ANNEX

- Contracts with Donors
  - *Wellspring Advisors*
  - *Education Above All*
  - *UNICEF*
- Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

Wellspring Advisors

II. Mission Statement

To catalyze enhanced prevention of attacks on education, effective response to attacks, improved knowledge and understanding, better monitoring and reporting, stronger international norms and standards, and increased accountability.

III. Funding Request

1. How does your organization develop, review and adapt its goals and priorities

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) was established in 2010 by organizations from the fields of education in emergencies and conflict-affected fragile states, higher education, protection, international human rights, and international humanitarian law who were concerned about on-going attacks on educational institutions, their students and staff in countries affected by conflict and insecurity. The issue of attacks on education has often suffered from a lack of attention as it occurs at the interstices of many fields and disciplines and is typically seen as a peripheral rather than central concern or responsibility of any one discipline or organization. The Coalition was formed to facilitate coordination between different disciplines impacted by attacks on education, and the organizations that represent them, and to focus attention directly on this issue and draw it in from the margins. From its inception, then, the Coalition has had a particular goal: *to be an international advocacy organization promoting the protection of education from attack*. As a coalition, GCPEA also plays a unique role: to engage in advocacy activities that will benefit from the coordinated efforts of several organizations, and which individual organizations are less able to conduct alone. In prioritizing activities or selecting projects, GCPEA is cognizant of its unique composition and form. As a result, decisions about direction and strategy are strongly influenced by the extent to which they enable the Coalition to utilize its niche qualities to effectively advocate for measures to end attacks against education.

GCPEA's method for developing, reviewing and adapting its goals and priorities requires reaching a consensus among its Steering Committee members, who govern the Coalition. The Steering Committee is made up of the following organizations: Education Above All (EAA); Human Rights Watch (HRW); Save the Children International (SCI); the Institute of International Education's Scholar Rescue Fund (SRF); United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). The Institute of International Education (IIE) currently serves as GCPEA's fiscal and administrative agent. Decision-making by consensus ensures buy-in and commitment from all GCPEA members for all plans, which inevitably strengthens the Coalition.

GCPEA has determined that the most effective way to implement its goals and priorities is through focusing on the following three initiatives: 1) To strengthen field-based measures to prevent and respond to attacks on education; 2) To strengthen monitoring and reporting of attacks on education; and 3)To restrict the military use of education institutions.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) is seeking $200,000 over one year (January 1, 2013 – December, 2013) to support its advocacy and programmatic initiatives in the three major areas described below. For each initiative a working group is in place, and plans have been developed to achieve outcomes over a multi-year timeframe.

1. ***The initiative to strengthen field-based measures to prevent and respond to attacks on education*** is designed to assist field-level actors to implement effective, evidence-based programmatic measures to end targeted attacks on education. To achieve this goal, GCPEA will prepare a series of briefing papers documenting good practices to contribute to the body of research on responses that have been identified by practitioners as effective in preventing and protecting education from attack. It will also highlight lessons learned in developing these measures to encourage successful adaptation in different conflict-affected contexts. GCPEA will disseminate the briefing papers widely, including by hosting webinars on select practices in the papers.

2. ***The initiative to strengthen monitoring and reporting of attacks on education*** has taken over responsibility from UNESCO for publishing the *Education under Attack* series, beginning with *Education under Attack 2013.* The report will survey attacks on education worldwide. Its aim is to provide convincing evidence that the problem is widespread and the impact devastating; to motivate policy-makers to implement protections for education in conflict; to assist GCPEA and other organizations to advocate for these protections; and to analyze new developments, while highlighting promising practice, gaps and opportunities. Data collection and drafting will begin in 2012 and the final report will be published in December 2013, accompanied by dissemination and advocacy.

3. ***The initiative to restrict the military use of education institutions*** will utilize a GCPEA report on military use to be published in 2012 to advocate for domestic and international policies and laws that restrict military use and occupation of education institutions. In 2012 GCPEA hired a consultant to develop guidelines drawing on international humanitarian and human rights law as well as best practices, including progressive domestic legislation, to restrict the military use of education institutions. In 2013 GCPEA will advocate with states, as well as regional and international institutions that provide peacekeeping forces or engage in military interventions, to adopt and implement these guidelines.

Anticipated short and long-term outcomes of these three initiatives include: 1) increased access to information on good practices in preventing and responding to attacks for field-level education and protection actors and improved knowledge on the efficacy of select measures; 2)increased implementation of effective preventive and protective field-based measures at the policy, and community levels; 3)improved data collection, analysis, and understanding of the nature, scope, and consequences of attacks and commitment at policy levels to act to end these attacks; and 4) commitment from government policy makers, military and security forces, and armed groups to reform legislation, policy and practice to restrict the military use of education institutions.

A working group carries out the work of each initiative. Steering Committee members, as well as representatives from other affiliated or partner organizations, serve on the working groups. Steering Committee members thus participate in goal formulation at two levels: at the overall GCPEA level, and also at the working group level to implement the initiatives formulated to achieve the larger overarching goals. The Steering Committee meets face to face every six months to review GCPEA goals and to re-evaluate or develop new strategies for achieving these goals. The Steering Committee also has teleconferences every two months to evaluate progress in reaching goals and modify strategies as required. The working groups have teleconferences as needed, and as often as once a week, to implement plans for achieving goals within each initiative.

