

Utenriksdepartementet
v/Ass Utenriksråd for utviklingssaker
Postboks 8114 Dep.

Arkivkode/ File no:
842.3

Vår ref./ Our ref.:
1100660-95

Via: Norad, Direktøren:

Deres/ Dykkar ref./ Your ref.:

Vår saksbeh./ Enquiries:
Eva Kløve

Dato/ Date:
02.11.2015

Kopi til:

- Seksjon for globale initiativ
- Seksjon for etatsstyring, budsjett og forvaltning
- Seksjon for Afrika sør for Sahara
- Avdeling for helse, utdanning og forskning, Norad

Oppfølgingsnotat: Evaluering av norsk støtte til grunnutdanning gjennom Unicef og GPE

Bakgrunn

Rapporten *Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education* (Rapport 7/2015), ble offentliggjort 6. oktober 2015 og presentert samme dag. I tråd med Evalueringsinstruksen gir dette notatet Evalueringsavdelingens vurderinger og anbefalinger om oppfølging av evalueringen.

Norge har satt seg som mål å bli en global leder innen utdanningsfeltet. I evalueringsperioden (2009 – 2013) gikk nesten tre fjerdedeler av norsk bistand til grunnutdanning gjennom multilaterale kanaler. Unicef og Det globale partnerskapet for utvikling, GPE, mottok i samme periode nesten all denne bistanden.

Bakgrunnen for å bestille evalueringen var dermed både at utdanning er prioritert sektor innen norsk utviklingspolitikk, og et behov for å se nærmere på de multilaterale organisasjonene som kanal. Sett i lys av Stortingsmelding nr. 25 «Utdanning for utvikling» er det viktig å vite om bistanden som kanaliseres gjennom Unicef og GPE holder mål. Evalueringen var ment å gi nyttig kunnskap i å vurdere dette.

Evalueringen ble gjennomført på oppdrag fra Evalueringsavdelingen av Development Portfolio Management Group (DPMG) ved University of Southern California.

Formål

Formålet med evalueringen var å bidra til mer kunnskapsbaserte beslutninger om politikk- og programutforming i UD, i Unicef og GPE, med et fokus både på ansvarliggjøring og læring.

Evalueringen så på bistandseffektivitet (resultater), bistandsforvaltning og finansiering av utdanning i 10 land; Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Etiopia, Haiti, Madagaskar, Malawi, Mali, Mosambik, Nepal og Zambia. Alle landene var gjenstand for deskstudier, og i fire av landene ble det i tillegg gjennomført intervjuer (Etiopia, Malawi, Madagaskar og Nepal). Det ble lagt særskilt vekt på tre utdanningsmål som er viktige for landene, som også Norge har vært særskilt opptatt av; kvalitet (økt læringsutbytte), likestilling og inkludering av marginaliserte grupper.

I tillegg til hovedrapporten foreligger det egne landrapporter for Etiopia, Malawi, Madagaskar og Nepal. Basert på evalueringsrapportene er det også utarbeidet to "evaluation briefs" med følgende fokus: «How effective is Norway's aid to basic education?» og «How can aid management be evaluated?». Alle rapportene finnes her: <http://www.norad.no/om-bistand/publikasjon/2015/evaluation-of-norwegian-multilateral-support-to-basic-education/>.

Evalueringsavdelingens vurderinger og anbefalinger

Evalueringsavdelingen mener at rapportene svarer på mandatet og vurderer kvaliteten på evalueringsarbeidet som solid, der funn og konklusjoner kan forsvares.

Samtidig som Evalueringsrapporten peker på at begge organisasjoner har fått til mye bra, er den kritisk til viktige deler av både Unicef og GPE sitt arbeid. Hovedbudskapet er at verken Unicef eller GPE leverer tilfredsstillende. Unicef får svært dårlig score på viktige områder som kvalitetssikring av bistanden, og dokumentasjon og rapportering av resultater. For GPE er en hovedutfordring at det er for lite kvalitetssikring både av de partnerne som følger opp GPEs midler, og av de nasjonale utdanningsplanene som GPEs støtte baserer seg på.

I løpet av evalueringsprosessen har flere interessenter pekt på at funnene når det gjelder dårlig resultatrapportering i Unicef er kjente – også Unicef selv. Etter vår mening styrker dette behovet for å se nøye på hva som kan gjøres for å utbedre dette, også når det gjelder hvilke rapporteringskrav UD stiller. Vi er også av den oppfatning at Unicefs kommentarer til rapportutkast og endelig rapport til dels vitner om manglende analytisk tilnærming til resultatrapportering.

Basert på evalueringen og de framkommede kommentarene og synspunktene anbefaler vi at følgende følges opp av Utenriksdepartementet:

Anbefaling	Tiltak (eller grunnlag for ikke å følge opp)	Ansvarlig for tiltak	Tidsramme	Resultat/endring/kommentar
Vurdere om dagens oppfølging av Unicef og GPE er god nok.				
Vurdere hvilke krav som bør stilles til dokumentasjon av resultater fra Unicef og GPE, og utarbeide transparente og klare regler for hvilke følger det skal få om kravene ikke innfris. Fremtidige budsjettallokeringer bør knyttes til hvorvidt det kan dokumenteres forbedringer langs de dimensjonene som rapporten tar opp.				
Kreve at Unicef og GPE utarbeider en plan for oppfølging av evalueringsrapportens anbefalinger til dem. Kommentarene fra de to organisasjonene (Vedlegg 1 og 2) kan brukes som				

utgangspunkt for en slik plan.				
Vurderer alternative kanaler og aktører for forvaltning av norsk støtte til grunnutdanning, inkludert en vurdering av regionale utviklingsbanker.				

Evalueringsrapportens hovedfunn

Under følger en oppsummering av evalueringsrapportens funn på hvert av områdene bistandsforvaltning, bistandseffektivitet (resultater) og finansiering.

