be completed by UNPP managers. Technical and administrative screening and review of EoIs will be undertaken by an in-house panel and shortlisted CSOs will be informed about UNICEF’s willingness to partner with them, subject to satisfactory completion of standard organizational management, systems, and fiduciary assessments. UNICEF will enter into an agreement using Partnership Cooperation Arrangement (PCA) with the selected CSOs as implementing partners (IPs). Prior to establishment of partnership, Prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) assessment will be conducted by UNICEF or third party to review a CSO’s PSEA-related policy, training, awareness, reporting and investigations for all CSOs selected for partnership. Roles and responsibilities of CSOs, UNICEF and other partners involved in programme implementation are premised on the principles of 360-degree accountability. The PCA and assessment reports detail out the roles, responsibilities and expected deliverables and requirements of the IPs as well as UNICEF, which will be regularly monitored. Key responsibilities of the IP shall include i. timely delivery of quality programme interventions as detailed out in the programme document (PD), which will be assessed through field monitoring and review of reports as well as client satisfaction assessments; ii. judicious management of resources (financial and non-financial) using value for money principles; iii. efficient organizational management practices supported by necessary policies and procedures as agreed in the due diligence assessment and management action reports; iv. organisation’s responsibilities relating to prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) will be detailed out in the PSEA assessment report and risk rating conducted by UNICEF; v. wherever applicable, CSO’s responsibilities regarding sensitivities of advocacy, communication, visibility and engagement with different stakeholders will be spelt out in the PCA; vi. CSO partners are responsible for regularly reporting on risks, which forms part of risk matrix embedded in the PCA/PD; vii. specific responsibilities relating to reporting fraud and child protection concerns are embedded in the PCA.

### 5.5.1 Role of partners

International, national and local actors, including civil society, each have a fundamental role to play within the GPE AF programme. The GAs will engage consistently and systematically with all partners, ensuring all are included in relevant decision-making and coordination fora, and will seek to gain from their insights and inputs to achieve greater coherence, complementarity, accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, quality assurance and improvement of the programme. This will be achieved for local partners through representation of local partners in the SC, continuous engagement and feedback with the Education Cluster coordination groups (both national and sub-national) and through direct support for local partners.
International partners

The landscape of partners includes INGOs that work in specific localities, especially as they support capacity development of national and local partners, or work in areas that have other complexities for NGOs, local partners and CSOs to operate. A main contribution of the INGOs will be to provide technical inputs to strengthen and innovate the programme leveraging their extensive global expertise and experience.

The Education Cluster will be the main mechanism for engaging INGOs, including the SAG, as well as the technical working groups or reference groups that are often formed on a temporary basis to work on a key task or deliverable. Technical resource development and guidance will be led by the Education Cluster coordinator and GAs, as well as other international cluster members, through technical working groups to inform and enhance programme design and implementation. For example, review and consolidation of existing technical materials for ECE can be undertaken through a dedicated ECE working group. This also aligns with the programme approach to build on and strengthen existing mechanisms. Other specific tasks (e.g., medium-term OL resources, digital materials, etc.) may be suited for consultants or private institutions/companies that may be identified through international partners’ networks.

National partners

The long-term sustainability of the programme approach relies on localisation through the national and local partners. National partners have an extensive presence throughout Myanmar, are active in coordination platforms and have strong connections with the communities in need. The national partners bring cultural and historical knowledge, credibility and have access to local networks to understand the needs and tailor the programme. They have the advantage of closely observing and understanding the needs of the affected communities and tailoring generic interventions to better match the needs. Together with local networks and partners, the national partners will lead and inform the contextualization of the programme.

Local partners

Local partners will be a primary strategic focus of the programme and will be prioritised and supported to implement the key interventions wherever possible. Local partners are in an indispensable position in contexts of crisis and conflict and are better positioned to work with local authorities in various locations (including NGCAs), and in most areas, already have existing and trusting relationships with the communities in which they work. These existing relationships are key strengths in their ability to operate, while also improving the security for their operations (see Risk Management Section 6 for more information).

Further, national partners and local and civil society organisations have a particular role in upholding the duty bearers accountable to children and communities. The GAs will work with and influence national and local actors to drive forward our commitment to inclusion, gender equality and child participation and will seek to build partnerships with female-led organisations and organisations committed to tackling inclusion, disability and equity issues.

---

44 As a result of the WHS Grand Bargain in 2016, SCI and UNICEF, confirmed their commitment to localisation and to ensuring national and local partners were involved in decision-making processes in any humanitarian response.
5.5.2 Local partner selection

The GAs will develop clear selection criteria and processes. They will be developed and communicated in close collaboration with the Education Cluster in a consultative and transparent manner.

Local partners will be selected through a transparent call for proposals and followed up with a proper due diligence process. This will expand the options for partnership beyond current SCI and UNICEF relationships. Efforts will be made to encourage a broad range of applicants. Those partners who are not selected will be supported to understand the reasons and referred to the small grant mechanism (Component 3, key intervention 4). Notably, partners will sign partnership agreements with either UNICEF or SCI, but not both, to reduce the burden in terms of reporting.

5.5.3 Capacity strengthening

During implementation, local partners will be supported by the GAs and shall be provided with adequate resources to develop their technical and organisational capacities. Capacity strengthening will be taken as a continuous process, where the GAs seek to learn with the partners and improve throughout.

Capacity strengthening will be undertaken in accordance with the capacity assessments and will recognise and build on the extensive experience and expertise of the partners. To support the partners in achieving compliance with best practices, international standards and some compliance requirements, some mandatory training will be undertaken. These include donor compliance and award/grant management standards, as well as policy awareness training such as fraud, bribery and corruption, CSG, PSEA, anti-trafficking, procurement standards, finance standards, safe programming and human resources (HR) standards.

6. Risk management

The risks of the programme were analysed and assessed with risk management measures identified as detailed in Annex C. Overall risk for the programme is assessed as high, with an outlook of continued unpredictability in the programming environment. To mitigate unforeseen risks, the GAs will work to ensure a strong link between their strategic planning and risk management, informed from ongoing risk analysis and programme progress updates, to allow for well-informed implementation that is responsive, flexible and adaptive.

The risks and uncertainties discussed below are not exhaustive but serve to cover main risks categorized into seven categories. These are further elaborated in Annex C.

While the GAs will continue focusing on risks specifically associated to the programme implementation and operationalisation, there is a need to look at risks at a higher level that are related, though not limited to the GPE AF programme. Those include risks to implementing partners’ safety and protection, safe access to conflict affected areas and partnership development in inaccessible areas. To address those broader risks related to education response in the current emergency context, the education sector group’s current work on principles of engagement, led by the DP co-facilitators, will be a useful reference. To address such broader risks related to education response in the current emergency context, the education sector group might need to consider some form of engagement with relevant bodies to ensure
no interference in the programme implementation, based on the principles of engagement that is currently under development by the education sector donors, in coordination with partners and the Education Cluster.

(1) Context: Safety and security, natural disasters, epidemics, political developments, and economic environment

Over the past year, Myanmar has been coping with the COVID-19 pandemic, further political turmoil resulting from the military takeover and an installed mixed military-civilian SAC for an interim period. Myanmar is in a complex political state with a deteriorating economy (World Bank, 2021), increasing violence and a growing CDM. Further, Myanmar is prone to significant and seasonal climate-related emergencies (e.g., flooding, cyclones and earthquakes).

Contextual risks place individuals, particularly educators, children and parents and caregivers, at risk to injury, death, psychosocial harm, cognitive delays and/or displacement. GA, field and IP staff and other authorities-facing colleagues may face security risks if the relationship with the SAC deteriorates, as well as have an impact on delivery of services. Learning communities risk disruptions of learning activities due to lack of spaces, overcrowding of remaining spaces, increased dropouts from disruption of household livelihoods, etc. and damages to learning spaces (including teaching and learning materials, furniture and equipment, etc.) and the routes to learning spaces. And learning systems are at risk to the politicisation of education and schools, humanitarian access blockages, diversion of funds from education, destruction of administrative systems and records and grievances due to inequitable access to quality education.

While recognizing that external actors have limited control over the contextual risk factors, the GAs aim to employ a risk-informed programme and ensure a stronger reliance on continuous risk analysis to allow for adaptations and the engagement with local entities and communities while systematically supporting activities that promote the humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

(2) Delivery: Capacity of implementing partners, inadequate coordination between development and emergency partners, constraints across delivery chain, including with the SAC and areas under EAO control, willingness of beneficiaries to engage, conflict sensitivity (do no harm) and interventions do not reach the most at-risk and marginalised

Delivery risks encompass programmatic weaknesses jeopardizing the achievement of programme aims and objectives and may result in causing harm through the intervention(s). The targeting of beneficiaries, procurement of supplies, delivery of services, services to displaced people and even the publication of research findings can have negative impacts on conflict dynamics.

All efforts will be made to ensure the programme plan, timeline and interventions and activities have been developed with consideration to potential bottlenecks and constraints in delivery; there remains a possibility that uncontrollable factors may cause unseen delays or harm. To mitigate conflict dynamics, GAs will work with their staff, IPs and programme stakeholders to foster recognition of conflict-sensitive


---

45 The Guidance for Risk Informed Programming (GRIP) and Risk-informed Education Programming for Resilience Guidance Note serve as resources for UNICEF and SCI to assess and manage risks related to fragility, violent conflict, disaster, climate change, epidemics and economic instability.
programming and integrate the DNH principle\textsuperscript{46} into work plans and partnership agreements that entail conflict analysis. Further, the GAs will ensure the application of SPHERE and INEE tools and standards where relevant in the management and oversight of the programme implementation. The GAs will also strengthen coordination of the GPE AF programme via their already established co-lead roles in the Education Cluster, ensuring the sharing of best practice and learning with Cluster members and the wider sector, maximizing synergies and avoiding duplication within the wider EiE response.

\textbf{(3) Operational: HR and unethical behaviour, supply and logistics, ICT system and information security and transition and exit strategies}

Given the complex context, the operational environment presents multiple risks and potential bottlenecks to the GAs around HR and ethical breaches, management of funds, procurement and delivery in a safe and time manner and sustainable practices. Understanding the potential impacts of shocks and/or stresses on operations is essential to the design, implementation and sustainability of a functional and risk-informed programme.

A main concern includes the risks around the management of funds, including potential delays in funding, high costs and risks of an unregulated or failed formal banking sector. To mitigate any banking restrictions, the GAs and their partners will continue to strategically assess and remain prepared to act in advance to avoid problems and delays by using adaptive, innovative and alternative mechanisms for transferring relief into programme areas such as a shift to commodity-based and in-kind interventions, cash or commodity exchanges amongst partners, recognising and factoring for significant losses resulting from transactions costs or the use of local networks and alternative financial mechanisms. It is recognised that each of these adaptation mechanisms has its own drawbacks. And, the potential unpredictability of bank transactions may cause difficulties for beneficiaries and the partners’ relationships with the broader community. This is an ongoing issue that both grant agents are already addressing\textsuperscript{47}, at least partially, and need to continually address in their current programming, with risk assessment and mitigation needing to be continually updated.

Essential to all operations, including to the sustainability of the programme, is to maintain a localised approach – working through and with local authorities, stakeholders and partners. This includes advanced consultation and information sharing with the relevant local entities on the programme. In addition, the promotion of community and local ownership of the programme will foster its sustainability. As much as possible the GAs will encourage locally procured supplies and materials, local distribution utilizing the safest locally identified approaches and routes and as necessary agree with local authorities and partners if stocks need to be stored prior to distribution. Amongst the mitigation measures, direct cash assistance to local partners will reduce procurement and logistics costs for the GAs while stimulating local economies.

\textsuperscript{46} The \textit{Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding Programming Guide} serves as a resource for the GAs to consider conflict dynamics and reduce the risk of conflict and crisis by examining the composition, characteristics and capacities of personnel, operations (supply, finance and HR), partnerships and communications practices across the GPE AF programme implementation.