GCPEA's Management Committee, comprised of four of the Steering Committee members as well as GCPEA's fiscal agent and the GCPEA director, as *ex officio* members, is responsible for the Coalition's financial and administrative decisions. It approves the budget and strategy of GCPEA as a whole, as well as the work plans and budgets for each working group. It holds teleconferences at least every two months and on an ad hoc basis as needed.

GCPEA's Secretariat—a director and a program coordinator—support the Coalition's work, including by facilitating development, review and adaptation of goals and priorities. GCPEA will hire a half time program officer in 2013 to assist the Secretariat in coordinating and providing substantive input to the working group activities.

2. *What is the longer term goal for the work supported by this grant?*

GCPEA seeks to establish a world in which all who wish to learn, teach and research, at all levels and in all forms of education, and all those who support them, can do so in conditions of safety, security, dignity and equality, free from fear, consistent with the principles of mutual understanding, peace, tolerance and academic freedom.

To achieve this goal, GCPEA has identified the following sub-goals:
- To highlight the incidence and impact of attacks on education in conflict-affected and fragile situations among key actors, and cultivate public support for education in safe and secure environments.
- To promote the strengthening of existing monitoring and reporting systems as well as the creation of new systems where needed.
- To promote effective, coherent, timely and evidence-based programmatic measures, including prevention and response.
- To encourage adherence to existing international law protecting education and the strengthening of international norms and standards as needed.
- To fight impunity for attacks on education by promoting and supporting a range of accountability measures.

3. *Why is this an important goal?*

Students, teachers and schools have been the target of intentional attacks in over 30 countries in the last five years according to UN studies. Attacks have included teachers and students being

threatened and killed, disappeared and abducted, raped or forcibly recruited from schools. Armed groups have burned, bombed, looted or destroyed schools. In addition, government security forces and other armed groups have used schools as bases for military operations in some 20 conflicts in the last five years, putting students at risk and further undermining access to education.

Attacks on schools, teachers and students violate the right to education and may also violate international humanitarian law and constitute war crimes or crimes against humanity. The impacts on children and their communities can be devastating. They can include death, injury and the destruction of schools. Attacks can lead to diminished education quality, loss of teachers and weakened educational systems. Weakened education adversely affects a country's economic, political and social development.

Field-based practitioners have developed a range of programs to reduce or prevent attacks on education. Yet, they have little information about each other's work or how to adapt successful initiatives to their contexts. Timely and accurate monitoring and reporting on attacks is crucial for responding to attacks, holding perpetrators accountable, and preventing attacks from occurring, but data on attacks is lacking. Few countries restrict their own military's use of schools and understanding of the consequences of such use is limited.

4. ***What changes do you expect to see by the end of the grant period? What are the intended outcomes of the work supported by this grant?***

By the end of the grant period the following changes/outcomes should be visible in each initiative:

a) Field-based Programmatic Responses to Attacks on Education
   - Increased access to information on good practices in preventing and responding to attacks for field-level education and protection actors.
   - Increased implementation of effective field-based preventive and protective measures at the community levels as well as increased support for these measures at the policy level and by donors.

b) Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Education
   - Improved data, analysis, and understanding of the nature, scope and consequences of attacks.
   - Improved ability to advocate for policies to protect against attacks on education by utilizing commitment at policy levels to act to prevent or respond to these attacks.
   - Increased understanding at national and international decision-making levels about the devastating impact of attacks on education; commitment by policy makers and donors to protect education from attack

c) Restricting the Military Use of Education Institutions
   - Increased understanding by government policy makers, military and security forces, and armed groups about the deleterious effects of military use of education institutions.

- Increased commitment from these same actors to reform legislation, policy and practice to restrict the military use of education institutions.

5. ***For each outcome, please describe the strategies and activities you will implement to achieve each outcome.***

a) <u>Field-based Programmatic Responses to Attacks on Education</u>
To achieve the outcomes of the field-based programmatic responses initiative, GCPEA plans to build upon its previous work by providing more in-depth information to practitioners in the field. In 2011, GCPEA held a global knowledge roundtable in Thailand with UN, and government, and non-governmental organization (NGO) representatives from 15 countries to exchange information on field-based approaches. In addition to the information shared among participants, GCPEA published a report of the meeting proceedings, produced a *Study on Field-based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack* that documented nine types of measures in 20 countries, and developed priorities for a research agenda on programmatic measures. GCPEA also built a network of key, field-based prevention and response actors in some 20 countries to share and disseminate information.

Drawing upon this work, GCPEA plans to research and publish a series of briefing papers on good practices in implementing individual programmatic measures to protect education from attack. Each paper will explore in depth a single type of response captured in the *Study*, providing much more information to practitioners who wish to implement the measure in their own context. GCPEA plans to produce at least three briefing papers in the series and to actively disseminate them through launches and webinars. In 2013, GCPEA is planning to produce at least one paper, the first to address community involvement in protecting education from attack, and to hold at least one webinar on the topic.