Bistandsforvaltning:

Unicef får sterk kritikk for at resultatrapporteringen er for dårlig. Ofte stopper rapporteringen med umiddelbare resultater (for eksempel antall lærere som får opplæring), uten at mer langsiktige utviklingseffekter dokumenteres (om opplæringen bidro til økt læring for elevene). I den grad resultater måles, er det ofte fragmentert og lite konsistent over tid, noe som gjør det vanskelig å danne seg et bilde av om bistanden faktisk virket eller ei. Konsulentene trekker også frem at det er stor grad av variasjon i kvaliteten på de resultatrapportene som produseres – noen inneholder for eksempel ingen analyser. Selv med «perfekt» bistandsforvaltning er det ikke garantert at prosjektene lykkes, men med dårlig forvaltning reduseres sjansen for at målene nås. I rapporten konkluderes det med at Unicef ikke forvalter bistanden på en måte som øker sannsynligheten for vellykkede prosjekter.

Begge organisasjonene får godt skussmål hva gjelder relevansen av bistanden; den er generelt i tråd med både givers og nasjonale prioriteringer. Begge scorer moderat hva gjelder effektiv ressursbruk. Det hevdes at Unicef gjør noen ting bra med få ressurser, men dårlige rapporteringsrutiner gjør det vanskelig å fange opp – og endre kursen på - prosjekter som ikke går etter planen. GPE får skryt for sin rolle i å harmonisere bistand fra ulike givere, og for sin faglige støtte til sektorplaner. Likevel er mindre enn halvparten av utdanningsplanene av tilfredsstillende kvalitet, noe som blant annet gir økte kostnader i den videre oppfølgingen. Dette er det svakeste leddet i GPE-programmene; kvaliteten på nasjonale utdanningsplaner, utviklingspartnernes godkjenning av disse planene, og kvaliteten på innretningen av GPEs programmer. I den grad GPE foretar eksterne gjennomganger, får disse godt skussmål.

Bistandseffektivitet:

I vurderingen av dette ble det fokusert spesielt på tre mål; kvalitet (økt læringsutbytte), likestilling og inkludering av marginaliserte grupper. Både Unicef og GPE fokuserte på likestilling, og det er her resultatene er best. De fleste landene i porteføljen oppnådde sine mål for de lavere trinnene (barneskole). Utfordringen hva gjelder likestilling, er derfor først og fremst å sikre dette på de høyere trinnene innen grunnutdanning (ungdomsskole). I tillegg er det noen geografiske områder i enkelte land hvor måloppnåelsen også på barnetrinnet er for svak. Inkludering av marginaliserte grupper var som oftest et mål både for Unicef og GPE, og ofte lykkes de to i å nå marginaliserte grupper på en eller annen måte. Dessverre målte Unicef bare dette i fem av landene, men fire av disse viste forbedringer. De dårligste resultatene ser man på læringsutbytte; enten måles det ikke, eller så uteblir resultatene. Blant landene som målte læringsutbyttet var det kun Etiopia som oppnådde sine mål, mens Mali og Mosambik delvis oppnådde dem. I Unicef sine programmer var det seks land som fokuserte på å øke læringsutbytte, men ingen av dem kunne vise til forbedringer.

De viktigste tiltakene som er støttet er læreropplæring, bygging av klasserom og utdeling av læringsmateriale. Samtidig har befolkningsveksten og økt innrulling av elever noen ganger vært så sterk at disse tiltakene ikke

har bidratt til at det blir flere lærere, klasserom eller bøker per elev – skjønt de har bidratt til at dette ikke ble verre. Konsulentene viser til forskning som peker på at det er andre faktorer som bidrar mer direkte til å øke læringsutbyttet, blant annet hvor mye tid læreren bruker per elev, om læreren får profesjonell veiledning underveis, og om undervisningen foregår på barnets morsmål.

Finansiering:

Trendene for ODA-bistand til utdanning i evalueringsperioden viser at sektoren økte med lavere hastighet (33%) enn total ODA-bistand (økte med 90%). Mens ODA-bistanden til grunntdanning gikk ned med 16%, økte Norge sin bistand til grunntdanning med 41%. Samme trend gjelder for bistanden til Unicef og GPE; Norge er største giver til Unicefs program for grunntdanning og likestilling, som har opplevd nedgang siden 2010, og femte største giver til GPE, som også har vært underfinansiert i forhold til behovet. På nasjonalt nivå er det ofte stor variasjon i budsjettene til utdanning, noe som sannsynligvis skyldes dårlig finansforvaltning heller enn at myndigheter erstatter egne midler med givermidler. Unicef får kritikk for å sette i gang prosjekter som ikke er fullfinansierte fra starten av.

Evalueringsrapportens anbefalinger:

Her lister vi opp anbefalingene slik de fremkommer i rapporten. De fleste av disse retter seg mot Unicef og GPE.

Anbefalinger om å styrke langsiktige effekter:

- 1) Prioritere målet om læringsutbytte høyere.
- 2) Vektlegge faktorer som mer direkte bidrar til bedre læringsutbytte.
- 3) Støtte land i å etablere/styrke nasjonale vurderinger av læringsutbytte.
- 4) Fremme målet om likestilling i innrulling, og i læringsutbytte, i ungdomsskolen.
- 5) Styrke målet om inkludering av marginaliserte grupper, spesielt funksjonshemmede, blant annet gjennom å sikre at EMIS-systemene disaggregerer data i tilstrekkelig grad.

Anbefalinger om bedre bistandsforvaltning:

- 6) Agentene (Unicef og GPE) må holdes ansvarlig for kvaliteten på utforming og implementering av programmene, mens prinsipalen (UD) har ansvar for å sette standarden for kvaliteten – enten ved bruk av dialog eller regulering av pengebruken.
- 7) Både Unicef og GPE anbefales å rutinemessig arkivere nøkkeldokumenter på sine respektive nettsider.
- 8) UNICEF må bedre den analytiske kvaliteten på resultatkjeden, og gjøre den tydeligere og mer konsistent. For å få dette til trengs en annen kompetanse, og endringer i organisasjonskulturen.
- 9) UNICEF bør kun starte opp fullfinansierte programmer.
- 10) GPEs styre bør klargjøre uklare ansvarsroller mellom sektorgrupper (LEG), sekretariat og styre.
- 11) GPEs styre og sekretariat bør finne måter å heve kvaliteten på nasjonale utdanningsplaner, og redusere variasjonen i kvalitet mellom disse. Bør gjøres på en måte som tar hensyn til nasjonalt eierskap.
- 12) GPEs styre bør innføre en sertifiseringsprosess for de aktørene som kvalifiserer til å være «Monitoring Entity» og «Supervising Entity».