\textsuperscript{47} For instance, UNICEF, in collaboration with other UN agencies within the broader UN framework, has been negotiating with banks and the Central Bank to make sure that remittances of funds into the country can go through smoothly and disbursements to our partners and suppliers are made timely to support programme implementation. For example, when inter-bank transfers across banks was not possible, UNICEF negotiated with our house-bank to allow our partners to open new accounts with them to facilitate direct deposits. UNICEF also negotiated to allow payments using cheques, allowing cashing at full amounts without limitations. Working jointly with other UN agencies, we have managed to have the Central Bank restrictions on cash withdrawal eased. This allows for the use of cash payments as an alternative payment modality to some partners and suppliers. UNICEF also has in place LTAs with event management companies that can facilitate activities including disbursement of allowances to participants and paying for conference facilities using their own funds, to be reimbursed by UNICEF after an event.
(4) Fiduciary: Fraud and corruption

To mitigate the risk of mismanagement of funds due to weak partner financial systems, insufficient compliance to systems and procedures in place, fraud and/or corruption, SCI and UNICEF have stringent internal risk management controls. Both GAs have experience as grantees for GPE AF funding in other country contexts (UNICEF is also the GA for GPE AF COVID in Myanmar) and both have proven robust financial systems to document the source of funds and determine how funds are being used, with the maintenance of separate records for GPE funding. Each GA will disburse GPE funds to the IPs and provide fiduciary oversight and technical guidance as appropriate. The grantees are responsible and accountable for the overall efficient and effective implementation of the GPE AF, including the management of all financial disbursements to partners in line with accountability and risk management requirements, reporting and support of external audits as needed.

(5) Reputational: Neutrality

Adverse consequences of a perceived lack of political neutrality could impede programme support and result in reduced staff security, the immediate inability to deliver and longer-term reputational damage. Both SCI and UNICEF are committed to the humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence that underpin and guide all programming to reflect a human and child-rights based approach. Another guiding principle is to safeguard the AAP through effective, transparent and honest community participation, including children. All programming will be designed in view of the DNH principles and promote equity (see Principles of engagement Section 2.2.2). Furthermore, the GAs will prioritize an approach to localisation through quality local partnerships that share roles and responsibilities, allow for flexibility to adaptations in response to evidence of changing needs and community feedback and strengthen local capacities.

(6) Organisational: Governance and accountability

With the proposed well-defined governance and management structures, including a SC and PCU, with clear and agreed upon roles and responsibilities (see Operational and implementation arrangements Section 5), there is a very low risk of ineffective oversight and accountability structures. Given the GAs co-leadership roles in the Education Cluster and designed roles of the SC and PCU, the grantees demonstrate their commitment to information sharing, dialogue and bringing together different partners that support education in Myanmar to strengthen oversight and accountability.

(7) Safeguarding: Risk of harm to children (abuse exploitation, neglect and physical safety), risk of harm to communities, individual adults and marginalised groups and environmental damage, including damage to structures

---

48 The humanitarian principles are derived from the core principles, which have long guided the work of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the national Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies. The principles are to the work of UNICEF, SCI and other humanitarian organisations. The principles are formally enshrined in two General Assembly resolutions. The first three principles (humanity, neutrality and impartiality) are endorsed in General Assembly resolution 46/182, which was adopted in 1991. General Assembly resolution 58/114 (2004) added independence as a fourth key principle underlying humanitarian action. The General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed the importance of promoting and respecting these principles within the framework of humanitarian assistance.
Safeguarding, especially CSG, refers to all the actions the GAs, IPs and contractors take to keep all people, especially children, they come into contact with safe – and it includes the proactive measures put in place to ensure people do not come to harm as a result of any direct or indirect contact with the GAs, IPs and contractors. It encompasses the prevention of physical, sexual and emotional abuse, neglect and maltreatment of adults and children, by employees and other persons whom the GPE AF fund is responsible for, including contractors, business partners, visitors to premises and volunteers. It also encompasses actions to mitigate and respond when such abuses occur.

The risk matrix in Annex C identifies the key safeguarding risks and proposed interventions from a child-centred and participatory approach to mainstream CSG strategies. Both SCI and UNICEF have zero-tolerance for violations including sexual exploitation and abuse and maintain strong CSG policies and practices informed by the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The mainstreaming of CSG strategies will be led by CSG focal points in SCI and UNICEF. The focal points will work closely with the PCU and dedicated staff to guide programme and partnership development as well as relevant monitoring, evaluation and learning activities.

7. Monitoring approach

The programme monitoring, evaluation and learning plan is organized into four main streams of work: 1) results monitoring, 2) implementation monitoring, 3) evidence generation and 4) assurance activities. The four work streams are interlinked and will be continuous throughout the programme duration with an aim to drive evidence-based learning for the education cluster, inform GA decision-making for improved programme and operational performance and strengthen the accountability and transparency across the programme. The table below indicates the available tools and resources for data collection and processing for further refinement in their detailed monitoring plan. All agreed upon tools and monitoring activities will leverage the GA’s existing monitoring activities and systems, expertise and experiences. Each workstream is further described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstream</th>
<th>Indicative tools &amp; resources for data collection &amp; processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results monitoring</td>
<td>- System to be designed to capture results at periodic intervals (see Results Framework Annex F for sources and means of verification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draw on aligned indicators to Education Cluster HRP reporting (e.g., ESMT, EiE platform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draw on digitised data tools to be utilised (e.g. KoBo, ONA, OpenEMIS, DHIS2, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

50 The CSG focal points will work closely with the Protection Cluster and CP area of responsibility to mainstream protection in all humanitarian interventions to ensure that safe access and use of appropriate services for the most marginalised groups is upheld.
51 Potential monitoring tools under discussion include: KoBo Toolbox (KoBo), Organisational Network Analysis platform (ONA), Open Education Management Information System (OpenEMIS) and District Health Information Software 2 (DHIS2), etc.
Implementation monitoring

- Field monitoring via GAs or IPs (e.g. field visits may use a mixed method approach and employ observational, KII, FGD and situational checklists, etc.)
- Community consultation & feedback and reporting mechanisms\(^\text{52}\), well linked to CSG (e.g., FGD, KII, hotlines, photovoice, picture story, staff outreach focal person, etc.)
- Onsite and remote monitoring using third-party organisation
- Draw on digitised data tools to be utilised (e.g., KoBo, ONA, OpenEMIS, DHIS2, etc.)

Evidence generation

- Summative evaluation
- Refer to Section 3.2 with key interventions dedicated to generating evidence for the Education Cluster

Assurance activities

- Spot-checks and micro-assessments [note, they are part of the core pillars of the UN harmonized approach to cash transfers (HACT)]

7.1 Results monitoring

To monitor results at output and outcome level of the theory of change (see Annex B), the GAs and IPs will periodically collect of data to report against a defined set of indicators (see Results Framework Annex F) using a simple online system of data collection.\(^\text{53}\) The agreed set of indicators in the results framework will also include high-frequency indicators aligned to the HRP 2022 and captured in the Education Cluster’s Education Sector Monitoring Tool (ESMT) to allow IPs to leverage their reporting to the cluster. The indicators also demonstrate the GA’s commitment to equity-focused programming reaching the most marginalised children, with the inclusion of disaggregated data for sex, age and children with disabilities.

7.2 Implementation monitoring

Programme implementation will be systematically monitored to guide provision of timely technical support, to increase accountability, to enhance learning and to facilitate timely decision-making. To monitor programme implementation, SCI and UNICEF will employ three mechanisms to ensure the monitoring of inputs and activities at the field-level: 1) routine monitoring visits by GA staff, 2) continuous monitoring by IPs and 3) as needed, remote and onsite monitoring by a third-party organisation covering remote and security compromised areas.

GA field monitoring

For the GAs, regular field monitoring is an integral part of programming. Field visits entail going to the field (service point or community) to witness implementation. Moreover, the visits help assure the progress towards the achievement of planned results, including attention to the pace of implementation

\(^{52}\) The plan is to collect data on a regular basis through different mechanisms including hotlines that will be recorded in a register, weekly collection of written complaints, and online consultations that will be recorded with permission. Data will be analysed, and feedback shared back with the beneficiaries on a regular basis

\(^{53}\) It is recognized that different agencies and organisations have different tools to track indicators. As an example, SC has expertise in the development of an indicator performance tool tracking table (IPTT) to capture and collect results and track progress against targets.
and the use of resources. Visits also allow the GAs to verify any assessment of progress reported by IPs, to support the identification of bottlenecks and barriers in implementation and ultimately, to trigger solutions and corrective actions.

Field visits will:
- Help to assure progress towards the achievement of planned results,
- Complement IP monitoring with additional data collection and
- Gather feedback from beneficiaries on the relevance, quality and effectiveness of support being provided by IPSs
- Allow verification of data and assessment of progress reported by IPs (on a sample basis),
- Direct observation and on-site verification on the implementation, including the pace, quality, and efficiency of implementation and the use of resources.
- Situational Analysis of operational environment.
- Support the identification of bottlenecks and barriers in implementation and trigger solutions and corrective actions.

The GAs will consult with their monitoring specialists and field-based staff to develop a set of field monitoring tools (e.g., observational, KII, FGD and situational checklists, etc.) to record key observations on continuity and use of services, quality and supplies and to help identify inconsistencies, gaps and issues raised by beneficiaries and partners. The collected data and findings will serve as an input to the comprehensive programme monitoring and managing of results. To be effective in reaching planned outputs, the monitoring visits must be systematically planned, be regular in frequency and ongoing.

Consistent with the GA’s commitment to the humanitarian principles, grand bargain commitments, and human rights approach to programming, the field visits also aim to ensure accountability to our primary stakeholders. A contextualised complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM) will be designed as a first step towards improving AAP (see Annex I). Field engagement will promote accountability through the provision of regular, timely and accessible information to children and adults in the targeted communities in a manner that is easily understood, respectful and culturally appropriate for different members of the communities, especially for the most marginalised. Further, opportunities and tools (e.g., FGD, KII, hotlines, photovoice, picture story, staff outreach focal person, etc.) will be used to engage children, educators, parents/caregivers and other community members, with a focus on the inclusion of the most marginalised voices, in a meaningful dialogue to hear and understand their ideas, opinions and concerns to influence programmatic adaptations, adjustments and decision-making. Establishing appropriate CFM with multiple child-friendly entry channels and systematic tracking will also be employed. Regardless of the modality, all engagement will seek to do no harm and be conducted under clear codes of conduct for ethical data collection and management and uphold safeguarding and PSEA policies and protocols.

Partner monitoring

The programme will be delivered primarily through international, national and local implementing partners (IPs). Therefore, as highlighted in the role of partners Section 5.5.1, local partners will be essential to conducting the core monitoring work of the programme, particularly in areas where access is limited to those outside of the affected area. The IPs will conduct continuous programme monitoring, collect

---

54 The GAs commit to upholding accountability to affected populations (AAP), a core humanitarian commitment, which will be informed by principles of active participation, gender mainstreaming, inclusion and responsiveness. Furthermore, AAP is part of SCI’s global Accountability to Children initiative and supports both GAs’ commitments to CSG.
data, support and facilitate accountability activities and submit regular progress and financial reports as per their cooperation agreements.\textsuperscript{55} The partners will adhere to the monitoring standards and guidelines set by the GAs and draw on tools provided.

To support and build the partners capacity, specialized GA monitoring staff in collaboration with the programme team will provide technical support, guidance and training on programme monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning as needed. Additional technical support and guidance will serve to promote quality assurance of the data collection and analysis. Support will include the development and training on common data collection tools to use, including on how to use the programme-wide data collection and management system.

In addition, education donors and partners may join the GA and/or IP monitoring work with a view to promote common understanding about the programme implementation among education sector partners and to find solutions jointly to address challenges related to the programme implementation (details will be worked out later).

\textbf{Monitoring by third-party organisation}

Given the dynamic context, third-party monitoring (TPM) services will be contracted, especially to cover areas where accessibility is limited and/or restricted due to political and security situations. Online data collection tools using digital platforms (e.g., KoBo, ONA, OpenEMIS, DHIS2, etc.) may be used to support the uninterrupted flow of data. Where online systems will be challenging, low-tech alternatives will be used such as phone calls and/or paper reporting.