Each briefing paper will include the following:
- *Executive summary* – a concise summary of the report
- *Overview* – a mapping of how the particular programmatic measure has been implemented. This will involve conducting a literature review of studies on the specific programmatic measure, including any evaluations of how effective this measure has been in different contexts.
- *Case Study* – an in-depth case-study illuminating how the measure has worked in practice. Production of the case study may involve relevant GCPEA affiliates or Steering Committee members and will include travel to one or more countries and interviewing individuals involved in implementing the program, as well as community members who have been impacted.
- *Lessons learned / points of consideration for adaptation* – lessons learned from the mapping and the case study in terms of what contributes to the success of the measure or, conversely, contributes to its failure, particularly with a view towards identifying how these measures can be adapted to other contexts.

To select the individual topics from the nine documented in the *Study*, GCPEA recently circulated a survey to its network of practitioners to determine which programmatic measures they were most interested in learning how to implement more effectively. GCPEA's field-based

measures working group then considered the findings, as well as their own expect knowledge of where there are gaps in understanding. The International Network of Education in Emergencies' (INEE) director, who is a member of the working group and who brings broad knowledge about the work of various organizations working on education in emergencies, was helpful in identifying gaps. Accordingly, GCPEA will focus the first briefing paper on community involvement in the protection of education from attack. GCPEA will prepare terms of reference (TORs) for a consultant to produce each briefing paper and circulate the TORs to appropriate researchers identified by Coalition members' networks. The TORs will request that the applicant include a methodology for preparing the briefing paper, based on guidelines included in the TORs.

Once the consultant has prepared the briefing paper, GCPEA will vet, edit and publish it, and disseminate it widely through GCPEA's and partners' networks. GCPEA will approach INEE and other organizations to host a webinar in collaboration with them: practitioners associated with good practices documented in the briefing paper will discuss their experiences implementing the practice and respond to questions from participants interacting with them virtually.

GCPEA also plans to use the papers as an advocacy tool to encourage field-based practitioners, policy makers at the national level and in international institutions, and donors to implement or support implementation of effective field-based measures. Accordingly, GCPEA will share the paper with relevant missions to the UN, including donor nations as well as conflict-affected states. GCPEA will ask its Steering Committee members with country offices to share the briefing papers with ministries of education in relevant states. Finally, GCPEA will share the briefing papers with contacts at the World Bank and other relevant multi-lateral donors such as UN agencies that are not part of the Steering Committee. The paper may also be adapted as a thematic essay for inclusion in *Education under Attack 2013*.

Support requested from the anonymous donor: The Secretariat will play a crucial role in this initiative, including organizing the working group, providing substantive input by selecting and hiring consultants, contributing to the content of reports and editing them, and implementing dissemination and advocacy strategies though meetings with policy makers and donors as well as public-speaking and publication of op-eds or advocacy pieces. GCPEA is seeking support for a new half time position of Program Officer in the Secretariat with expertise in education and emergencies, focused on the work on field-based responses. (Another donor is supporting the direct costs around producing the papers).

b) Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Education
To achieve the monitoring and reporting initiative outcomes, GCPEA has taken over responsibility from UNESCO for producing the *Education under Attack* series. *Education under Attack 2007* was the first major document specifically addressing worldwide attacks on students, teachers, and educational institutions during armed conflict and insecurity. The more extensive 2010 volume brought this issue to the fore, contributing to its inclusion in the General Assembly Resolution of July 2010 on education in emergencies and serving as a crucial advocacy tool in the lead up to Security Council Resolution 1998 (2011), which made attacks on schools and

hospitals a trigger offense to the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on children and armed conflict.

Education under Attack 2013 will be similar in approach to *Education under Attack 2010*. The introductory chapter will provide a global overview delineating trends in attacks against education since publication of the last report, offering an update on responses to such attacks and information on the international agenda for change, and outlining needed next steps to be taken to protect education from attack. Three thematic chapters will address particular aspects of areas of focus by the Coalition in 2011-2013, namely, field-based responses, military occupation/use of educational premises and attacks on higher education. The final section of the report (about 50% of the text) will comprise country profiles summarizing incidences of recorded attacks on education, as well as significant initiatives for prevention and response. More specifically, each country page will include the following

(i)   an overview of the conflict and how attacks on education fit with the broader conflict;
(ii)   a description of the nature of the attacks;
(iii)   the impact of the attacks;
(iv)   in-country responses to the attacks including: (a) the legal framework; (b) accountability; and, (c) prevention and other programmatic responses; and (d) international responses within the country.

GCPEA will plan the collection of data for *Education under Attack 2013* in a manner that will lay the foundation for the Coalition's ongoing monitoring and reporting work.

Data included in the report will include attacks on the following: education facilities (all levels); teachers, academics, and other education personnel; students (all levels); military use and occupation of education facilities; and field-based responses to attacks on education. The report will cover the period from July 2009 – December 2012 (plus major issues arising in early 2013 prior to finalization of the report). In addition to the networks of GCPEA's member organizations and some 80 affiliates, the Coalition will seek data from: Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism Country Task Forces/Children and Armed Conflict Working Groups ("attacks on schools" focal points); education clusters or leading education agency (country coordinator/information manager/response expert in lead agency); education ministries/departments/district offices (key staff involved in monitoring and reporting as well as policy and planning response); local human rights organizations/partnerships and education trades unions; and higher education student and academic unions.