Evalueringsprosessen

I henhold til Evalueringsavdelingens praksis har de ulike del-leveransens av evalueringen blitt sendt på høring til alle interessenter, og avdelingen har mottatt kommentarer fra Unicef, GPE, Norads utdanningsseksjon, UD samt ambassadene i Nepal, Malawi og Madagaskar på en eller flere av del-leveransene. I tillegg oppnevnte vi en referansegruppe for evalueringen, bestående av en til to representanter fra hver av Unicefs evalueringskontor (Colin Kirk), Unicef utdanningsenhet (Jo Bourne), GPE (Litt utskiftninger, men blant annet Karen Mundy og Jean-Marc Bernard), UD (Kari Riisøen) og Norads utdanningsseksjon (Vigdis Cristofoli).

Evalueringsavdelingen har hatt en aktiv dialog med Unicef og GPE i prosessen. Unicef signaliserer i sine kommentarer (Vedlegg 1) at de ønsker funnene i evalueringen velkommen. De påpeker at oppnåelse av resultater på flere av områdene innebærer å jobbe med myndigheter både hva gjelder «politisk klima», nasjonal kapasitet og tjenestelevering, siden hoveddelen av midlene kommer fra myndighetene selv. Unicef er bare delvis enig i kommentarene om resultatrapportering og resultatbasert styring. De erkjenner at det er rom for forbedringer. GPE har også vært aktive underveis i prosessen. I deres kommentarer til den endelige evalueringsrapporten (Vedlegg 2), ønsker GPE evalueringen velkommen og peker på at funn og anbefalinger er nyttige i prosessen med å utarbeide en ny strategi for partnerskapet. Evalueringen komplementerer GPEs egeninitierte evaluering.

Presentasjonsseminaret

Tirsdag 6.oktober inviterte Evalueringsavdelingen til seminar på Litteraturhuset. Leder og nestleder av evalueringen, Dean Nielsen og Sue Berryman presenterte kort hovedfunn og –anbefalinger i rapporten. Seminaret tok utgangspunkt i rapporten for å diskutere hvordan man kan dokumentere resultater i utdanningssektoren, når midlene forvaltes av en multilateral aktør. I panelet satt Jean-Marc Bernard fra GPE, Jo Bourne fra Unicef, Olav Seim fra UD, og Sølvi Lillejord fra Forskningsrådets kunnskapscenter. Hovedbudskapene på seminaret var i helt tråd med det som har kommet fram i rapporten og kommentarene til denne.

Vedlegg:

Vedlegg 1 Kommentarer fra Unicef til endelig evalueringsrapport.

Vedlegg 2 Kommentarer fra GPE til endelig evalueringsrapport.



Per Øyvind Bastø
Avdelingsdirektør



Eva Kløve
Seniorrådgiver

UNICEF Evaluation Management Response

Evaluation title: Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education: Synthesis Report

Year: 2015

Office and person in charge for management response: Jo Bourne, Associate Director, Education, Headquarters, New York.

Overall response to the evaluation: UNICEF welcomes the recommendations of this evaluation, in particular the emphasis on learning, gender equity, reaching the marginalized, and the measurement of results in these areas. UNICEF's Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (SP) is more sharply focused on equity – so that all children, regardless of their circumstances, have equal opportunities in education and learning – helping children to secure basic skills such as literacy and numeracy, and a wider range of social, emotional and cognitive skills. In countries where girls' education lags behind that of boys, UNICEF is increasing the focus on strategies to improve regular attendance and learning outcomes of girls from early childhood through to adolescence. This is aligned with the Gender Action Plan, which includes girls' education including to secondary as a key strategy. UNICEF's Strategic Plan 2014-2017 is accompanied by a results framework (with baselines and targets) which allows the organization to track progress against key indicators.

UNICEF notes that the evaluation focuses primarily on the management of projects in order to assess aid effectiveness. Whilst UNICEF agrees that the effective management of projects is critical to the delivery of results for children, the theory of change underpinning UNICEF's 2014-2017 Strategic Plan recognizes that larger and more sustainable results can only be achieved by simultaneously supporting improvements in the wider enabling environment for education. Support to standard setting, policy development, evidence and data, knowledge and capacity building are particularly important in education, which is primarily funded by national governments, because they have the potential to impact upon the education outcomes for children at scale. UNICEF appreciates that it is difficult to assess the impact of this work and in particular it is rarely possible to *attribute* direct results to a single agency. In order to capture UNICEF's *contribution* to improving the enabling environment (e.g. policies, standards and systems), country offices are expected to report on progress against key indicators in those priority areas that they have agreed to support. Ratings (from weak to championing) are normally discussed with national governments against evidence based criteria. This allows UNICEF to track progress against those enabling environment factors assessed as being critical to overall results, even though the actual inputs provided by UNICEF against each result will vary widely according to context and the actions taken with other partners. UNICEF also collects aggregate data on a number of service delivery indicators, where results can be *attributed* to UNICEF, including the training of school management committees, the delivery of teaching and learning materials, and the number of children reached with education support in humanitarian situations. Results are published annually, in the Executive Director's Annual Report, and accompanying education Annual Results Report.

UNICEF welcomes the evaluation's emphasis on improving results based management, whilst also noting that the time frame for the evaluation (2009-2013) and limitations to the amount of field work and number of interviews conducted with key staff perhaps meant that the evaluators were unable to capture a wider perspective on UNICEF's evolving and improving approach to results based management. In 2014 the UNICEF appointed a dedicated Deputy Executive Director – Field Results with responsibility for supporting the strengthening of programming (planning, implementation, monitoring and quality assurance). The Field Results Group is developing a new system for more rigorous and accountable UNICEF programming processes whereby country offices will have to develop, in addition to current programmatic documents, country support strategy notes detailing how UNICEF intends to achieve country program outcomes, and which will include a theory of change, refined results structure, indicators and means of verification. These strategy notes will be systematically reviewed and quality assured by regional offices and will guide key moments in the programme cycle (e.g. mid-term review). UNICEF is a member of the International Aid Transparency Initiative, and in 2015 was rated 14 out of 68 organizations. Open.UNICEF.org was revamped in June 2015 and provides public access to financial information and programme documents.