Remote and third-party monitoring guidelines and training will be established, adapted as needed and used to ensure quality of monitoring. Monitoring guidelines may include third party workflow processes, responsibilities of various stakeholders, standards and guidance to different field monitoring methods and quality assurance mechanisms. Guidance may also cover the need to assess appropriateness of interventions to the needs of the affected populations, to assess the quality of services as per the agreed standards, to identify gaps in delivery of services (including end user supplies) and situation monitoring to identify any emerging issues related to the affected population which require urgent attention.

\subsection*{7.3 Evidence generation}

A summative evaluation is proposed to take place at the end of the programme. The purpose of the evaluation is to take stock and assess the short and medium-term outcomes and achievements after 18 months of implementation, as well as the sustainability of the results achieved and ultimately to generate evidence to inform and influence future programming. The evaluation will provide useful insights on continuing education for crisis-affected children in Myanmar amid an evolving humanitarian crisis. The main objectives of the evaluation are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item To assess programme progress against the targets agreed upon in the results framework and the ToC, including for example the extent which educators have improved their competencies in terms of subject knowledge, skills and attitudes and the extent to which partner capacity has increased.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{55} For UNICEF’s IPs, the programme cooperation agreements are in-line with the UN HACT, a simplified set of common principles and processes to request, disburse, provide assurance and report on funds.
● To assess which interventions and approaches are proven to be most successful and least successful, how these interventions contributed to achieving the desired level of results and which interventions will be sustainable over time and the necessary conditions for sustainability.

● To assess the coordination mechanisms between DPs and IPs and how collaboration between agencies led to magnified impacts.

● To identify best and promising practices, provide lessons learned and develop actionable recommendations to support future programme design and implementation.

The findings and learning will be essential for not only the donors and IPs, but also for the EDPCG and Education Cluster to better understand and inform how the programme managed to address and adopt strategies to reach the most marginalised children. The evidence will be used for advocacy and further resource mobilisation purposes.

The evaluation will follow a theory based and utilisation focused approach with mixed methods. It will include collection of baseline and end-line information allowing for before-after analysis. It will also be informed by an organisational capacity assessment and a teacher competency assessment, in addition to other sources of primary information generated by the programme’s monitoring framework and secondary information. The baseline itself will also support for the establishment and refinement of realistic targets of the indicators (see Results Framework Annex F). The evaluation will be conducted by a third party and managed by SCI and UNICEF to ensure neutrality, independence, and objectivity throughout.

Given that the programme aims to support learning outcomes of the targeted beneficiary children, the GAs will commission an independent evaluation of the open learning element of this programme with the objective to capture and document the lessons learned specifically in relation to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the intervention. This will include children’s learning outcomes as well as the appropriateness and timelines of the key interventions that could inform critical decision making and to feed into future program designs.

7.4 Assurance activities

Drawing on the GAs’ capacity and extensive experience in technical, programmatic and financial oversight and quality assurance – which include indicative activities such as programmatic visits, spot checks and micro-assessments – there will be well-established and agreed upon financial assurance principles and processes to ensure that the funds transferred to IPs are used for intended purposes, that the programme continues as planned with any needed adaptations and that the targets are fully met.

IPs will be required to conduct programme monitoring and submit regular progress/implementation status and financial status reports consistent with the agreed upon principles and processes (e.g., periodic progress/utilisation, annual, final report, etc.).

8. Programme budget overview and funds flow arrangements

56 For UNICEF’s IPs this will include the adherence to the principles and processes of the UN HACT as described in the programme cooperation agreement (PCA).
8.1 Programme Budget

Both GAs have developed a detailed itemised budget using standard costing principles in consultation with the relevant supplies and finance colleagues from the respective organisations. Prevailing inflation, currency depreciation etc. have been factored into while developing cost estimates. Table 2 below provides a budget summary, for a detailed budget see Annex H.

Table 2: Indicative budget summary (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>Total (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Access</td>
<td>$2,411,133</td>
<td>$2,644,618</td>
<td>$5,055,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quality</td>
<td>$1,730,130</td>
<td>$3,192,370</td>
<td>$4,922,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Community systems strengthening</td>
<td>$716,618</td>
<td>$1,019,382</td>
<td>$1,736,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Support costs (TA)</td>
<td>$447,289</td>
<td>$1,078,855</td>
<td>$1,526,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Operational costs (incl. M&amp;E)</td>
<td>$701,716</td>
<td>$757,889</td>
<td>$1,459,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,006,886</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,693,114</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Funds flow arrangements

The section below details out the funds flow arrangements of respective GAs.

**Save the Children International**: For Save the Children the donor (GPE) is expected to transfer funds directly to Save the Children UK (managing member) as per the flow of funds table highlighted as below. This table also describes the flow of funds from the donor to the member and to the implementing CSO partners. The following mechanism also applies throughout the program implementation.

- Consultant payments varies (if consultants have bank accounts internationally SCI Center transfers and if local consultants SCI Myanmar transfers)
- Partners transfer funds to vendors by wire transfer
- Generally, in Myanmar most partner staff salary is paid monthly in cash in MMK,
SCI make Bank transfers monthly to pay SCI Staff – send USD/Receive MMK.

UNICEF:
**Within UNICEF:** Once UNICEF receives the official approval from GPE Secretariat (the approval letter), the Public Partnership Division (PPD) in HQ, in coordination with UNICEF Myanmar, will submit the grant creation request through an internal system. Normally it takes no more than two to three (2-3) business days to create a grant. As soon as the grant is created in the system, UNICEF Myanmar will receive the budget in advance as frontload from UNICEF HQ in the system, regardless of whether UNICEF HQ has received funds from GPE or not; as a result, UNICEF Myanmar will be ready to proceed with procurement and other activities. Necessary preparatory work, planning and documentation will begin as soon as the grant funding is approved. Starting from grant approval to grant creation/startup, it will not take more than 7-10 working days in total.

**Between UNICEF and CSO partner/s:** Cash and supply contributions from UNICEF and the CSO partner are critical inputs to programme implementation. UNICEF follows the global UN Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) as a corporate standard practice. After signing of the small scale funding arrangement (SSFA) using a simple terms of reference (ToR) or Programme Document (PD), the CSO partner submits a Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditure (FACE) form signed by an authorized officer to request cash transfers amounting to cash needed to meet three months of the programme’s cash flow requirements, and a Supply Request form to request supplies. There are three modalities of payment to CSOs i.e. CSO can request (a) cash advance in the case of direct cash transfer (DCT); (b) authorization to enter into commitments in the case of direct payment; or (c) authorization to incur expenditure in the case of reimbursements. All funds are released after proper review and verification by designated officers from UNICEF. For (a) and (c) modality funds are transferred to CSO’s authorized bank account, whereas for direct payments CSO shares the bank details of the vendor/supplier/service provider to be paid. The FACE form should contain detailed funds requests at the activity level based on the mutually agreed budget. Along with the FACE form, the CSO submits an Itemized Cost Estimate (ICE), or detailed activity budget, with a detailed budget breakdown listing the planned utilization of cash at the input level.

| Method, Currency, and Frequency of Transfers: From GPE-SCUK-SCI-Partners – Vendors-Suppliers-Consultants |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **TRANSFER**                      | **Method**      | **Currency**    | **Frequency**   |
| GPE to SCUK bank account          | Wire Transfer   | Donor Currency  | Annually        |
| SCUK to SCI Centre                | Wire Transfer   | Donor Currency  | Quarterly       |
| SCI Center to SCI Myanmar         | Wire Transfer   | USD             | Monthly         |
| SCI Center to Partners in Myanmar via international banking service | Wire Transfer | USD             | As per cash flow plan |
| SCI Center to Vendors via international banking service | Wire Transfer | Invoice Currency | Against Invoice |
| SCI Myanmar to Vendors based in Myanmar via in country banking service | Wire Transfer/Cash* | Invoice currency | Against Invoice |
| Partners to Vendors / Suppliers   | Wire Transfer/ Cash | MMK            | Against Invoice |
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Annex A: Education Cluster’s EiE provisional strategy, June 2021 – May 2022

EiE Provisional Strategy

Draft: 15 July 2021

Context

Most children and youth in Myanmar have not been engaged in organized learning since March 2020. Following the outbreak of COVID-19 as a pandemic, the Ministry of Education closed schools as a pre-emptive measure prior to Myanmar’s first recorded case on 23 March 2020. Except for some areas beyond administration of MoE, all other learning spaces followed suit. These learning spaces remained closed through May 2021, except for a brief 3-week exception for some high schools. This created a learning crisis for Myanmar’s 12 million school-aged children, as well as adolescents and youth attending non-formal and TVET courses.

The actions of the military on 1 February 2021 resulted in widespread protests and civil unrest which continues to date. The education system has been affected: approximately 25 per cent of education staff are already suspended or dismissed due to their participation in a civil disobedience movement, there are numerous reported cases of the occupation of schools by security forces, and explosive devices have been used at schools by various groups, including those opposed to their re-opening. The de facto authorities declared schools re-opened beginning 1 June 2021; while there are estimates about 1 in 3 children returned to schools in June, the results are mixed by location – in Rakhine State nearly all schools re-opened with significant attendance, in Kayah State nearly no schools re-opened. However, as of 12 July, schools were closed again nationwide due to the increasing prevalence of COVID-19 throughout the country. In addition to the above incidents, armed clashes between the military and ethnic armed organisations have quickly escalated since March 2021, resulting in thousands of newly displaced persons in existing HRP areas and beyond.57

The impact of COVID-19 and the events since 1 February 2021 cannot be overstated for children and youth – nor for caregivers and teachers. All age groups have had limited opportunities to engage in learning, with lasting effects for their cognitive development and their socioeconomic futures. The instability, particularly in regards to access to education, will have serious impact on the mental and emotional wellbeing of children, youth, and their caregivers; further, without access to education, children and youth have much greater exposure to protection risks such as child labour, early marriage, and others.

Education Cluster thus far prioritized consultations with communities regarding the support required for their children and youth to continue or re-engage in learning. For reasons related to both security and COVID-19, many families respond that they do not feel safe to send their children to schools; this occurs

57 As of 18 June 2021, this includes up to 5000 in Kachin State; several thousand in Northern Shan State; up to 40,000 in the Southeast including some 2000 crossing the border to Thailand; up to 15,000 near Mindat and Kanpetlet in Chin State; several thousand in both Sagaing and Magway Regions; and over 100,000 in Kayah State.
in both HRP and non-HRP locations. Families are requesting support for teaching and learning materials in nearly all locations.

Even as there is significantly increased need to support continued engagement in learning, the complex operational context has numerous, very serious challenges. In many locations, the security situation has deteriorated, making access difficult. Limitations remain for mobile and broadband data use. The capacity of the banking sector, and the availability of cash, has diminished and is having a serious impact on procurement and on payment of staff and volunteer teachers. A third wave of COVID-19 will make access and logistics of activities even more difficult. These potent challenges must be considered in preparedness activities and while formulating responses.

### Strategy Purpose and Duration

A provisional EiE Strategy is needed to outline the coordinated preparedness and response actions required to support children and youth to (re-)engage in learning in a fragile context; education in emergencies (EiE) actors provide support to minimize disruptions to education caused by crises and fragility.

The Provisional Strategy outlines Education Cluster activities until the typical beginning of the next academic year (present through May 2022) and will be reviewed at 6 months (November 2021) as well as with any major change in the situation. The Provisional Strategy outlines how the Cluster will monitor education needs and provide support to communities for safe learning opportunities, in locations where disruptions to education are likely or ongoing.

Given the extent of education disruption in Myanmar and the expanded need for an EiE response, the EiE Provisional Strategy will be implemented while closely working with other education stakeholders in Myanmar. This particularly includes education DPs and ethnic/indigenous education providers and those organisations and networks which support them. This will support bridging an emergency response and longer-term objectives more oriented to development. The multi-sectoral needs of children, families and educators will be met through working with other clusters – particularly CP and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH).

The Provisional Strategy continues to encourage a comprehensive do no harm approach in all activities, with full consideration of conflict sensitivity. It also prioritizes a rights-based approach, with particular focus on the right to education and parents’ right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. It additionally maintains the four humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence.