An International Advisory Committee will guide the work on the preparation of the report. The Committee will comprise approximately five to eight outside experts (academics, practitioners, etc.), with selection approved by the GCPEA Steering Committee. Final editorial control will rest with the Steering Committee, which will review issues highlighted by the International Advisory Committee, the GCPEA Monitoring and Reporting Working Group, and the GCPEA Secretariat. Steering Committee members will have the opportunity to review and sign-off on process and content at several stages in the preparation of the report and on the final text.

GCPEA will hire the following consultants to produce the report.

Production Coordinator: This person will conduct some research and editing but will primarily be responsible for coordinating input from the Lead Researcher, the Senior Editor and the other researchers involved in gathering data for the project. She will also handle the later stages of incorporating feedback from the International Advisory Committee and GCPEA's Steering Committee. This position will be held by Jane Kalista who played a similar role in producing *Education under Attack 2007.*

Lead Researcher/Writer. The Lead Researcher will conduct the majority of the research and prepare the first draft of the report. This position will be held by Brendan O'Malley, the same consultant who authored *Education under Attack* in 2007 and 2010.

Senior Editor. An experienced/senior editor will review the draft texts to ensure that information is presented in a way that is hard hitting and the data most accurate and valid. This position will be held by Mark Richmond who was responsible for producing *Education under Attack* in 2007 and 2010.

Other Researchers. In order to better cover language groups and to improve on the quality and validity of data, we will hire additional researchers to collect data from specific countries and language groups.

The Senior Editor and Lead Researcher/Writer are developing a methodological framework for producing *Education under Attack 2013*. Data collection will begin in September, with drafting of the report beginning in 2013.

Education under Attack 2013 will be a major advocacy tool for all GCPEA outreach, including efforts to restrict military use of schools and promote effective programmatic response. We plan to launch *Education under Attack 2013* around December 10, 2013, (Human Rights Day) in New York. This will help maintain the momentum established with the General Assembly and Security Council Resolutions. Additional launches may be planned in Europe and elsewhere in 2014, based on leadership by the Steering Committee members, and may be accompanied by high level panels on the topic. The report will be available on the GCPEA website (including through the interactive map), and announced on list-serves of concerned networks. Steering Committee members will disseminate the report through their networks in a coordinated approach.

In addition, GCPEA is planning a distribution strategy that includes the following: national education ministries and provincial ministries/district departments in worst-affected countries; military training institutions; heads of parliamentary education committees (or their equivalents), plus heads of regional federations of parliamentarians committed to promoting education; editors of annual human rights reports (to encourage their focus on these violations in the future); international and regional associations of universities; coordinators of Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism Country Task Forces and children and armed conflict working groups; cluster coordinators (education and child protection); and specialist journals (e.g. International Journal of Educational Development; Comparative Education Review; Compare; Comparative Education; and Harvard Education Review).

Support requested from the anonymous donor: GCPEA is seeking partial support for the production of *Education under Attack 2013,* including consultant salaries, the costs of printing,

launching and disseminating the report, as well as conducting pre-and post-publication advocacy. Education Above All has committed to providing 45% of the total costs of producing *Education under Attack 2013*, and UNICEF has committed to providing $112,330. By contributing to this project at the requested level, the anonymous donor will enable GCPEA to meet the full expenses of producing this report.

c) <u>Restricting the Military Use of Education Institutions</u>
To achieve the restricting military use initiative outcomes, GCPEA is developing international guidelines to restrict military use of education institutions and conducting advocacy campaigns to encourage states to adopt and implement them. In 2011, GCPEA commissioned the Colombia Group on Children and Adversity to prepare a research study outlining the scope of the practice of military use of educational institutions, negative consequences, best practices, and case studies. This study will be published in 2012 and launched at an event in New York. The report will be an important advocacy tool for raising awareness about the negative consequences of military use of schools.

In May 2012, GCPEA, in collaboration with the Geneva Academy on International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, convened a consultation of a group of international humanitarian and human rights lawyers, education in emergencies specialists, military leaders, and government officials. Over two days, the group discussed a draft of the report on military use, processes for drafting international guidelines, potential sticking points and strategies to gain state acceptance for and implementation of the guidelines. GCPEA also commissioned a legal expert to draft guidelines on military use of educational institutions based on recommendations from the meeting.

In November 2012, an expert roundtable will be convened in Geneva on the issue of military use of education institutions. GCPEA's legal consultant will present the draft guidelines at that meeting. Participants will include representatives from states identified as sympathetic to the creation of guidelines and who are likely to endorse them and act as champions encouraging other states to sign on to them, and representatives from agencies working on issues of education and child protection in emergencies. The participants will exchange perspectives about current law, policy, and practice; highlight negative consequences of military use of educational institutions on the right to education; identify positive examples of law, policy, and practice; address good examples where states are confronting domestic conflict but not using education institutions for military purposes; review and agree on the proposed international guidelines on military use of education facilities; and establish collaborative strategies for endorsing and implementing the guidelines. GCPEA hopes the consultation will result in some agreement on the international guidelines by at least a few states.