The evaluation report says little about UNICEF's work in emergencies. In 2014 27% of UNICEF's total education programming was focused on education in emergencies and protracted crises. UNICEF reached an estimated 8.6 million children in humanitarian situations with education support.

Recommendation 6.5. 1) to 3) p 65: (...) encourage UNICEF and GPE to:

- 1) Place a higher priority on learning outcomes. The efforts of donors and partner governments to expand enrolment have helped many children, but resources now need to be invested in factors that increase the main payoff from being enrolled, namely, acquiring basic knowledge and skills.**

- 2) Give more emphasis to proximate causes of learning outcomes: student/teacher time on task, teacher supervision, and use of local language in early learning.
- 3) Support countries in establishing or continuing regular national assessments of learning outcomes, but for evaluating short-term learning gains, related to educational interventions, to set up targeted assessments, showing changes among those experiencing the interventions; (where possible) compared to control groups.

Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): **Agree**

Actions	Progress	Key examples of actions taken	Supporting documents
A higher emphasis on learning outcomes.	Ongoing	Increased emphasis on learning, including measuring learning outcomes, is in the Strategic Plan (SP) 2014-2017, and also reflected in regional strategies and country programs. Progress is tracked through indicators including: the implementation of quality standards in schools, early learning policies and systems, multilingual education, and well-functioning school management committees. Also tracked are the number of UNICEF-supported countries that have well-functioning student learning assessment systems. At the outcome level, UNICEF monitors the percentage of countries in which students' learning outcomes are increasing in standardized learning assessment surveys.	http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/
A higher emphasis on the proximate causes of learning outcomes: student / teacher time on task, teacher supervision and use of local language in early learning.	Ongoing	<p>UNICEF agrees that student and teacher time on task are relevant, alongside other factors such starting school at the right age, attending regularly, and early learning programs. Evidence suggests that strong school communities and school management committees (SMCs) can support schools to tackle student and teacher absenteeism, monitor school performance and support school improvements. In 2014, UNICEF trained 47,141 SMCs and communities. UNICEF is piloting approaches to improve accountability of schools to parents through the provision of accessible school-related data (e.g. in Togo, Zambia, Laos, Nepal, Madagascar co-funded by UNICEF and GPE). In 2014, the number of countries supported by UNICEF and where Education Information Management Systems make key performance data available to communities and school management committees increased to 44, from 40 in 2013¹.</p> <p>UNICEF also works with governments to put in place quality standards for schools that are coherent with the child friendly school (CFS) approach, including aspects such as measurement of learning outcomes, pedagogy, community involvement, etc. In 2014, 89 countries (up from 79 in 2013) reported having quality standards consistent with CFS.</p> <p>The number of countries supported by UNICEF that have an education policy/sector plan that includes multilingual education to allow children to learn in their mother tongue during the early grades increased from 47 to 62 between 2013 and 2014. UNICEF intervenes at the policy and implementation level. For example, UNICEF collaborated with the Asia-Pacific Multilingual Education Working Group to ensure that all children in the region have access to education in their mother tongue. In the Plurinational State of Bolivia, UNICEF partnered with Plan International to support adaptation of the curricula to the local context and ensured implementation of this model in 11 municipalities with indigenous populations.</p> <p>Early learning is the foundation for later learning, and in 2014, among countries supported by UNICEF, 52 reported having effective early learning policies and quality early learning programs, as compared to 41 in 2013. Working with governments and local partners,</p>	<p>http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-agreement-school-profiles-systems-improvement-unicef</p> <p>http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/2014_Annual_Results_Report_Education.pdf</p>

¹ As explained in the overall response, UNICEF country offices report progress against critical enabling environment factors as per the SP, when the country programme includes UNICEF support or advocacy work in that area.

		UNICEF helped improve and expand coverage of these services, both in and out of emergencies. For example, in Nigeria, UNICEF supported the increase of new community-based education childcare centers from 25 in 2013 to 103 in 2014, reaching roughly 47 per cent of the targeted children in 11 states.	
Supporting the measurement of learning outcomes.	Ongoing	<p>UNICEF is working with governments to strengthen learning assessment systems. Between 2013 and 2014, the number of countries with well-functioning student learning assessment systems, especially for early grades, increased from 56 to 65.</p> <p>UNICEF co-chaired the Learning Metrics Task Force from 2012-2013, as part of the global effort to increase the focus on the measurement of learning outcomes. At global and regional levels, UNICEF support has included the inclusion of learning outcomes in Sustainable Development Goal 4; provides support to new and existing global and regional partnerships²; is piloting the development of new indicators and tools to measure early learning outcomes (ongoing); and the inclusion of learning assessment in MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey) household surveys.</p> <p>Progress at country level includes support to some of the largest longitudinal studies on learning outcomes in the developing world. For example in India, between 2009 and 2011, nearly 30,000 rural children, their classes, schools and families were followed over 3 grades to explore factors linked to language and math outcomes. Another ongoing India study tracks the impact of different early childhood education programs on school readiness and early grade learning for nearly 10,000 children.</p>	http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/universal- http://www.unicef.org/supply/files/LR_PS_OS_R_2014_9112798_Concept_Note.pdf http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/universal-education/learning-metrics-task-force-2/melqo http://www.asercentre.org/p/62.html
Recommendation 6.5. 1) to 3) p 65: (...) encourage UNICEF and GPE to 4) Vigilantly promote gender equity in enrolment and learning outcomes in the higher grades of basic education.			
Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree) Agree			
<i>Note:</i> UNICEF's Strategic Plan "prioritizes improving primary and lower secondary access and learning outcomes for girls in countries where significant numbers of girls are routinely excluded from education". Approaches are tailored to the country context, noting that poverty and location, combined with gender, are often the primary drivers of exclusion. In countries where the most vulnerable girls do not enter or complete primary education, UNICEF strategies will continue to address this, whilst incrementally paying increased attention to secondary education.			
Actions	Progress	Key examples of actions taken	Supporting documents
High priority on gender equity in enrolment and learning outcomes, including to secondary education, in UNICEF's Strategic Plan 2014-2017.	Ongoing	<p>Gender equality was already a high priority in the previous Medium Term Strategic Plan (see e.g. 2013 Thematic Report for details) and it remains a high priority in the new SP.</p> <p>At the outcome level, UNICEF tracks gender equity in access to primary and secondary education and in learning outcomes. At the output level, UNICEF supports and monitors the enabling factors (such as budget allocation, learning environment and strategies to improve demand) for improving girls' enrolment, retention and learning. UNICEF also supports and monitors the development of education sector policies or plans that specify prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools.</p>	http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/files/2014-8-Final_results_framework_of_strategic_plan-ODS-EN.pdf http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/Basic_Education_and_Gender_Equality_2013_Thematic_Report.pdf
Development and implementation of the UNICEF Gender Action Plan as part of the Strategic Plan, with a targeted priority on girls' education including to secondary.	Ongoing	The UNICEF Gender Action Plan 2014-2017 (as part of the SP) has girls' education, including to secondary, as a targeted priority. This includes strengthening the enabling environment to support girls' secondary education; increasing and improving secondary level educational opportunities for the most vulnerable girls, and creating demand for girls'	http://www.unicef.org/media/files/UNICEF_Gender_Action_Plan_2014-2017.pdf