---

Geographic Scope

The Education Cluster will continue to support the populations identified as in need and targeted in the 2021 Myanmar Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), in the 2021 interim emergency response plan, and will additionally consider a further expanded response (see next paragraph). This 2021 HRP includes communities affected by conflict, displacement, and statelessness in Kayin, Kachin, Northern Shan, Southern Chin, and Rakhine States. The 2021 interim emergency response plan includes communities in peri-urban areas of Yangon and opens the door to rapid responses in other areas which face new humanitarian situations, such as conflict-related displacement in Kayah and Chin States.

The Education Cluster will also work with existing and new partners in areas throughout Myanmar, i.e. in non-HRP locations, which either 1) have new displacements of children, youth and families, or 2) have a demonstrated need for emergency support to minimize disruption to learning. Such needs will be identified through monitoring access to learning, detailed in the below section on key activities. Both a demonstrated need and the capacity to respond are required to provide an EiE response.

To better respond outside HRP areas, the Education Cluster is currently undertaking a capacity mapping of existing EiE partners, and mapping organisations and education providers which have not yet been part of EiE activities.

Key Objectives and Activities

The objectives and activities of the Provisional Strategy are informed by three existing Education Cluster documents:

- The Education Cluster COVID-19 Response Strategy (developed April 2020; last updated October 2020)
- The 2021 Myanmar HRP (published January 2021)
- The Guidance for Critical Activities (last updated March 2021)
- The 2021 Myanmar Interim emergency response plan (endorsed June 2021)

59 In the case that these are not covered by the 2021 interim emergency response plan.
They continue to be important reference documents for preparedness and response.

**Objectives**

The objectives in the 2021 HRP and the Education Cluster COVID-19 Response Strategy remain largely relevant. With some minor adjustment – namely the inclusion of youth, community facilitators, and caregivers - these objectives will be maintained:

1. Crisis-affected girls and boys, adolescents and youth (ages 3-24) have continued access to protective, quality and inclusive learning opportunities that promote their health and wellbeing (2021 HRP)
2. Volunteer teachers, community facilitators’ and caregivers’ capacity is enhanced to provide continued quality education to and cater for psycho-social and socio-emotional needs of crisis-affected learners. (2021 HRP)
3. The education cluster (local/national NGOs and education spaces) has increased capacity to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises. (2021 HRP)

Within these objectives, specific attention is needed to ensure the integration of non-specialized psychosocial support and COVID-19 prevention.

4. Girls and boys, adolescents, and youth (ages 3-24), educators and caregivers receive psychosocial support that promotes their protection and wellbeing and continued learning capacity. (COVID-19 Response Strategy)
5. Girls and boys, adolescents, and youth (ages 3-24), educators and caregivers have the awareness and supplies to prevent and control COVID-19 (COVID-19 Response Strategy)

**Activities**

**Critical Activities for EiE Partner Direct Implementation**

The Education Cluster agreed on four critical activities for EiE partners’ direct implementation following 1 February 2021; these remain in place:

1. Open, supplementary learning supported by volunteer teachers, community facilitators, and/or caregivers; or, ensuring community acceptance and safety of children and youth, support education in schools or other safe learning spaces
2. Non-specialized psychosocial support to children, youth, caregivers, and teachers (such as regular and structured recreational activities, remote messaging for PSS) for improved learning outcomes; and case referrals for specialized PSS and protection, all in coordination with CP actors
3. Life skills and life-saving information, including continued communication and engagement for COVID-19 prevention.
4. Continue incentive payments for volunteer teachers.

**Priority Education Cluster Activities for Joint Preparedness and Response**

Especially given the difficult operational context, these will remain priorities going forward. While these are activities for implementation by individual EiE partners, several joint activities for preparedness and
response are prioritized for action across EiE partners, using the Education Cluster coordination mechanism. They are described below.

To understand where these four critical activities are required, and to tailor them appropriately in each location, the Education Cluster will engage in initiatives for monitoring and assessment:

**Monitoring access to learning:**

This proposed initiative will use the network and presence of EiE partners in and beyond HRP locations to monitor whether children and youth are accessing learning opportunities, and if so, which learning opportunities. This will include collecting unofficial reports on the status of formal education spaces and complementary education systems (e.g. monastic, ethnic). It will also include the use of an updated version of the contextualized education needs assessments following any new displacements.

**Monitoring attacks on education:**

The Education Cluster and partners will participate in and support existing initiatives (the MRM as well as ongoing data collection from UN agencies and INGOs) to monitor attacks on education, both regarding infrastructure as well as education personnel and students.

These two monitoring initiatives will continuously inform the Education Cluster response per location, and provide an evidence base for an EiE response, particularly outside HRP locations.

The Education Cluster will also engage in preparedness actions through capacity mapping, contingency response planning, and localization through greater engagement of local organisations and staff:

**Capacity mapping:**

Education Cluster is reaching out to existing partners to understand their capacity (i.e. offices, staffing, pre-positioned stock) to update information for HRP areas and to collect this information as a preparedness activity in non-HRP areas; this mapping will then require regular updating in all areas. Such a mapping will be used to then engage partners in the above monitoring exercises, if they opt in, as well as to reach out to partners in case of conflict and/or disasters that cause new displacements.

**Contingency response planning:**

Some scenarios and contingencies have already been discussed in inter-agency forums at State/Region level; based on the scenarios already decided, Education Cluster will work to develop contingency plans at State-level. This will begin in Kachin and Northern Shan States as areas with renewed armed conflict and displacements. Work with EiE partners in the Southeast and Northwest (Rakhine and Chin States) will follow, along with other non-HRP locations as possible.

**Greater engagement with local actors:**

Localization is a standing priority for Education Cluster, and particular emphasis will be given to: 1) improving the outreach of Cluster, with a focus on its relevance and capacity to support existing activities of local and national organisations providing EiE response; and 2) strengthening understanding and skills
related to education in emergencies across all contributing organisations, particularly working with any new, local, and/or non-traditional EiE partners based on their own identified needs.

Finally, the Education Cluster will look to **address quality through scaling and expanding on existing good practices.** This will include providing guidance on responses to provide emergency support to learning and wellbeing:

**Common packages and trainings for supplementary/open learning:**

Building on the joint recommendations and lessons learnt from Education Cluster’s COVID-19 home-based learning efforts, Education Cluster partners may come together to produce common packages of supplementary or open learning for specific age groups and geographic areas, so that children and youth can continue to learn even if they are not able to attend learning spaces. Such packages will also build more structure around supplementary learning activities.

**Capacity building and technical support to integrate PSS in education interventions:**

Several EiE partners already have efforts underway for materials and training related to non-specialized psychosocial support (PSS) to children, youth, and adults (caregivers/teachers). Partners may take from these efforts for certain good practices and offer joint ToTs.

**Developing key resources for supporting youth education and pathways:**

Youth engagement in education is a fundamental protection tool and forms a core component of durable solutions for crisis-affected communities. To strengthen youth education, key resources may be identified regarding life skills for the current context (e.g. media and information literacy), relevant technical and vocational education, other skills development programmes, and any other priority needs.

**Standard guidance and materials for reaching the most marginalised, including children and youth with disabilities:**

Creating more opportunities for learning in a systematic manner must specifically seek to engage the most marginalised in these efforts; the Education Cluster will continue to support efforts to better support fully inclusive education, including those efforts already underway.

**Monitoring Framework**

A monitoring framework for the priority joint preparedness and response activities will be developed in the weeks after the Provisional Strategy is finalised. Monitoring of the reach of EiE partners in implementing the critical activities will occur through the Education Sector Monitoring Tool (ESMT). Efforts will be made to harmonize monitoring for other types of report.
Annex B: Theory of change

Overall objective

Crisis-affected girls and boys (ages 3-17) access safe, quality, inclusive education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing

Component 1: Improved safe and inclusive access to education for crisis-affected girls and boys

1.1 Provided safe learning spaces and basic materials to ensure continuity of education services
1.2 Expanded access to ECE
1.3 Provided NFE and life skills for adolescent girls and boys
1.4 Supported PTAs/SMECs/VECs to ensure protection, safety and wellbeing of children

Indicative interventions
- Provide school/teacher/student kits & COVID PPE
- Improve learning spaces, use of safety assessments
- Enhance & distribute NFE materials, integrate life skills
- Consolidate and strengthen ECE resources
- Provide incentives for educators
- Sensitize and mobilize community
- Train PTAs/SMECs/VECs

Component 2: Enhance quality of education for crisis-affected girls and boys

2.1 Strengthened educator capacity, targeting competencies identified in capacity gaps assessment
2.2 Supported safe and continuous, long-term learning

Component 3: Enhanced capacity of the Education Cluster, esp. local partners, to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises

3.1 Strengthened EiE monitoring and IM
3.2 Evidence generation for EiE
3.3 Contingency planning at sub-national level
3.4 Strengthened local partners’ capacity to provide coordinated education response in emergencies

Indicative interventions
- Develop an IM platform
- Develop standardized monitoring tools and guidance
- Design small/medium scale studies to generate evidence on EiE
- Develop contingency plans; operationalise plans through pre-positioned contingency stocks
- Develop a mechanism to provide small grants to partners