In 2013, GCPEA will continue to work with the legal consultant to refine the language or the draft guidelines to reflect the discussions at the November meeting and to bring as many states on board without diluting the language and intention of the guidelines. The Coalition will also conduct ongoing advocacy with states and other stakeholders to raise awareness about the impact of military use of education institutions on students and communities and to gain further support for the guidelines. GCPEA will develop a strategy for encouraging military and defense department leaders in key states, as well as peacekeeping entities, to endorse and adopt the guidelines. Such advocacy will require travelling to the capitals of key states to advocate with

decision makers at the ministries of foreign affairs, education and defense, as well as with leaders within the military, and with NGOs, academics and think-tanks working in the education or security fields. The exact nature of the Coalition's next steps will be determined by the outcomes of the November meeting. However, GCPEA is considering organizing events to commemorate and publicize endorsements of the guidelines when they are made by states, and to advocate for full scale implementation through the enactment of legislation, military orders, and other measures.

In addition to advocating individually with states to endorse the guidelines, GCPEA will continue working with partners such as the Geneva Academy, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and UN agencies including UNICEF, the UN Office of the Higher Commissioner on Human Rights, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Action (OCHA) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), as well as NGOs, such as Geneva Call, which works with non-state actors, to raise awareness of the damaging impact of military use of education institutions and to pressure governments and militaries to restrict this practice. The Coalition intends to create a community of actors all sending the same message to policy makers in education and defense ministries, as well as within national or multi-lateral military forces, that military use must of schools must end. GCPEA will work with these organizations to prepare advocacy materials, including articles in appropriate journals, and to disseminate them widely. The strategy the Coalition has employed is not necessarily to shame states into ending the practice but to try and convince them of the benefits they will accrue by voluntarily adopting measures to restrict military use of schools.

Support requested from the anonymous donor: GCPEA is seeking support to carry out advocacy activities in 2013 to encourage states, militaries, and peacekeeping entities to endorse the guidelines and ultimately to implement them though incorporation into legislation and other measures. Partial support for this initiative has already been committed to by Education Above All.

6. *How will you know if you are making progress to achieve your outcomes?*

a) Field-based Programmatic Responses to Attacks on Education
GCPEA will know it is making progress towards achieving its field-based programmatic response initiative outcomes if the following occurs in 2013:
- GCPEA publishes a briefing paper that identifies successful examples of community involvement in protecting education from attack and guidance on how to implement similar measures in different conflict-affected contexts.
- GCPEA hosts a webinar in partnership with INEE or other organizations on implementing select forms of community involvement in protecting education from attack and attracts over 25 participants from around the world.
- GCPEA launches the paper at an event targeting policy-makers.
- GCPEA disseminates the paper widely to all the GCPEA Steering Committee member organizations and their networks; GCPEA's network of organizational partners and individual practitioners; ministry of education personnel in conflict-affected countries, and donor states and institutions.
- Individual practitioners and/or policy makers and/or donors report that they are using the briefing paper or information obtained from the webinar to design or improve

implementation of a field-based measure featuring community involvement to protect education from attack; and/or that they are reforming policy or providing financial resources to support community involvement in protecting education from attack.

b) Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Education

GCPEA will know it is making progress towards achieving its monitoring and reporting initiative outcomes if the following occurs in 2013:

- GCPEA produces *Education under Attack 2013*, a global monitoring report on attacks on education that have occurred since July 2009.
- GCPEA holds a launch in December 2013 in New York accompanied by regional launches.
- GCPEA widely distributes the report amongst: GCPEA Steering Committee members and their networks; GCPEA's affiliates' networks; other local, national and international organizations working in the education, child protection, humanitarian and human rights fields; education ministries, as well as other policy makers and donors.
- Reference to *Education under Attack 2013* or data contained within is made in the documents of GCPEA Steering Committee members or network partners, as well as in publications of other organizations working in the education, child protection, humanitarian or human rights fields; in oral or written reports of policy makers at the national level; reports of donor governments or organizations such as the UN or World Bank; or in the media.
- Increased funding becomes available for projects that protect education from attack or seek to further research the phenomenon.
- The issue of attacks on education is reported more frequently in the following sources: the media; new resolutions of UN bodies such as the Security Council or General Assembly; reports of UN treaty monitoring bodies or regional or national human rights mechanisms; reports of GCPEA Steering Committee organizations or networks or other organizations working in the fields of education, child protection, human rights or humanitarian aid; reports of education ministries or other government departments of states, particularly those featured in the report and where attacks have occurred; and in the reports of donor states or organizations.

c) Restricting the Military Use of Education Institutions

GCPEA will know it is making progress towards achieving its restricting military use of education institutions initiative outcomes if the following occurs in 2013:

- GCPEA conducts advocacy meetings with officials in at least 10 key states and discusses the damaging consequences of military use of schools.
- The guidelines or the issue of the damaging consequences of military use of schools is mentioned in the following: the media; reports of organizations working in education, child protection, human rights or humanitarian aid fields; reports of ministries of education or defense or other government entities; reports of donor governments or agencies; in the policy directives of militaries or peacekeeping forces; or in the training manuals of militaries or peacekeeping operatives.
- At least four States endorse the international guidelines on restricting military use of educational institutions.