² For example, the Measuring Early Learning Quality and Outcomes partnership, the South East Asia primary learning metrics and Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality.

		education at all levels. It also promotes gender equality in pre-primary and primary education as well as in conflict and peacebuilding, with a focus on quality and learning. Planned actions to support the implementation of the Gender Action Plan include: support to national analyses of gender issues in the education sector (with UNGEI and GPE); guidance for secondary education programming with a focus on gender and equity; and strengthening the evidence base, national capacity and policies/strategies to address school-related gender-based violence (a five country pilot, with GPE).	
Girls' education programming in high priority countries.	Ongoing	A selection of illustrative achievements during 2014 (including improvement of gender data , policies and direct support to girls' education) include: - In India, development of a digital Gender Atlas mapping information related to girls' education: girls' demographics, educational attainment, teachers, early marriage, pregnancy etc. The atlas will help target interventions on girls' education. - In Mali, implementation of the 'Mother's Scholarships' cash transfer program and support to mothers' associations and women's groups through income-generating activities. This enabled 85,800 children, mostly girls, to enter and stay in school. - In Eritrea, increased coverage of gender-friendly WASH facilities in nomadic schools, and supporting the gender-responsiveness of policies and girls' right to education. - In Nigeria, UNICEF supports enrolment drives and cash transfer schemes, which has brought 360,000 girls into school in five northern states.	http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/2014_Annual_Results_Report_Education.pdf
Support to the UNGEI initiative.	Ongoing	UNICEF hosts and provides funding to UNGEI - a multi-stakeholder partnership which advocates for girls' education and builds global, regional and country levels partnerships with civil society and other actors. UNGEI has an important partnership with GPE to strengthen gender responsive sector planning and implementation at the country level, and UNGEI and GPE have collaborated to strengthen global and country level guidance and policy advocacy.	http://www.ungei.org/whatisungei/index_730.html
Recommendation 6.5. 1) to 3) p 65: (...) encourage UNICEF and GPE to: 5) Strengthen the emphasis in each country on the needs of marginalized groups, particularly the disabled, at least by establishing or strengthening EMIS tracking of disaggregated population and outcome data on marginalized groups, including linguistic minorities and students from poor families as well as students with disabilities.			
Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree) Agree			
Actions	Progress	Key examples of actions taken	Supporting documents
Increased the emphasis on equity, particularly with regard to the needs of marginalized and vulnerable children (including children in humanitarian situations) in UNICEF's Strategic Plan 2014-2017.		Equity is at the core of UNICEF's strategic plan 2014-2017. This includes a focus on access and learning for disadvantaged and excluded children, and on increasing countries' ability to ensure safe and secure forms of education to children in humanitarian situations. At the outcome level, UNICEF monitors attendance in primary education and early childhood education of children from the poorest families (lowest quintile). At the output level, it tracks the number of countries that have policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities (52 in 2014, 48 in 2013). It also tracks the number of countries with Education Management Information Systems providing disaggregated data that allow the identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit realization of the rights of disadvantaged children (54 in 2014, 53 in 2013). Finally, it tracks progress in reaching children in humanitarian situations with formal or non-formal education (8.6 million children reached in 2014, 6.0 million in 2013).	

Improving data and analysis on marginalized children including children with disabilities.	Ongoing	Examples of work undertaken by UNICEF in this regard include: - Working with over 40 governments to identify precise national profiles of out of school children through the Out of School Children Initiative (OOSCI). - Development of two household survey modules, in cooperation with the Washington Group ³ , to identify children/youth with disabilities and assess school environments (implementation in MICS in 2016). - Production of a 'Guide for Including Disability in Education Management Information Systems' to collect data on children with disabilities and on school accessibility in EMIS. The guide is being tested in Ethiopia and Tanzania and should be finalized in 2016. - A chapter on inclusive education in the education sector analysis methodological guidelines developed with the World Bank, DFID, UNESCO/IIEP/Pole de Dakar and GPE Secretariat (expected 2016).	http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/oosci-global-report-en.pdf http://data.unicef.org/child-disability/overview
Improving equity-focused programming in UNICEF and at country level.	Ongoing	Monitoring of Results for Equity System (MoRES), introduced in 2011, emphasizes identifying and addressing context specific inequities and monitoring results for the most vulnerable and marginalized children. For example, in Togo, MoRES has helped identify the largest obstacles to children's education at national, district and school levels and incorporate solutions into national/decentralized/school level plans. In Nepal UNICEF is supporting development of an equity index for more equitable governance of the education system in Nepal. UNICEF has also developed, jointly with the World Bank, the Simulations for Equity in Education tool, an equity-focused financial simulation tool for governments. The tool was able to demonstrate in Ghana that a pro-equity approach to teacher training had potential to reach more children in remote areas, at lower cost, than traditional training approaches.	http://www.unicef.org/education/beg_e_SEE.html http://www.inclusive-education.org/sites/default/files/uploads/booklets/IE_Webinar_Booklet_1_0.pdf "Pursuing Equity in Practice" A compendium of case studies on MoRES implementation in countries.
Recommendation 6.36 1) Agents (those creating the design and managing the implementation of aid) should be held accountable for the quality of aid design and implementation. Even if the principals (those financing the aid) delegate the responsibility to others to assure that projects that they finance meet standards, the principals have a responsibility to set standards for good practice and to enforce these standards, either through suasion or the judicious use of their financing.			
Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree) This recommendation is for Norway's MFA.			
<i>Note: The actions that UNICEF is already taking to improve the quality of aid design and implementation are discussed below.</i>			
Recommendation 6.37 2) p 66: Both UNICEF and GPE to routinely and transparently archive on their websites all key documents pertaining to upstream work and the program cycle by country and operation. The staff in both agencies now waste time trying to find documents for various purposes and not always successfully.			
Management Response: Agree			
Actions	Progress	Key examples of actions taken	Supporting documents
Signing up to the International Aid Transparency Initiative.	Completed	Joining the IATI (2012), ranked 14 of 68 organizations in 2015. All UNICEF evaluations and internal audit reports publicly available.	http://dashboard.iatistandard.org/publisher/unicef.html
Launching of the UNICEF transparency portal.	Completed	Launch of the UNICEF transparency portal, with a wide array of information available publicly on a common website, including all current program documents, up to date data and reports and financial flows from donors to implementing offices and program areas.	http://open.unicef.org/ http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/index_46487.html