Assumptions: Communities are supportive of flexible and alternative learning opportunities (NFE, life skills, ECE, OL) and encourage children to participate / safety and security does not impede children from accessing learning opportunities / safe learning spaces are available / educators are engaged and retained
### Annex C: Risk matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>- Work-related security limitations - Field staff and other authorities-facing colleagues may face security risks if the relationship with the SAC, NUG, PDFs and EAOs deteriorates - Increasing expansion of AA administration may create dilemmas and pressures for staff who must engage with local authorities - Additionally, lack of clarity on local authorities in a programme area or the presence of multiple active local authorities makes it challenging to safely and appropriately engage with the authorities and relevant stakeholders which may affect staff and partners’ ability to implement</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Security procedures in place by each GA and Ips - It is critical to transfer as many risks as possible away from vulnerable colleagues by ensuring that relevant comms/messaging comes from an appropriately high level and/or consider an appropriate model for risk sharing - A valuable resource: GISF’s joint action guide <em>Partnerships and Security Risk Management</em> for step by step guidance - Proactive discussions on red lines will be managed through effective governance structures (e.g. GPE AF SC) Ongoing risk assessment and mitigation at activity level will, including the levels of acceptable engagement with the SAC, NUG, PDFs and EAOs, in different contexts, in order to safely deliver services will also be of key importance.</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>- Interference of authorities/groups including intimidation, detention, violence against partners, educators or the targeted population - Interference of authorities/groups resulting in occupation of learning spaces, confiscation/destruction/appropriation of programme-related supplies, documents, assets, etc. (the perceived or real risks of schools being targeted)</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Agree on red-lines and set criteria for partners' disengagement - Ensure relevant communication, info and messaging is provided to appropriate stakeholders - Ensure timely flow of relevant info on safety and security through IPs, field colleagues, community consultations, etc. - Ensure flexible context-informed approaches and mechanisms to deliver; imp. of operational</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners Development and EIE partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk subcategory</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>- Complex armed and frequently intense armed conflict persists in various locations resulting in extensive constraints of freedom of movement; limited humanitarian access and movement</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>- GAs have routine security and situational assessments and security procedures in place and continuous info sharing venues via UNCT, sectors, etc.</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners Development and EiE partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Natural disasters</td>
<td>- Seasonal floods and landslides (May to Oct.), with risks of larger emergencies due to a cyclone or earthquake, potentially directly affecting areas with already high levels of humanitarian need or creating emergency critical needs in other locations - Climate events cause delays in implementation (e.g., flooding, cyclones and earthquakes are major hazards) - Due to disaster damages, the further deterioration of the learning environment and potential to affect planned implementation activities</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>- GAs have established contingency and preparedness plans; utilize local and seasonal approaches to mitigate the risk to some extent - The programme design includes adaptive programming to ensure continuity of services which could be adapted/applied in the wake of a natural disaster</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk category</td>
<td>Risk sub-category</td>
<td>Risk description</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Gross risk level</td>
<td>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Net risk level</td>
<td>Risk owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Epidemics</td>
<td>- Ongoing COVID-19 pandemic; delay in field implementation due to movement restriction as a result of second wave of case surge of COVID-19; staff getting infected and risks to the IPs; increased transmission in humanitarian settings; disruption of other essential services, including education, e.g., closure of schools and the use of schools as quarantine facilities</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- COVID-19 IPC (infection prevention and control) measures continue to be implemented consistently across all activities. - Continue to monitor the situation of local transmission of COVID-19 closely. - Use of remote meetings and programme monitoring as needed. - Use of a business continuity plan (BCP) as needed, e.g., if infections result in a minimized staff presence. - Adapt programming to ensure continuity of services as COVID-19 increases.</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners Development and humanitarian partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Epidemics</td>
<td>- Potential outbreak of other disease(s) due to deterioration of the national health situation and capacity of health systems further stretched and access to quality health care services further compromised, particularly in NGCAs and conflict-affected areas</td>
<td>Moderate likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Relevant IPC measures will be adapted and continue to be applied consistently across all programme activities. - Adapt programming to ensure continuity of services in wake of potential outbreak of other disease(s); integrated efforts with relevant sectors, e.g., health, WASH, nutrition, etc.</td>
<td>Moderate likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners Development and humanitarian partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Political development</td>
<td>- Political unrest; military takeover on 1 February 2021 and little to no engagement with the de-facto authorities; implementing activities without formal approval may expose partners to risks of violating COVID-19 rules or other laws</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Maintain close coordination with donors including through the ROs and HQs. - Remain guided by UNCT guidance for principles of engagement and programme implementation.</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Political development</td>
<td>- Political agenda; current lack of political commitment to investments within education (country’s policy, priorities and financial changes)</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Root the programme in community while empowering local organisations to create buy-in and ownership to withstand any political turmoil.</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TOTAL RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Political development s</td>
<td>- Heightened security approach of de-facto authorities leading to constrained movement of programme personnel</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Partnerships with local civil society may help to navigate challenges related to dual administrative structure since the responsibility for engagement could be transferred to stakeholder with local knowledge to navigate sensitivities (at the same time, these administrative structures should not be uncritically accepted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Context</td>
<td>Political development s</td>
<td>- Civil unrest and changes to political context add to instability - Ongoing civil disobedience; politicization of education - Risk to UNICEF, its staff and partners, as well as their ability to implement due to increasing politicization and polarization of education; with teachers being particularly active in the CDM, protests, and attacks on schools, and education offices; the de-facto authorities promoted the opening of schools, whilst the NUG, a self-declared government in exile, encouraged home learning</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Rooting the programme in community while empowering local organisations to create buy-in and ownership to withstand any political turmoil - Working through local partners, who already have the long-term trust of local communities, and as such partner and community consultation is key to ensuring that materials and methods of implementation are acceptable at the local level - It is important that GAs maintain and are seen to maintain their neutrality, through careful messaging and always putting children, rather than any particular group first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Economic environment</td>
<td>- Inflation caused by increasing prices and commodity shortages because of disrupted supply chains</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Where possible, partners will be encouraged to purchase at scale and seek fixed prices with suppliers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RESIDUAL RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk category</td>
<td>Risk sub-category</td>
<td>Risk description</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Economic environment</td>
<td>- Macroeconomic risk due to decline in revenue and debt servicing may result in decline in investments in social sectors - Ongoing fiscal crisis and decreasing GOP revenues may result in reducing government financing of education services - Many students are dropping out of school or learning opportunities for financial reasons</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Economic environment</td>
<td>- Variation of the programme budget (in local currency) due to the fluctuation of exchange rate; unexpected increment of some implementing costs; and the difference in &quot;market value&quot; and the rates from illegal money changers of the local currency versus the central bank rate against the USD</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk category</td>
<td>Risk sub-category</td>
<td>Risk description</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Capacity of implementing partners</td>
<td>- Limited human resource capacities of any single IP to deliver on all programme targets lowers effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, etc.  - Lack of skilled and experienced education and EiE professionals (IPs) to manage programme and funds (inadequate programme planning and management and technical capacity)</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Inadequate coordination between development and emergency partners</td>
<td>- Poor coordination leads to duplication of other activities in programme areas  - Tensions between sector members between members and selected IPs  - Some sectoral partners may be uninterested in productive coordination and/or may have objectives that have conflicting purposes with the objectives or approaches of the programme</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TOTAL RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>RESIDUAL RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Delivery      | Constraints across delivery chain | - Limited capacity of the market and supply chain to meet demand  
- Delay in procurement of goods and services  
- Delay or inability to deliver supplies in a timely manner due to insecurity on transit routes or near warehouses or inaccessible areas, which might lead to supplies in warehouses/storage for a long time and not in the hands of intended beneficiaries | Moderate likely | Moderate | Medium          | - Mobilisation of existing partnerships and contractors  
- As needed, explore new partnerships for transportation of supplies; encourage local purchase of supplies/materials  
- As feasible, consider pre-positioning supplies  
- As needed, materials will be transported via the safest approach/route, including by convoy and engagement with communities, education stakeholders and/or local authorities prior to distribution as appropriate  
- Continue communication and coordination with the relevant UN agencies advocating on behalf of humanitarian actors for humanitarian corridors/access  
- Closely work with local partners who are familiar with the situation in areas with access constraints to explore alternative solutions of distribution or additional measure to facilitate the distribution | Unlikely | Minor | Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
| Delivery      | Willingness of beneficiaries to engage | - Lack of willingness or interest to participate in programme activities by beneficiaries  
- Including, insufficient interest and or availability of volunteers | Unlikely | Moderate | Medium          | - Prioritize community consultation and reporting (real-time monitoring and feedback loops) to be considered when determine the kinds of activities and level of engagement necessary  
- Engagement of stakeholders and communities through C4D | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Delivery      | Conflict sensitivity (e.g., DNH) | - The programme actions and behaviours may have unintended and negative consequences on the individuals and group dynamics and context in which humanitarian assistance is being provided  
- Potential tension in targeted communities due to expectations exceeding what the programme can deliver  
- Potential non-targeted communities feel unequally treated/left out and express frustration that their communities are not benefiting | Unlikely | Moderate | Medium | - DNH principle will lead the response; to adapt a strategic path to a conflict-sensitive humanitarian response  
- A full endeavour toward conflict sensitive programming will require a thorough conflict analysis  
- Advancement and role of social cohesion; to include monitoring the impact of the programme activities on conflict, social cohesion, and the level of inclusion, and uphold the principle of doing no harm to the community  
- Efforts from the onset of the programme to work with and through partners to establish transparency and information sharing with targeted and non-targeted communities through safe forums to discuss/inform/sensitize on the programme (e.g., outcomes/outputs, criteria/selection process, etc.)  
- Use of feedback mechanisms  
Ongoing risk assessment and mitigation at activity level will, including the levels of acceptable engagement with the SAC and EAOs, in different contexts, in order to safely deliver services will also be of key importance | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Delivery      | Interventions do not reach the most at-risk/marginalised | - Lack of recent data (surveys, studies, evaluations) limits ability to ensure targeted and evidence-based programming  
- Lack of disaggregated data (at least by sex and age) including on disability and other specific needs of children; delay in the production of such data  
- There is a risk that marginalised communities (especially Muslim communities) may be excluded due to access restrictions imposed by the SAC  
- Insufficient safe and dignified access to learning spaces, e.g., children with disabilities | Unlikely | Moderate | Medium | - A comprehensive mapping of the intervention areas to reach the most at-risk/marginalised children  
- UNICEF's guidance and mandate under the Core Commitments to Children  
- Partners and programmes will aim to provide inclusive and safe education; ensuring a gender and inclusive perspective is integrated and monitored in all activities  
- Partners and programmes will seek support from relevant sectors/partners (e.g., WASH, GBV, CP, etc.) |
| Operation al  | Budget and funds management | - Limited cash availability and reduction in banking transactions and limitations on cash withdrawals and scrutiny of large transfers  
- Recognition that in any context, the routine transfers of moderate amounts of cash carries substantial inherent risks | Likely | Severe | High | - Seek alternative arrangements for transfers through functioning bank systems, cash systems or cheque payments  
- Following disruptions to the banking system after the events of 1 February 2021, alternative solutions sought, such as negotiating with banks and the Central Bank to make sure that remittances of funds into the country can go through smoothly and disbursements to partners and suppliers are able to continue, including agreements for increased fund withdrawals for GA's current partners and GAs “introducing” partners through a letter in some cases, and cross border accounting for partners operating partially from neighbouring countries and EAO areas.  
- Arrangements can be made with IPs to secure cash flow, but some delays may remain due to cash | Moderate | Moderate | Medium | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
### TOTAL RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>HR and unethical behaviour (excluding CSG)</td>
<td>- Failure to adhere to or raise issues regarding organisational values or standards of integrity resulting in actual or perceived fraud, waste or abuse</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Limits - Training of partners on assurance activities (e.g. HACT activities for UNICEF), including spot checks and programme monitoring visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Supply and logistics</td>
<td>- Limited ability to secure required supplies from external sources due to constrained procurement and delivery in and into Myanmar</td>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Limits - UNICEF and SCI have a full set of policies regarding ethical conduct, fraud, harassment and abuse of authority, whistle blowing, and retaliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESIDUAL RISK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Grant Agents Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk category</td>
<td>Risk sub-category</td>
<td>Risk description</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Operation        | ICT system and information security | - Due to increased conflict and instability, limited availability of or restrictions on Internet, Internet service providers in hard-to-reach areas; potential disruption to tele-communication systems that will interrupt coordination of activities with partners  
- Linked, unprotected data on children and educators/volunteers | Moderate likely | Moderate | Medium     | - GAs, with other sectoral partners, will seek new opportunities/ideas to mitigate, manage and resolve connectivity issues  
- Partners will be encouraged to back-up programme & compliance data on external drives  
- GAs and partners will put in place contingency plans for remote low-tech comms; a variety of comms tools will be deployed to bridge gaps; programming and activities will be adaptable (e.g., low tech OL, a neutral platform to upload teaching/learning activities)  
- Data on children and educators will be anonymized as appropriate and protected within secure data management systems; consultations with partners on how to ensure collection and storage of data is secure | Moderate likely | Minor   | Medium     | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operation     | Transition and exit strategies | - Limited human financial resources
- Lack of uptake or ownership by communities to sustain activities | Unlikely | Minor | Low | - Engagement of national and local partners in decision-making, transition and exit strategies; phased exit strategy to empower national and local actors
- To design and put into place transition and exit strategies that realistically address the continuity/sustainability of activities, and the need to maintain skills, infrastructure, and labour resources to achieve outcomes, and that avoid negative disruption or harm to communities
- Inform all relevant stakeholders about intended activities, including programme design, programme objectives, levels of commitment and sustainability/exit strategies | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
| Fiduciary     | Fraud and corruption | - Institutional corruption risks
- Misuse of funds by local IPs (risks that funds are not used for the intended purposes and/or are not properly accounted for)
- Credit risks
- Do not achieve value for money; and/or are not properly accounted for | Unlikely | Minor | Low | - Funding will be subject to extensive checks and controls
- Continue application of UNICEF HACT policy and procedures, financial spot-checks, programme monitoring visits and end-user supply monitoring spot-checks are regularly carried out with all IPs
- Compliance spot checks are carried out at the field
- Fraud awareness training for IP staff
- Close follow up on audits and micro-assessment findings | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reputation      | Neutrality        | - Perceived lack of political neutrality could impede advocacy and programme support  
- Perception of impartiality can result in reduced staff security and inability to deliver programmes  
- Risk of backlash from within the communities, including unintended consequences  
- Implementation of learning activities may be perceived as legitimising the de facto authorities  
- Reputational risks may spill over into security risks if the activities become (negatively) high profile | Moderate | Moderate | Medium | - Prioritize work through local communities and partners  
- Communicate and sensitize communities and local authorities on the programme’s outcomes/outputs, etc.; prioritize early dialogue and a process for regular consultation with stakeholders/partners/communities  
- Communicate GAs well established safeguarding policies, mandates and humanitarian principles | Unlikely | Minor | Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
| Organisational  | Governance and accountability | - Lack of clarity around individual roles and responsibilities and cumbersome or ineffective oversight structures that could impede operational effectiveness and fail to empower management and staff to make decisions or escalate as necessary  
- Limited effectiveness of governance structures i.e. inadequate oversight and accountability, as seen in slow decision-making  
- Mismanaged processes / inadequate roles and responsibilities | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | - Clear governance structures, including a SC and PCU, with clear and agreed upon roles and responsibilities  
- Establish and maintain regular communication pathways with all education actors and coordination groups | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL RISK</th>
<th>RESIDUAL RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk sub-category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding</td>
<td>Risk of harm to children; abuse, exploitation, neglect and physical safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk sub-category</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Gross risk level</th>
<th>Mitigation strategy and measures (actions that have been or will be taken)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Net risk level</th>
<th>Risk owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safeguarding  | Risk of harm to communities, individual adults and marginalised groups | - Sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment by IPs, UNICEF and SCI personnel and associates  
- Safety of parents, communities and other stakeholders for participating in the programme related consultations, focus group discussions (FDG), etc. | Unlikely | Moderate | Medium | - PSEA training for all staff and IPs; the PSEA course is now available in Myanmar language course on Agora, the UNICEF learning platform, which is made available to IPs; it is a mandatory course for NGO partners  
- PSEA protocols for beneficiaries to report any abuse any staff; protocols are part of the partnership agreement and are shared widely with those are benefit from programmes  
- Constant monitoring will ensure that any violations are identified and dealt with accordingly  
- Continue the provision of orientation on minimum standards to partner agencies  
- Work with local partners to assess the situation and level of risks for parents, communities and others’ safety, and share the analysis with them transparently so that they make the informed decision on their participation.  
- Keep confidentiality of the consultation, FDG, etc. | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
| Safeguarding  | Environmental damage, including damage to structures | - Environmental degradation, natural resource depletion, pollution and rising inequity work in concert to accelerate and exacerbate environmental impacts; may include death, injury, disease and other negative effects on human physical, mental and social well-being | Unlikely | Minor | Low | - Consideration of resilient development to address the underlying drivers of inequity and fragility that cause environmental, economic and social deprivations and stresses; to bridge the arbitrary divide between development and humanitarian assistance, integrating risk factors such as climate change into programming, and strengthening systems that can anticipate as well as absorb shocks in the event of disasters | Very unlikely | Negligible | Very Low | Grant Agents Implementing partners |
Annex D: GA organograms