- States take steps towards passing legislation or directives that restrict the military use of schools.

7) ***Tell us what internal and external factors might affect the outcomes you are trying to achieve?***

Internal factors affecting outcomes: GCPEA is comprised of large, influential organizations with vast networks that exist at the field level for some organizations and at the policy level for others. Simply by accessing its own membership, the Coalition is able to tap into a wealth of data and information. Similarly, by releasing information through its members' communications channels, advocacy messages are disseminated very broadly. This situation bodes well for the success of GCPEA's data gathering and advocacy efforts. At the same time, GCPEA will need to make an extra effort to go beyond its membership to obtain data and spread advocacy messages to ensure that it is capturing information and reaching audiences beyond typical targets to ensure truly comprehensive products and advocacy.

External factors affecting outcomes: Governments and other entities that oppose GCPEA's agenda will exert pressure to try to discredit research findings in the series of briefing papers or *Education under Attack,* or will undermine support for the international guidelines on restricting military use of education institutions. Even without interference from opposing entities, the context in which GCPEA is trying to effect change, conflict-affected situations, means that governments are very cautious about implementing measures that may be seen to diminish security or place them at a strategic disadvantage. This is especially the case for restricting military use of schools. Similarly, international humanitarian law does not prohibit military use of schools in most situations, which may make it difficult to convince states and armed groups to restrict this practice.

8) ***What challenges do you anticipate in implementing this work? How will you approach those challenges?***

Challenges in implementing this work include an ambitious agenda for a Secretariat comprised of two staff members, and working groups that are largely composed of Steering Committee organization members who already have full-time jobs. The projects will involve supervising at least five consultants, producing one briefing paper accompanied by a webinar, and one book-size publication *(Education under Attack 2013)*. At the same time, the restricting military use initiative will involve intensive advocacy in a number of states to convince policy makers to endorse guidelines on the issue. Once the briefing paper and *Education under Attack 2013* are published, implementation of intensive dissemination and advocacy strategies will also be required.

To overcome human resource limitations, GCPEA's 2013 budget includes funds for a half-time program officer position to assist in coordinating and providing substantive input into the activities of the working groups. Moreover, the budget includes a line item for consultants that may be hired to support programmatic initiatives as required. GCPEA is in the process of encouraging affiliate members to participate in the working groups to lessen the human resources burden, and to gain from a wider range of experience and perspective in implementing the activities of the initiatives. The Coalition's methodology of hiring consultants to produce reports

and other substantive products also means that it can achieve much more than if it tried to complete projects in-house.

Another challenge that GCPEA will face in implementing its projects is that it focuses on conflict-affected situations. Places experiencing these conditions are by definition not easy to access or obtain information about. As a result, it may be difficult to learn about positive examples of community involvement to protect education in certain areas for inclusion in the briefing paper, or to collect data for *Education under Attack.* Fortunately, GCPEA has among its membership several organizations with offices in conflict-riven areas or contacts with networks of actors who work in these locales. GCPEA or its consultants can thus draw on UNICEF, UNHCR, or Save the Children field offices, for example, or speak with Human Rights Watch's country researchers to assist them in carrying out their research.

Finally, GCPEA faces the challenge of being comprised of a number of large organizations with substantial bureaucracies and approval processes that may object to certain language because it raises political concerns or may jeopardize their ability to work in a particular state in the future. GCPEA's consensus model of functioning means that significant negotiation is required to arrive at language that is acceptable to all parties. To date, these considerations have not prevented the Coalition from issuing press releases and more lengthy documents, and the Coalition has maintained a commitment to accurate messaging without political interference. Although challenges remain, GCPEA has developed a practice of extensive advance communication, and building in significant lead-time before any decision is required so that requisite approvals can be obtained. In addition, GCPEA can publish reports in its own name without referring to its constituent members, if such course of action is required. In this way, the Coalition can release the information to the public without naming any individual organization, while still draw on the expertise and resources of that organization.

9) *What is it that makes your organization well positioned to do the proposed work?*

GCPEA is particularly well-positioned to conduct the work set out in this proposal as it was created specifically to advocate for the protection of education from attacks in conflict-affected situations. The issue covers a wide spectrum of individuals and institutions including children, adult teachers and academics, teachers unions and education aid workers, as well as schools and universities. Protection of all these individuals and institutions within a context of conflict engages a range of disciplines including education in emergencies, child protection and humanitarian and human rights law. Few agencies have expertise in all these areas: if they do, experts are generally located in different sections of the agency and have not often collaborated. The issues of children's education and higher education are usually separated and child-focused organizations by definition do not address adult education. As a result, there are few, if any, organizations that have the expertise or mandate to deal with attacks on education in a way that encompasses the full extent of the definition that GCPEA utilizes.

GCPEA includes amongst its coalition members expertise in most, if not all, the disciplines that must coordinate with each other in order to ensure a comprehensive response to attacks on education. These organizations have an international reach with offices throughout the world, including in most conflict-affected locations. Membership includes three United Nations

organizations as well as some of the pre-eminent education, child protection, and human rights organizations. In addition, the Coalition has some 80 affiliate members, many of which are local, field-based organizations in conflict-affected states. GCPEA thus has access to a vast array of information resources, and can also command influence beyond its size. Nonetheless, the fact that GCPEA is a separate entity from its constituent members means that it has some flexibility to take positions that the bureaucracy of its members may not permit.