³ The Washington Group on Disability Statistics includes representatives from international organizations such as the World Bank, WHO, and UNICEF, organizations representing persons with disabilities, as well as 118 national statistical authorities.

Improving standards in UNICEF accounting.	Completed	Adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) – in 2012.	http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/UNICEF_moves_to_IPSAS.pdf
Establishing an internal data collection and reporting tool (Results Assessment Module)		The Results Assessment Module (RAM) was established in 2012 and is used for collecting and reporting on country programme activities, progress and results. The Module has improved several times since its creation (e.g. integration of the MoRES framework in 2014), based on lessons learnt from users. It is accessible to all UNICEF staff.	
Recommendation 6.37 3) p 66: UNICEF to dramatically improve the analytic rigor, clarity, and consistency of the documentary trail for its activities. Whatever its ultimate role relative to other aid agencies, the quality of UNICEF's upstream and downstream documents are now unacceptable. UNICEF's Headquarters understands that to fix this deeply seated problem, the skill mix has to change at all levels of the organization and the operational culture has to change at the level of the regional and country offices.			
Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially Agree			
<i>Reasons for partial agreement:</i> UNICEF only partially agrees with the assessment regarding upstream and downstream documentation. Whilst UNICEF acknowledges that there is room for improvement and has been making efforts to address these shortcomings, we also recognize that the budget and time constraints of the evaluation made it impossible for the evaluators to spend enough time with country teams and regional offices to investigate all aspects of UNICEF's programming and documentation. With regards to results based management, the findings of earlier evaluations such as the DFID's Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) 2011 & 2013 update, and the 2012 review by the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) also underlined the need to strengthen management for results. Both the MOPAN and MAR rated UNICEF very highly in comparison to other multilateral organizations and the more recent DFID update notes a positive trajectory of change for results management, transparency and accountability.			
Actions	Progress	Key examples of actions taken	Supporting documents
Improving document transparency.		See above (in response to recommendation 6.37 2) p 66).	
Establishment of a Field Results Group reporting to a new Deputy Executive Director position to strengthen UNICEF's results-based management.	Completed	Establishment of the Fields Results Group (2014) reporting to a new dedicated Deputy Executive Director, to strengthen UNICEF performance in the area of programming for results at country level (including planning, implementation, monitoring, quality assurance and results reporting).	http://www.unicef.org/french/about/execboard/files/2014-ABL4-Creation_of_a_fourth_DED-16Apr14-EN.pdf
Introduction and mainstreaming of the MoRES approach.	Ongoing	Introduction (2011) and mainstreaming (ongoing) of MoRES (Monitoring of Results for Equity Systems) in education programming at all levels for stronger analysis, programming, monitoring, feedback loops and evaluation (including an equity focus).	http://www.unicef.org/about/employ/files/MoRES_Briefing_Note.pdf
Planned introduction of "country program strategy notes" for more rigorous and accountable programming, monitoring and evaluation at corporate level.	Ongoing	The Field Results Group is developing a new system for more rigorous and accountable UNICEF programming whereby country offices will have to develop, in addition to current programmatic documents, country support strategy notes detailing how UNICEF intends to achieve country program outcomes including a theory of change, refined results structure, indicators and means of verification. These will be systematically reviewed and quality assured and will support key steps in the programming and supervising processes.	
Improving the skills mix among UNICEF staff.	Ongoing	Development of technical competencies for education staff with an increased focus on analytical and data skills. Hiring for talent groups (ongoing) in order to ensure the right mix of skills at all levels. Creation of new positions of data/analysis/learning assessment/girls' education specialists at RO and HQ levels (ongoing). Staff capacity building, including corporate-wide Results Based Management e-learning (expected 2015) and training on education sector analyses for UNICEF, government, and development partners in country (in Africa in 2015). Strengthened staff performance assessment system with enhanced linkages with organizational outcomes (2016).	
Improving education sector analysis to inform government and UNICEF programming	Planned and ongoing	Development of education sector analysis methodological guidelines (volumes 1 and 2 in 2014 and volume 3 to be finalized in 2016) and direct support to individual countries for	http://www.unicef.org/education/files/vol1eng.pdf