Below presents how the two GAs will organize themselves internally to support the programme in relation to the Steering Committee. It is not about the Steering Committee composition, which will be discussed and decided by education partners and donors through consultations, as described in the programme document.
## Annex E: GA roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key leadership</th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intervention areas** | - 1.1. Established safe learning with materials and educators  
- 1.2. Expanded ECE  
- 1.4. Strengthened PTAs/SMCs/VECs  
- 2.1. Strengthened capacity of educators  
- 3.2. Generated evidence for Education cluster  
- 3.4. Strengthened capacity of local partners in EiE | - 1.3. Expanded NFE  
- 2.2. Supported OL, with engaged parents/caregivers and families  
- 3.1. Strengthened EiE monitoring and IM  
- 3.3. Developed contingency plans at sub-national level | - |
| **Geographic implementation areas** | - Central and South Rakhine  
- Northern Shan  
- Kayin and the Southeast | - Northern Rakhine  
- Chin  
- Kachin  
- Kayah and Shan South |
| **GPE AF PCU** | - The PCU will consist of three dedicated staff.  
- It will be co-led by the SCI programme lead and UNICEF programme manager.  
- SCI’s full-time dedicated MEAL coordinator and UNICEF’s monitoring and evaluation specialist will be a members of the PCU. | |
| **Education Cluster** | - Co-leads of the Education Cluster  
- Education Cluster national coordinator will sit on the GPE AF SC  
- GAs regularly participate in national and sub-national Education cluster meetings  
- GAs will play active roles in any technical working groups formed around the key intervention areas  
- GAs will utilise the cluster to engage with INGOs, NGOs and CSOs  
- GAs sit on the SAG | |
### Annex F: Results framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component / key initiative</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Component 1: Access**    | # & % girls and boys (3-17 years) regularly attending education services | 0        | 60,000 | Summative evaluation | Once (end of programme) | - Regularly attending is defined as attendance for 75% of the available days within a month, as defined by the Education Cluster.  
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (children 15% CWD as per IASC guidelines) |
| Outcome 1 : Improve safe and inclusive access to education for crisis-affected girls and boys in Myanmar | # children (5-17 years) enrolled in basic education | 0        | 50,000 | Partner documentation | Quarterly | - Target - crisis-affected girls and boys ages 5-17  
- Continuous learning and wellbeing include ethnic basic education schools, faith-based schools, TLCs and community-based education initiatives that have received support toOutcome 1 : ensure minimum learning materials and minimum safety standards for children accessing the learning space  
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (children 15% CWD as per IASC guidelines) |
| Output 1.1: Provision of safe learning spaces and basic materials to ensure continuity of education services | # children (3-5 years) enrolled in early childhood education | 0        | 20,000 | Partner documentation | Quarterly | - Target - girls and boys ages 3-5 access safe, inclusive early childhood education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing |

---

61 For this particular project activity this baseline value at the start of the project is zero and we will track the progress as we move on with implementation of GPE key interventions. There will be a baseline study at the inception and importantly, project will measure GPE project contribution only. As this project is yet to be start their activities, thus most of the output indicators are "0".

62 All data is disaggregated by gender and disability (for CWD the target is 15% as per IASC guidelines and for PWD the target is 5% as educators with disabilities are less likely to be serving as educators due to stigma and education barriers).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.3: Provision of non-formal education and life skills education for adolescent girls and boys</th>
<th># children (11-17 years) enrolled in non-formal education</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.4: Support Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), School Management Committees (SMC) and/or other village education committees (VEC) to ensure protection, safety and wellbeing of children</td>
<td># education committees engaged in workshops on protection, safety and/or wellbeing of children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (children 15% CWD as per IASC guidelines)
- Target - girls and boys ages 11-17 access safe, inclusive non-formal education that promotes their continuous learning and wellbeing
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (children 15% CWD as per IASC guidelines)

**Component 2: Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: Enhance the quality of education for crisis-affected girls and boys in Myanmar</th>
<th># &amp; % educators with improved teaching competencies for supporting learning and wellbeing of children</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2,763</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># &amp; % girls and boys completing OL programme</td>
<td>14,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Educators defined as teachers, volunteer teachers, community education volunteers, and ethnic basic education teachers that teach basic education through any of the above listed types of schools (see Key Initiative 1.1)
- Target represents approximately 85% of HRP target
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (educators approx. 5% PWD)

- Completion of OL defined as completion of hard-copy materials distributed
- Target represents approximately 75% of HRP target
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (children 15% CWD as per IASC guidelines)
Output 2.1: Strengthen educators’ capacity, targeting competencies identified in capacity gaps assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># educators who have received capacity building/training opportunities to increase their capacity to cater for psychosocial and learning needs of crisis-affected girls and boys</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3,250</th>
<th>Partner documentation</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,825 F</td>
<td>1,825 M</td>
<td>160 PWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Educators defined as teachers, volunteer teachers, community education volunteers, and ethnic basic education teachers that teach basic education through any of the above listed types of schools (see Key Initiative 1.1)
- Target represents approximately 50% of the HRP target (6,666)
- Target represents the same # of teachers needed to support the targeted # of children in Key Initiative 2.2 (130,000), in alignment with the Education Cluster Standard of 40 children per teacher
- Data disaggregated by gender and disability (educators approx. 5% PWD)

Output 2.2: Support Open Learning for children’s safe and continuous, long-term learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># children (3-14 years) receiving open learning materials and follow-up support for their safe and continuous learning</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>130,000</th>
<th>Partner documentation</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65K F</td>
<td>65K M</td>
<td>19,500 CWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Target - crisis-affected girls and boys ages 3-14 access medium-term OL initiatives
- Target represents 50% of the HRP original and inter plan targets

Component 3: Community systems strengthening

Outcome 3: Enhance the capacity of the Education Cluster, especially local partners, to prepare for and respond to shocks and crises in Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Qualitative] Documented increased capacity of Education Cluster partners to prepare for and respond to shocks</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Reported capacity enhancements</th>
<th>Summative evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Qualitative indicator that captures reports from Education Cluster partners on (1) staff capacity, (2) information management and evidence generation and (3) contingency planning and stocks

Output 3.1: Strengthen EiE monitoring and information management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># partners that regularly report into the Ed Cluster management platform</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Education Cluster Information Management platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- 15 partners regularly report monitoring data into an updated Education Cluster IM platform
- Regular reporting is most of the available reporting period during the programme period

Output 3.2: Generation of evidence for Education cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># completed studies shared with partners</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Education Cluster documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Includes 1 national study and 7 small or medium-scale studies on
| Output 3.3: Support contingency planning at sub-national level | # contingency plans finalised | 2 | 6 | Education Cluster documentation | Bi-annually | - 4 contingency plans will include agreed joint actions for preparedness and response developed at State/Region levels, including pre-positioning of contingency stock.  
- 2 contingency plans should already be in place at start of programme  
- EiE materials prepositioned sub-nationally to serve children in acute onset emergency |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.4: Strengthen local partners' capacity to provide coordinated education response in emergencies</td>
<td># local partners that have completed capacity-building initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Education Cluster documentation</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>- 16 local partners with increased capacity in EiE preparedness, response, and recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># small grants issued to local partners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education Cluster documentation</td>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
<td>- 14 small grants rewarded to local partners to support access to quality education in crisis settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex G: Workplan

## Proposed Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>START UP</strong></td>
<td>Proposal Submission and Contract Finalisation</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Provision of safe learning spaces and basic materials and incentivized educators</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Payment of incentives to volunteer teachers and community educators</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Expand access of Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Provision of Non-formal education and life skills education</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Support Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) /School Management Committees (SMCs) / and/or other village education committees</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY</strong></td>
<td>2.1. Strengthen educator capacity, targeting competencies identified in capacity gaps assessment</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Support Open Learning for children’s safe and continuous, long-term learning</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community SYSTEMS STRENGTHENING</strong></td>
<td>3.1. Strengthening EIE monitoring and information management</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Evidence Generation for EIE Sector</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Contingency Planning at sub-national level</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Strengthen local partners’ capacity to provide coordinated education response in emergencies</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Nat’l</td>
<td>Sub-nat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- planned work is indicated in color
- National level work includes: development of guidance, meetings/workshops to agree upon common approach and standardization where applicable,
- Sub-national level work includes: implementation of planned service delivery including local level evidence generation
- Steering committee meetings are proposed: once every 2 months at first, and quarterly thereafter.
## Annex H: Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component / key intervention</th>
<th>SCI USD</th>
<th>UNICEF USD</th>
<th>TOTAL USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Provision of safe learning spaces and basic materials to ensure continuity of education services</td>
<td>1,818,057</td>
<td>2,023,944</td>
<td>3,842,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Expand access to ECE</td>
<td>331,100</td>
<td>368,900</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Provision of NFE and life skills education for adolescents</td>
<td>141,900</td>
<td>158,100</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Strengthen PTAs/SMCs/VECs to ensure protection, safety and wellbeing of children</td>
<td>120,076</td>
<td>93,674</td>
<td>213,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>2,411,133</td>
<td>2,644,618</td>
<td>5,055,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Strengthen educators’ capacity targeting competencies identified in capacity gaps assessment</td>
<td>177,350</td>
<td>85,150</td>
<td>262,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Support OL for children’s safe and continuous, long-term learning</td>
<td>1,552,780</td>
<td>3,107,220</td>
<td>4,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>1,730,130</td>
<td>3,192,370</td>
<td>4,922,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Community systems strengthening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Strengthening EiE monitoring and IM</td>
<td>46,758</td>
<td>199,242</td>
<td>246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Generation of evidence for Education Cluster</td>
<td>179,330</td>
<td>110,670</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Facilitate contingency planning at sub-national level</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>388,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Strengthen local partners’ capacity to provide coordinated education response in emergencies</td>
<td>478,530</td>
<td>321,470</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>716,618</td>
<td>1,019,382</td>
<td>1,736,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Operational (including M&amp;E)</td>
<td>447,289</td>
<td>1,078,855</td>
<td>1,526,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1. M&amp;E</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2. Operational</td>
<td>589,716</td>
<td>421,889</td>
<td>1,011,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (M&amp;E and Operational)</strong></td>
<td>701,716</td>
<td>757,889</td>
<td>1,459,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6,006,886</td>
<td>8,693,114</td>
<td>14,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex I: Complaint and Feedback Mechanism

The proposed project is committed to mainstreaming principles of accountability throughout program design and implementation in accordance with the Core Humanitarian Standards. The project will establish a Complaint and Feedback Mechanism (CFM) with multiple community and child friendly channels that consider age, ability, and literacy level. The CFM will adhere to the principles of confidentiality (data and information), protection of complainant, and fairness. Channels include both reactive (hotlines, suggestions box) and proactive (one to one discussion, FGD) channels and posters/advertisements in local languages to ensure that participants understand their entitlements and know how to raise concerns as needed. The complaint and feedback will be collected by project staffs and send to accountability focal for storing of data at central database. The project will manage responses in a timely and appropriate manner that prioritizes the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages with confidentiality. The MEAL Team will analyse and present the information from CFM to project team to inform decision making. The MEAL team will work with Accountability focal points in areas of operation to close the feedback loop, communicating with communities and children about the actions that have been taken based on their feedback.