> 10) *Regranting – N/A*

> 11) *Among Wellspring's priorities are programs that advance the needs and uphold the dignity of under-represented and under-serviced populations, in particular women, racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities, and people with disabilities. How does your organization incorporate these groups into your work?(One paragraph)*

The Institute of International Education (IIE), GCPEA's fiscal agent, is governed by a Code of Conduct that includes a commitment to diversity, and a prohibition on discrimination, harassment or intimidation. It also stipulates that there will be reasonable accommodation to employees who are disabled or have religious or other requirements. The Code of Conduct applies to all IIE employees and consultants. It thus applies to the GCPEA Secretariat and anyone that IIE contracts with on behalf of GCPEA, which includes all GCPEA's consultants. Members of the Steering Committee are governed by the non-discrimination policies of their own organizations. Attacks on education tend to disproportionately affect vulnerable populations. For example, sometimes schools are targeted specifically to prevent girls from attending; conflicts often have ethnic dimensions resulting in schools serving particular minority groups being targeted; and threats of attacks on the way to school may affect children with disabilities more severely than other children as alternative routes may be inaccessible to them. Marginalized children often have fewer alternatives when their schools are attacked or occupied by armed forces. The way in which attacks on education differentially impact members of particular identity groups is always a key part of any GCPEA analysis or strategy of response. Finally, while member organizations determine which individuals they select to serve on the Steering Committee, GCPEA is fully committed to having a diverse body, as are the organizations that comprise the Coalition. At present, there are eight representatives on the Steering Committee: two men and six women. The Steering Committee represents persons from seven different countries and includes one visible minority person. None of the members has a disability that is visible or that they have reported, and the sexual orientation of the members is unknown. The Secretariat includes a director who is a visible minority woman and a program coordinator who is male.

> 12) *Progress update - include a one-page report on progress since the last grant award*

GCPEA has made considerable progress in reaching the goals and objectives identified in its original proposal to Wellspring Advisors. Specific achievements include the following:

Field-based Programmatic Responses Initiative: Following the Knowledge Roundtable it hosted in Thailand in November 2011, GCPEA published a report on the proceedings, as well as a *Study on Field-based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*. The latter

report examined a range of responses to attacks on education that practitioners are implementing in conflict-affected contexts across the globe and was disseminated through launch events in New York and London, as well as on-line, via email, and by mail. In addition, GCPEA commissioned a paper entitled *Prioritizing the Agenda for Research for GCPEA.* The paper identified the need for further research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures to protect education from attack. As detailed in this proposal, as a first step GCPEA intends to publish a series of briefing papers that will examine in-depth some of the programmatic measures identified in GCPEA's *Study on Field-based Programmatic Responses,* with the first paper focusing on community involvement in protecting education from attack.

Monitoring and Reporting Initiative: GCPEA achieved its goal of developing a work plan and securing funding for the publication of *Education under Attack 2013*. As detailed in this proposal, GCPEA has hired consultants to prepare the report and they are in the process of developing a methodological framework for conducting the research, which will begin in September. The Coalition is on track to completing the final product by December, 2013.

Restricting Military Use of Education Institutions Initiative: In 2011, GCPEA commissioned the Columbia Group for Children in Adversity to produce a study on the nature, scope, and consequences of military use of education institutions. The report will be released in the fall. The research findings were presented at a May meeting GCPEA organized in collaboration with the Geneva Academy on International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights. Following extensive outreach, 16 persons participated, including representatives from the Philippines, Qatar, Switzerland, the Netherlands, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations. Participants agreed that it would be useful to develop international guidelines on the issue and GCPEA contracted a consultant to prepare these draft guidelines based on discussions at the May meeting. In November, GCPEA will gather approximately 15 state representatives and other stakeholders to review and, ideally, reach agreement on the content of the guidelines. Over the next few months the Coalition will encourage states to participate in the November meeting and promote the need to restrict military use of schools. As detailed in this proposal, in 2013, GCPEA will focus on advocating for endorsement of the guidelines by key states, militaries and peacekeeping forces.

In addition to progress in implementing its three main initiatives, GCPEA has launched an interactive map on its website. By clicking on countries where attacks on education have occurred in the last five years, users can access reports on the following topics, where available: 1) The nature and scope of the attacks; 2) Programmatic measures that have been used to address the attacks; and 3) Legislation that protects schools from attack and military use. While currently including information from 31 countries, the map will be updated periodically.

GCPEA also strengthened its internal operations, hiring a new director, and solidifying management structures and procedures. The Coalition is in the process of transferring from IIE to the Tides Center as its fiscal agent to take advantage of the latter's role as a "dedicated" sponsor and the specialized financial, administrative and human resources support it can provide. IIE is working closely with GCPEA to ensure a smooth transition by January 1, 2013.