		the development of education sector analyses in 2014/15 (e.g. in Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, DR Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho).	http://www.unicef.org/education/files/vol2eng(2).pdf
Improving education program guidance and strengthening HQ and regional support and quality assurance of country program documents at key moments, including at the design stage and during mid-term reviews.	Ongoing	Development of the Theory of Change of the Strategic Plan (June 2014), supported by guidance to Country Offices as to how it applies at country level (2015). Guidance/quality assurance for country program documents and mid-term reviews (2015). Development and use of strategic plan education profiles with comparative information on country, region and indicator-specific performance to support education programming at country level (since 2014).	http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/files/2014-CRP_14-Theory_of_Change-7May14-EN.pdf
Improving monitoring of education results and related reporting.	Ongoing	Introduction of MoRES in 2011 (already described above). Compared to the previous strategic plan (MTSP 2006-2013), improved precision, objectivity and coherence in the rating of strategic plan (SP) indicators, with related <i>SP 2014-2017 education indicators guidance notes</i> (2014). Introduction of scorecards for office results (early 2016). Improved 2013 and 2014 annual reports (formerly named <i>Thematic Reports</i>). The 2014 Annual Results Report includes results chains for each program area linking 2014 spending to output and outcome SP indicators. Also note the EDAR to the Executive Board, and the data companion, which provides considerable data (for 2014 see the report and its addendum: the "data companion").	http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/Basic_Education_and_Gender_Equality_2013_Thematic_Report.pdf http://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/2014_Annual_Results_Report_Education.pdf http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2014-6-Annual_report_Executive_Director-ODS-EN.pdf http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2014-6-Add1-Annual_report_of_ED-Addendum-28Apr14-EN.pdf http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/DC-2014-final-EN.pdf
Strengthening approaches to evaluation and results within UNICEF education programs.	Ongoing	Development of an evaluation strategy emphasizing the importance of analytical rigor and the need to embed robust evaluation within programs/projects (completion by early 2016, based on findings of a 2014 independent assessment of UNICEF's education evaluations).	
Recommendation 6.37 4) p 66: UNICEF to start country program activities only when the activity is fully funded. Some UNICEF officials deny that starting with partial funding affects the stability of objectives and activity completion rates. Those outside of UNICEF see partial funding as helping to explain why some UNICEF activities fail to complete and why some started activities change direction over time in response to new funders for the activity.			
Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree) Partially agree			
<i>Reasons for partial agreement:</i> While UNICEF program funding levels do not support the idea that many programs would have to be discontinued because of a lack of funding, we acknowledge that lack of funding can sometimes put achieving country plans at risk. However, we cannot agree to only start implementation when fully funded. UNICEF's model is not based on projects, but rather on country programs in support of governments for the implementation of their national plans, including both downstream and upstream support (e.g. policy influencing, knowledge development, capacity building). UNICEF would prefer more predictable and flexible funding from donors. Highly earmarked funding reduces UNICEF's efficiency and effectiveness. In this regard, Norway represents a positive model and UNICEF will continue to encourage other donors to follow this model more closely.			

GPE Secretariat Management Response to the Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education

The Secretariat of the Global Partnership for Education welcomes the Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Support to Basic Education, and its useful findings and recommendations. The results of this evaluation are especially timely, as they come as the GPE Board of Directors is preparing the Global Partnership's new five-year strategic plan. We also thank the Norwegian government for its leadership on the Global Partnership's Board of Directors, where it has played a key role in the development of policies and strategies aimed at strengthening the partnership.

The Norwegian evaluation looks at the overall program effectiveness of two organizations - the Global Partnership for Education and UNICEF - and makes recommendations regarding their efforts to spur learning outcomes, gender equality and overall equity in basic education. It also explores the value added to Norway's Ministry of Foreign Affairs of using the Global Partnership for Education and UNICEF as the two multilateral conduits for its investments. As such, it has a different but complementary purpose to the [Independent Interim Evaluation](#) that was commissioned by the Global Partnership's Board of Directors, and published on October 2, 2015.

It is one of the overarching findings of the Norwegian evaluation that despite strong expressions of support, donors and governments are not committing adequate financing to basic education. Norway stands out as an exception to this trend - it has increased its financing for basic education, and emerged as a global leader on this issue, through its support for the 2015 Oslo Summit on Financing Education for Development, and its initiating role in the recently announced International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunities. The GPE Secretariat looks forward to working with the Government of Norway and the new Commission to promote improvements in financing for basic education, particularly in low-income countries and countries affected by conflict and crisis.

The GPE Secretariat welcomes the evaluation's central finding on GPE's performance: that "GPE achieves powerful efficiencies with its model of donor harmonization of funding and technical support around a country education sector plan." The new strategy being discussed by the GPE Board of Directors continues to place sector planning and education sector plan implementation at the center of its business model. The Secretariat recognizes that more can be done to improve the quality of sector plans, and is strongly committed to supporting such improvements through its unique, country-led partnership approach.

The GPE Secretariat also welcomes the Norway evaluation's positive findings on the strength of supervision and quality of implementation in the Global Partnership's programs. However, the GPE Secretariat recognizes the need for improvements in GPE efforts to promote learning outcomes, gender equality and broader equity issues. The Secretariat also

agrees with the evaluation's recommendations on the need to strengthen GPE's operational platform at the country level. As recognized by the evaluators, significant improvements in the partnership's operational platform and program effectiveness have occurred since 2013.

Many of these are not fully captured in this report, which covers the period between 2009-2013.

Below we respond to the evaluation's specific recommendations in more detail, describing more fully where progress has been made.

General Recommendations (for both GPE and UNICEF)

- 1) *Place a higher priority on appropriately measuring and improving learning outcomes. The efforts of donors and partner governments to expand enrolment have helped many children, but resources now need to be invested in factors that increase the main payoff from being enrolled, namely, acquiring basic knowledge and skills.*
- 2) *Give more emphasis to proximate causes of learning outcomes: student/teacher time on task, teacher supervision, and use of local language in early learning.*
- 3) *Vigilantly promote gender equity in enrolment and learning outcomes in the higher grades of basic education.*
- 4) *Strengthen the emphasis in each country on the needs of marginalized groups, particularly the disabled, at least by establishing or strengthening Education Management Information Systems tracking of disaggregated population and outcome data on marginalized groups, including linguistic minorities and students from poor families as well as students with disabilities, and promoting the use of an "equity parity index."*

The GPE Secretariat welcomes the evaluation's recommendations for the Global Partnership and UNICEF to focus more strongly on learning outcomes, gender equity and the needs of marginalized groups, as well as their recommendations on improving data, monitoring and evaluation. Since 2013, the Global Partnership has taken significant steps to improve its work in these areas:

- The Global Partnership has expanded the value of funding available for education sector plan development to a maximum of \$500,000; these funds can now be used to support a more comprehensive sector analysis with stronger attention to bottlenecks and barriers to equity and learning in national systems.
- In 2014, as part of its new funding model, GPE adopted a requirement for governments to invest in stronger data systems and a strategy for improving data systems.
- In its present portfolio, 27 of the Global Partnership's active grants contain significant investments in Education Management Information Systems; while 21 include investments in learning assessments.