**CFM flow chart**
Annex J: Consultations with the EiE Sector National and Sub-National for GPE Accelerated Funding

2nd July 2021 – National Consultation
9 July 2021 – Rakhine and Chin State Consultations
12 July 2021 – Southeast and Northeast Consultation

Lists of attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs: NECF (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGOs: CSI, Global Family/Family World, Myanmar Education Consortium, The Border Consortium (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs: ADRA, AVSI, CFSI, FCA, JRS, Lutheran World Federation, Norwegian Refugee Council, People in Need, Plan International, Save the Children, VSO (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies: UNESCO, UNICEF (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chin State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs: Alternative Education Movement, Ar Yone Oo Social Development Association, Chin Association for Christian Communication, Chin Community Based Rehabilitation, Chin Education Initiative, Community Agency for Rural Development, Community Care for Emergency Response and Rehabilitation, Grass Root Empowerment &amp; Ecosystem Nurturing, Rural People Uplift Foundation (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGOs: Global Family/Family World, Karuna Mission Social Solidarity (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs: Lutheran World Federation, Save the Children, World Vision (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies: UNICEF (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rakhine State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs: Youth Strengthen Association (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs: Lutheran World Federation, MA-UK, People in Need, Plan International, Save the Children (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies: UNICEF (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southeast (Kayah, Kayin, Mon, East Bago, Tanintharyi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNGOs: Myanmar Education Consortium (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/Indigenous Education Providers: EC, KECD, KnED, KNGY, MNEC (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs: Finnish Refugee Council, JRS, Save the Children (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Agencies: UNHCR, UNICEF (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast (Kachin, Northern Shan States)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs: DCE-Bhamo, DCE-Myitkyina, Kachin Baptist Convention (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Education Providers: Ta’ang Education Institute, Nyein (Shalom) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGOs: Community Partners International, Metta (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INGOs: ADRA, Finn Church Aid, Norwegian Refugee Council, Save the Children, Terre des Hommes-Italy, World Vision (6)
UN agencies: UNICEF (1)

Outcomes of the consultations

National level:

**EiE national meeting 2nd July 2021**

1. **ACCESS group,**

Participants – UNICEF, ADRA, PIN, SCI, NRC, TBC,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Justification and Discussion points, and key points during the prioritization process</th>
<th>Geographic location and any clarifications per location:</th>
<th>Priority level (H, M, L):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provision of boarding houses in the ethnic areas (including food assistance) - for middle school students</td>
<td>Increased demand after the military takeover as parents doesn’t want to send their children to govt school</td>
<td>TBC with sub-national consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provision of access to early learning activities for school readiness and to reduce dropouts</td>
<td>Reduce drop-out, increase completion, very low availability of early learning (noted Kachin); safeguarding against issues of quality in basic education in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of teachers and teaching learning materials in IDP camps and/or NGCA* Volunteer teacher training for community self help schools</td>
<td>Classes to be able to maintain children’s school level, as they are unable to access MOE schools in this context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community self-help schools in GCA where MoE students are displaced.</td>
<td>They are in grave need of learning facility and classroom facility and quality teachers Some MoE displaced schools goes to EAO schools and both host and guest children need support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OOSC program in IDP and Host community – NFE, NFPE etc for 11-14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Incentives to volunteer teachers (GCA/NGCA)</td>
<td>Teacher incentives are a key gap, raise not only by EiE partners but also by EESR at yesterday’s meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provision of learning materials in monastic school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provision of disability inclusion-provision of student kit, school kit, recreation kit to disadvantaged children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Extending program for new crises, and new IDP because of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unexpected arm/community conflict.

## 2. Quality

### Participants

- MEC, UNICEF, SCI, Plan,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Justification and Discussion points, and key points during the prioritization process</th>
<th>Geographic location and any clarifications per location:</th>
<th>Priority level (H, M, L):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY</td>
<td>Assessment on teachers’ capacity gaps/needs</td>
<td>MHPSS/ SEL training for CGs, PTA, community members, partners’ staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher trainings (Volunteers, ..)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mentoring supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer Learning Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers reference Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTA/CC capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caregivers capacity building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of CWDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy and Numeracy supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Skills training like EXCEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID-19 awareness and response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection/ Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Local systems strengthening

### Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Justification and Discussion points, and key points during the prioritization process</th>
<th>Geographic location and any clarifications per location:</th>
<th>Priority level (H, M, L):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening of partners (monitoring approach and tools to look into broader), collect</td>
<td>The needs for partners for some more dedicated training</td>
<td>Within and beyond HRP area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information in more consolidated way. Strengthening EiE monitoring system</td>
<td>The first responder in the region since they know the local context well.</td>
<td>Within and beyond HRP area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Engagement with local actors who are the first responder. Decentralization of local partners’ by building up capacity system. Funding flow to partner to expedite the process of implementation. (Mechanism to empower local partner) (contingency planning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expanding networks to CSO and Monastic education groups there by building up capacity and sharing knowledge platform. 21st century education (learning opportunity through digital platform)</td>
<td>CSOs and Monastic education system has more access to the population.</td>
<td>Within and beyond HRP area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex K: Consultation with the EDPCG members

**ACCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Comments (based on National EiE consultation)</th>
<th>Discussion and Details (including how?):</th>
<th>Location (where?):</th>
<th>Any additional questions to consider:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support for boarding houses in the ethnic areas (including food assistance) - <em>for middle school students</em></td>
<td>Increased demand after the military takeover as parents don’t want to send their children to govt school.</td>
<td>GPE grant supports only upto middle school students – for GAs to check. It is for NGCA should provide Nutrition-education sessions too.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will require strong CP integration or evidence of existing mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provision of access to early learning (Early Childhood Education)</td>
<td>Reduce drop-out, increase completion, very low availability of early learning (noted Kachin); safeguarding against issues of quality in basic education in the future.</td>
<td>There are many faith-based and community based ECCD centres in communities across the country. They need recourses like toys and games, story books, and salary for teachers, etc.,...</td>
<td></td>
<td>How can this be implemented in the current context? Home-based small group with facilitator? Centre-based? Any particular resources missing from current initiatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of full EiE classes in IDP camps and/or NGCA</td>
<td>Classes to be able to maintain children’s school level, as they are unable to access MOE schools in this context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What curriculum should be used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provision of supplementary educational materials (umbrellas, stationery, bags, etc.) in IDP camps, NGCA, and/or host communities</td>
<td>EiE consultation data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where are the biggest gaps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community self-help schools in GCA where MoE students are displaced.</td>
<td>They are in grave need of learning facility and classroom facility and quality teachers Some MoE displaced schools goes to EAO schools and both host and guest children need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risks and challenges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Comments (based on National EiE consultation)</td>
<td>Discussion and Details (including how?):</td>
<td>Location (Where):</td>
<td>Any additional questions to consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Out-of-school-children programs in IDP and Host communities – NFE, NFPE, life skills, etc for 11-14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incentives to volunteer teachers (GCA/NGCA)</td>
<td>Teacher incentives are a key gap, raise not only by EiE partners but also by EESR at yesterday’s meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provision of learning materials in monastic schools</td>
<td>More and more children moving into monastic schools, there is increased needs of teachers there.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To support not only materials but also for vol teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provision of disability inclusion - including provision of student kit, school kit, recreation kit to disadvantaged children</td>
<td>Some children, dropping out of system, if no proper career guided counselling system (middle school children especially), they may leave country soon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline of grant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CP mainstreaming especially for the children at specific risks – career guided counselling,</td>
<td>Including PSEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link with CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Comments (based on National EiE consultation)</th>
<th>Discussion and Details (including how?):</th>
<th>Location (Where):</th>
<th>Any additional questions to consider:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment on teachers’ capacity gaps/needs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ongoing support - Children assessment (learning gap or level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trainings for educators (volunteer teachers, community facilitators, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safe recruitment of Educators (background check, PSEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Learning Platform for teachers to ensure continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing supports for CWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F2F and online training as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentoring support and/or peer learning circles for educators (volunteer teachers, community facilitators, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be used local languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychosocial support/ social-emotional learning training for caregivers, PTA, community members, partners’ staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training materials/learning materials should be translated to ethnic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Materials (for quality learning environment - e.g. classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training materials/learning materials should be translated to ethnic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher reference materials for professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PTA/School Management Committee/Camp Committee capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caregivers’ capacity building to support their children’s learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inclusion of children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Basic Literacy and Numeracy support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Repair and rehabilitation of learning spaces in IDP camps and NGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 | Provision of Hygiene kits |  |
13 | COVID-19 awareness and response |  |
14 | Child Protection/ Safety trainings/mentoring for caregivers, educators, and/or organizations |  |
15 | Exchange and knowledge sharing platform |  |

**Participants**  – Thin Pyae (Australian Embassy), Ali (UNCEF), Anders Lee (UNESCO), Selim Benaissa (ILO), Naing Yee Mar (GIZ), Moe Myint Khaing (MEDG), Nicola Whybrow (VSO)

1. Local systems strengthening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Comments (based on National EiE consultation)</th>
<th>Discussion and justification notes</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Any additional consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strengthening EiE monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centralized system or decentralized system. Importance of designing the system to not overburden the implementation partners on the field.</td>
<td>Sub-national level (or) National level</td>
<td>Risk without MoE engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening of partners on monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Above link to capacity building of partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring tools to collect information in more consolidated/harmonized way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of Peer to Peer monitoring through decentralized system for sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small grants or other funding mechanism to partners to expedite the process of implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible guidelines/standards should be made available to local partners to follow through various channel to access funding or expedite the implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decentralization of local partners’ by building up capacity, including</td>
<td></td>
<td>Build up the capacity of existing partners and local actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement with local actors who are the first responder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contingency Planning at sub-national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional risk should be considered in developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contingency plan related to security forces interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over SAC-MOE system and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expanding EiE networks to CSO and Monastic education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups through knowledge exchange initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex L: Key findings and takeaway from the EIE sector partners’ community consultations

Overview

- Three EIE partners have initial findings available: People in Need, Norwegian Refugee Council, and Save the Children
- Locations of consultations include:
  - Kachin State (PIN+NRC)
  - Northern Shan State (NRC+SCI)
  - Southern Shan State (SCI)
  - Kayin State (SCI)
  - Mon State (SCI)
  - Sagaing Region (SCI)
- All consultations were held with parents/caregivers. Thus far no consultations done with children or (volunteer) teachers.