- Furthermore, under the new GPE funding model, countries applying to GPE grants now have access to a variable tranche of “results-based” funding, which is linked to demonstrated results in learning and equity.
- Through its Global and Regional Activities Program, and in cooperation UNICEF, the UNESCO Institute of Statistics, and the International Institute for Educational Planning, the Global Partnership has supported initiatives to improve available data and policies that are more sensitive to out-of-school children, learning outcomes, gender-based school violence, and equitable public expenditure in education. Through these initiatives we hope to build stronger adoption of policies that tackle key equity issues, including gender.
- The Global Partnership has completed a review of gender in education sector plans and is working intensively with the United Nations Girls Education Initiative to develop and pilot an approach to gender sensitive sector planning.

Aid Management Recommendations

- 1) *Agents (those creating the design and managing the implementation of aid) should be held accountable for the quality of aid design and implementation. Even if the principals (those financing the aid) delegate the responsibility to others to assure that projects that they finance meet standards, the principals have a responsibility to set standards for good practice and to enforce these standards, either through suasion or the judicious use of their financing.*

The GPE Secretariat strongly supports this recommendation – and would classify it as “imperative.” As part of the current strategic plan process, the Secretariat is working closely with a reference group of the GPE Board of Directors to evaluate and strengthen core aspects of the country-level operational platform of the Global Partnership.

In October the Board will be asked to consider recommendations that include: adoption of clearer descriptions of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities; minimum standards for selecting a managing or supervising entity (ME/SE); the creation of standard reporting tools for all grants; and the introduction of stronger quality assurance and conflict resolution mechanisms. These recommendations will be combined with the significant improvements made since 2013 in the Secretariat’s capacity to monitor and oversee grants and their management.

- 2) *Both UNICEF and GPE to routinely and transparently archive on their websites all key documents pertaining to upstream work and the program cycle by country and operation. The staff in both agencies now waste time trying to find documents for various purposes and not always successfully.*

The GPE Secretariat agrees that there is a need to improve the archiving and housing of key policy and program documents, which are not available on the web (or when they are, are

embedded in board documents and therefore not searchable). The Secretariat has introduced dedicated staff capacity to make these improvements.

- 3) *GPE's Board of Directors to resolve the ambiguous accountability relationships between the Local Education Groups, the Secretariat, and the Board.*

The GPE Secretariat strongly supports this recommendation and also considers it as imperative. This issue will be addressed as part of the above-mentioned work of the Board's reference group to strengthen the operational platform. The reference group has recommended that clear criteria and a mutual accountability matrix be developed to guide country- and global-level roles, responsibilities and accountabilities within the partnership. The adoption of minimum standards for Local Education Groups (LEGs) and stronger quality assurance and conflict resolution mechanisms are also recommended.

- 4) *GPE Board and the Secretariat to find ways to raise the quality of and reduce the variance in quality between Education Sector Plans. The GPE Board and its agent, the Secretariat, have ultimate accountability to the donors and their taxpayers for good aid delivery. GPE's operations should be based on Education Sector Plans, and their strengths and flaws radiate outwards to GPE-funded operations. At the same time, GPE builds on national policy processes that must be "owned" by the in-country players. Any heavy-handed intervention by GPE will undermine this process.*

The GPE Secretariat welcomes this recommendation. The business model of the Global Partnership supports governments and their development partners to jointly develop an education sector plan (ESP). It also makes development partners responsible for ESP appraisal and endorsement, in order to foster their alignment with national policies and systems.

A recent Secretariat review of 42 education sector plans confirms some of the ESP quality challenges identified in the evaluation. But it is important to note that the Secretariat review also finds signs of recent progress in ESP quality and credibility. This may be partly due to the significant increase, since 2013, of technical support from the GPE Secretariat to countries and LEGs involved in sector planning. Secretariat support has continued to improve with the creation of a new quality assurance team within the Secretariat, charged with developing additional upstream or "formative" quality assurance mechanisms to support stronger education sector planning and the development of a consistent methodology for monitoring and reporting on the quality of sector plans as part of the Global Partnership's new results framework. The Secretariat anticipates that these improvements will contribute to even stronger ESPs going forward.

During its October 2015 retreat, the GPE Board of Directors will also consider an additional measure to support the quality of ESPs: the introduction of independent technical reviews of sector plans within the Global Partnership's program cycle.

- 5) *GPE's Board of Directors to adopt a certification process for those agencies eligible to serve as Managing Entities and Supervising Entities. The risks associated with entities that have not been vetted are high. The Board's relevant Executive Committees, such as*

the Country Grants and Performance Committee and Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee, and its Secretariat could advise on criteria and process.

At its October 2015 retreat, the GPE Board of Directors will consider a recommendation to apply the existing minimum standards that are currently in place for INGOs to all supervising and managing entities. Under this proposal, a review of each existing supervising and managing entity will take place against these standards and the results will be shared with the Board's Committee on Governance, Ethics, Risks and Finance (GERF) at its first meeting in 2016 to determine whether any remedial action is required with respect to current supervising and managing entities that don't meet the standards. If adopted, any entity that wishes to serve in the role of supervising or managing entity will need to demonstrate initial compliance with these standards through an accreditation process arranged by the Secretariat

In closing, the GPE Secretariat would like to thank the evaluators and members of the NORAD evaluation team for a strong and useful report. The findings of this evaluation complement those found in the Independent Evaluation of the Global Partnership. They are in keeping with the reforms that have been agreed by the Board of Directors in recent years and the proposed improvements currently under consideration as part of the Global Partnership's new strategic plan. The Norwegian evaluation has made an important contribution by helping the partnership to further understand options for strengthening the impact and effectiveness of its work.

Alice P. Albright
Chief Executive Officer
October 2015