Limitations

- The consultations completed are those which were feasible with limited resources and access/connectivity challenges. They are focused on partner project areas.
  - They are not a representative sample of all people in the area, or in Myanmar
  - They are a snapshot of community sentiment at the time of the consultation
- There is some concern that people will give answers which are socially desirable, and/or reflect sensitivity of the questions
  - This is likely mitigated by close working relationship between partners and community
- Even with the limitations, these consultation findings are one of the few ways we are understanding needs and sentiments as expressed by communities themselves – not as reported in news only, nor provided on an ad-hoc, anecdotal basis.
Initial Findings – PIN in Kachin State

- FGDs in 12 locations (mainly IDP camps) across 5 townships in Kachin State
- Return to school - 55% unsure, 18% mixed opinions, 18% will not send, 9% will send
- Main concerns – on-going conflict and COVID-19
- Main return reasons – worries over their children’s future
- Current learning – lessons in camps (45%), outside tuition (45%), HBL (18%)
- MoE Workbooks – 80% acceptable
- Challenges – Parents unable to support (50%), child’s lack of interest (40%), no learning space in home (30%), financial difficulties (20%)
- Main requested support – student kits

Initial Findings – NRC in Kachin and Northern Shan States

- FGDs in 7 locations (mainly IDP camps) across 2 townships in Kachin State and 1 township in Northern Shan State; total 55 parents/caregivers
- Return to school – generally found that primary and middle school will return, high school will not return
- Main concerns – concerned about instability and arrest of teachers; COVID-19 prevention; high school students may not return because of financial difficulties, and lost hope in completing education
- Other concerns – parents are afraid their children will be discriminated against by host community; also concerned children will need extra support to return to school after one year (lack of concentration, may have forgotten last subjects studied)
- Main return reasons – want their children to have a better future; younger children want to see their friends
- Current learning – self-study or helped by older siblings; whenever parents can afford they are paying for private teachers
- Main requested support – student kits and hygiene kits; support for community based initiatives if children can’t return to schools; vocational training for youth; livelihood activities for parents

Initial Findings – SCI in 6 States/Regions

- 63 KIs across 6 States/Regions (Mon, Kayin, Southern/ Northern Shan, Sagaing, Rakhine); 40 KIs in 17 camps, and 5 at ward-level
- Return to school – 63% of KIs reported parents would send children to re-opened schools but many would need support to do so; 30% were unsure; 8% said they would not send children back.
  - When MoE schools were specified, 23% said they would not send their children
  - KIs from Rakhine (Camps and villages) and Shan/North camps and Shan South villages were the most likely to report that children would go back to school; however the majority of KIs from Kayin camps (6 out of 7 KIs) reported that they were not willing to send children back.
  - Although most locations had mixed results similar to that reported above, KIs from Sagaing ward had the highest proportion of KIs reporting that parents would not send children back to school that (2 out of the 3 assessed KIs)
  - Most of the KIs who reported parents would not send children back to government-run schools were from Kayin or Kayin states.

- Main concerns:
  - Lack of schoolchildren need to work
  - Lack of teachers
  - Other
  - Political reasons
  - Starting reasons

Reasons why parents wouldn’t send children back to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of schoolchildren need to work</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Findings – SCI in 6 States/Regions

- Current learning –
- Support requested –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support needed to help children attend school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop and premium mobiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 5 KIs in Rakhine reported children engaging in learning (3 camps, 2 villages in Sittwe town)

Parents listed materials to support if children not expected to return to school; more data forthcoming
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Key Takeaways

- Locations where children will return if schools are re-opened look to follow the polarization of the area, among other factors
- The missed year of education will be a significant factor, as well economic circumstances
- Parents mentioned COVID-19 in interviews; however it was not always the top concern

Further considerations:
- Increased attention to school re-opening in past two weeks; some violence related to it
- How much the “international community” is likely to sway parents to send children to schools or not – what is real extent of influence? Versus other factors?
- What support is feasible and appropriate in a context that will evolve rapidly? What mechanism is most appropriate to provide support? How can we be prepared?
Annex M: Description of financial management, auditing, and procurement arrangements of GAs

**Save the Children International (SCI):**

SCI Myanmar is an international organization that has strong control across all functions including financial management and procurement. SCI Finance Manual and Procurement Manuals guide financial management, auditing and procurement arrangements respectively. SCI Myanmar country office has two major finance divisions. The first unit is being directly managed by Finance and Support Services Director (FSSD) at the country office that is similar to a corporate head office finance unit. The second are area office finance units under Director of Field Operations. Each area and field office finance units report to Head of Area Offices with dotted reporting line to country office finance director.

There are two finance departments under Director of Finance & Support services at SCI country office in Yangon. Control and compliance department & Financial Planning and Analysis department are overseen directly by Deputy Finance Director. Each of these departments are managed by two senior finance managers who are supported by several Finance Coordinators in each department and there are Finance Officers and Finance Assistants working under these Finance Coordinators. There are 25 finance staff members, including the Finance and Support Services Director, managing country office finance at the head office level. The Area Office Finance Division ensures that financial planning, control and management are in place at every office at operation levels and that all financial information/transactions, including those of implementation partners, are captured and recorded in a timely manner. Larger area offices are headed by an Area Finance Coordinator whereas Finance Officers oversee financial management at smaller areas and field offices in the country. There is a total of 27 finance personnel under this division. In addition, SCI employs sub-grant officers for significant awards such as GPE programme to ensure implementing partners’ financial management practices meet SCI standards. Segregation of Duties ensure that more than one person has control of the whole of any financial process as per strict requirement stated in country office finance manual. Country office finance and support service director (FSSD) is ultimately responsible for the financial management including GPE grant.

Myanmar Country Office prepares monthly financial reports that include year to date and life of award Budget versus Actual (BVA) comparison reports. These reports are jointly reviewed by programme, finance and award teams and produce monthly BVA & Award meeting reports – which are discussed and reviewed by the country management team, led by the programme, finance and award directors. SCI has a cost allocation methodology (CAM) that is clearly documented with detailed policy and procedures for implementation of cost sharing arrangements in every country office. CAM is verified by KPMG London against written policy and procedures.

SCI uses financial ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) called Agresso that currently handles over a billion dollar per annum transactions globally. Agresso (SCI financial system) is currently integrated with Oracle Human Resource System, Effort Reporting (ER timesheet), Award management system (AMS) and TIM (Total inventory management) systems. In addition, new procurement and account payable system called “source to pay” will be further integrated in 2022. SCI country office’s annual financial statements are audited by an independent auditor and to appropriate international auditing standards. There is a transparent and competitive process for the selection of external auditors who are recruited by donors. SCI country office has suitable procedures in place to ensure that Sub-Recipients have established appropriate audit arrangements for the use of...
grant funds. Audit arrangements are discussed with donors and budgeted accordingly. Internal audit mechanisms exist at SCI and all the project activities are subject to be reviewed by the them. Specific for this purpose there is one internal audit officer reporting to Head of Risk & Compliance. The annual audit plan, audit report and ToR are subject to report to National Director.

SCI procurement manual outlines all mandatory procedures that must be followed during all procurement activities. Guidance has been provided to all staffs who are involved in the procurement processes on how to do this effectively and compliantly. All SCI staffs undertaking procurement activities must complete the procurement essentials training course which outlines legal and compliance mandatory standards on all areas related to procurement, including sourcing procedures, thresholds, approval of sourcing documents, evaluation methods and sourcing outcomes.

UNICEF:

a. **Financial Management:** UNICEF has an SAP based business and accounting system, VISION, which is part of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system integrated with programme and financial information management system that is accessible to UNICEF users globally. UNICEF Myanmar also makes use of VISION in which grants are issued with specific account codes. The PME unit of the office undertakes this function and funds allocation within the system is done together and as confirmed by the respective section chief—it is done in line with the approved proposal and donor guidelines/conditions. Funds allocation is done as per the authorization limit which is mentioned in the country office internal SOP.

UNICEF has a strict segregation of duties policy at various steps in most processes. Authority to make financial transactions (delegated approval levels) is determined by roles and their respective access rights on the ERP system. This ensures that finance-related activities are undertaken by personnel with the right authority/approval levels. The allocation of roles is governed by the office’s ‘table of authority’ which clearly sets out and allocates staff functions approved by the country representative. Financial limits are set by the organisational release strategy, which is derived from the office risk assessment and programme size which defines the commitments and value which must be authorised by more senior management within the office. Each country office has in place internal controls in financial management and accounting. These includes segregation of duties including authorisation, approval, certification and signing of payments through dual authorization.

The system is managed centrally while its accessibility is controlled using passwords. It generates account codes with unique tracking numbers which ensures expenses are charged against commitments recorded in the system. The checking of bank statements is done daily through online while linked to the ERP so that they are matched and cleared daily. The reconciliation of hard copy statements is conducted monthly with approvals posted on the system and reviewed by the division of finance and administration at headquarters level.
Financial monitoring is done on an on-going basis at the level of the implementing programme section, with monthly oversight by programme and country management teams. A set of key financial indicators are generated and reviewed monthly by Programme and Country Management Teams. Twice a month, the PME teams prepares and shares implementation status of all ongoing grants that is used to review key financial information such as expenditure, commitments, burn rate etc.

b. Auditing: UNICEF has adopted the internal control standards for the public sector developed by the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions. The internal control policy and framework includes the control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication and oversight. As part of corporate mandate, UNICEF has an internal audit function within UNICEF’s Office of Internal Audit and Investigations (OIAI). The internal audit function undertakes a risk-based approach to its audit plan, which is then reviewed by the Audit and Advisory Committee (AAC). This is based on annual global risk assessment that identify areas based on risk factors that include complexity, emergency financial size, conclusions from previous audits, transparency index scores, investigation cases and regional directors’ self-assessments. Globally established internal control procedures are followed by country offices as well as at programme level. Table of Authority are reviewed and updated regularly. Designation letters for role assignments are signed by the Representative. Anti-fraud awareness sessions are provided to staff as well as to implementing partners. At least (3) HACT trainings are conducted every year and Anti-fraud awareness session is one of the agenda of HACT trainings. HACT audit is a systematic and independent examination of data, statements, records, operations, and performance of a CSO partner carried out by an external service provider. Every year, UNICEF selects partners for audit using a risk-based approach to obtain realistic assurance on the appropriate use of funds by CSO partners. UNICEF also perform a special audit when significant issues and concerns are identified during programmatic visits, spot checks or identified by programmes during the programme implementation cycle.

c. Procurement Arrangements: Procurement of supplies and institutional services is governed by UNICEF’s Supply Manual. It prescribes the procurement practices all staff and processes must comply with, to assure the procurement is open, fair and transparent. Centrally Supply Division has a guidance and training role, but also an oversight role as well as a control function. At country office level procurement practices are monitored by the Chief of Operations, and by the Representative via the Contract Review Committee. Frequent peer reviews and internal audits further assure that our procurement operations comply with our procurement rules and regulations.

CSO Partner level: The Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) is a key tool that UNICEF uses in managing risks of downstream partners through a comprehensive due diligence assessment. This includes conducting of micro-assessment of partners with funding reaching specific thresholds (e.g., annual disbursement of USD 100,000) to assess their financial and programmatic capacities, identify key risks with recommendations which are followed up for implementation. The findings of HACT micro-assessment are valid for five years. Specific procurement procedures assessment is carried out for partners with substantial budget allocated for procurement of goods and supplies. The country office also conducts programmatic visits and financial spot checks to identify and address programmatic and financial implementation risks in a timely manner. The minimally required frequency for programmatic visits is determined by the amount of cash transferred by UNICEF to the partner in the year, and higher of two risk ratings of the partner (Micro Assessment and PSEA assessment). A minimum of one spot check is required for all
CSO partners reporting ≥US$ 50,000 expenditure in a year. The country office conducts **audits** based on specific criteria and supports with capacity building activities of all partners every year. As mentioned earlier PSEA is also assessed for all CSO partners, with recommendations and follow up made to address gaps. Further, partnership reviews in which progress, achievements, constraints/risks are identified and mitigation measures to address constraints established are conducted on an annual basis.