List of Board Members

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

List of Board Members/Governing Body

GCPEA is not incorporated but is governed by a Steering Committee made up of representatives from the member organizations. They are:

- *Human Rights Watch***:** Zama Coursen-Neff, Executive Director, Children's Rights Division, New York, United States (Chair, GCPEA). *Skill/attributes:* International humanitarian and human rights law, children's rights, advocacy, networking with major global organizations addressing children's rights in conflict affected countries, experience in monitoring and reporting.

- *Education Above All***:** John Gregg, Director, Doha, Qatar. (Vice-chair, GCPEA). *Skills/attributes:* Strategic planning, fiscal management, children's rights, education in emergencies advocacy, monitoring and accountability.

- *Education International*: Dominique Marlet, Senior Coordinator, Brussels, Belgium. *Skills/attributes*: Networking with thousands of education advocates worldwide, representing organizations of teachers and other education employees in 170 countries.

- *Save the Children*: Emily Echessa, Education Adviser, London, United Kingdom. (Vice-chair, GCPEA). *Skills/attributes:* Expert in education and protection of children, and education under attack in Africa.

- *The Institute of International Education's Scholar Rescue Fund:* Jim Miller, Executive Director, New York, United States. *Skills/attributes:* Knowledge of scope and nature of attacks on higher education and academics and measures for protecting higher education, contacts with persecuted scholars and the higher education community.

- *UNESCO***:** Kate Moriarty, Chief of Section, Section of Education for Peace and Human Rights, Paris, France. *Skills/attributes*: Expertise in children affected by armed conflict. Extensive experience in designing and implementing capacity development programs and training for a range of audiences.

- *UNICEF:* Brenda Haiplik, Senior Education Advisor, UNICEF, New York, United States. *Skills/attributes*: Expertise in education policy, program management, school governance and quality education in contexts of fragility; field experience in South Asia and Africa.

- *UNHCR,* Ita Sheehy, Senior Education Officer, Geneva, Switzerland. *Skills/attributes:* Expertise in humanitarian assistance and education and protection in emergencies, and protection in emergencies in Haiti, Sri Lanka, and other conflict and refugee contexts.

Biographical Information about Key Management

Zama Coursen-Neff, Chair, Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

Ms. Coursen-Neff is executive director of the children's rights division of Human Rights Watch and helps lead the organization's work on children's rights. She regularly conducts fact-finding investigations and is the author of reports and articles on a range of issues affecting children, including access to education, police violence, refugee protection, the worst forms of child labor and discrimination against women and girls. Among others, her publications include "Chapter 7. Attacks on education: Monitoring and reporting for prevention, early warning, rapid response and accountability," in *Protecting Education from Attack, A State-of-the-Art Review,* UNESCO, Paris, 2010; and Human Rights Watch's first report on attacks on education, "Lessons in Terror: Attacks on Education in Afghanistan." She has also published on op-ed pages in major international and US publications and speaks regularly to the media. During a sabbatical in 2006/2007, she ran a protection monitoring team for the Norwegian Refugee Council in Sri Lanka. Before joining Human Rights Watch in 1999, Ms. Coursen-Neff clerked for a US federal judge, advocated on behalf of immigrants and refugees in the U.S., and worked with community development and women's organizations in Honduras. She is a graduate of Davidson College and New York University School of Law.

Diya Nijhowne, Director, Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack

Ms. Nijhowne oversees management of all the Coalition's operations, including program implementation, human resources, fundraising and the budget. She has over a decade of experience working on children's rights and protection issues, including in emergency contexts. Ms. Nijhowne began her career as a Child Protection Worker in Canada investigating child abuse allegations. As a Program Officer with Global Rights, an international NGO, she built the capacity of local organizations to protect human rights, designing and implementing programming for women and minorities in Afghanistan and Nepal. In 2008, following the post-election violence in Kenya, she served as a Child Protection Officer with UNICEF, developing protection strategies for internally displaced children. In 2011, she held a similar position with UNHCR in Ethiopia, managing a camp for Somali refugees and developing registration and tracing procedures for unaccompanied children. Ms. Nijhowne also worked at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights as a Children's Rights Consultant, and developed advocacy strategies to promote the women, peace, and security agenda within the UN with the Institute for Inclusive Security. She has a Master of Social Work degree and a Juris Doctorate degree from the University of Toronto.

Wellspring Advisors
Program or Project Budget Worksheet

Organization Name: Institute of International Education
Program/Project Title: Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Proposed Grant Period[1]: 1/1/2013 - 12/31/2013
Requested Amount: $ 200,000

Budget Category	Total Budget for Project	Project Budget - Non-Lobbying Portion	Project Budget - Lobbying Portion (If Applicable)	Requested from Wellspring	Committed or Identified Funding from Other Sources	Funding Still Needed
1 Program Expenses	$ 433,200	433,200	0	56,700	376,500	0.00
(a) Monitoring and Reporting	$ 224,900	224,900	0	36,400	188,500	0.00
(b) Field-based Programmatic Measures	$ 123,000	123,000	0	0	123,000	0.00
(c) Restricting Military Use of Education Institutions	$ 65,300	65,300	0	20,300	45,000	0.00
(d) Higher Education	$ 20,000	20,000	0	0	20,000	0.00
2 Salaries and Benefits	$ 253,110	253,110	0	96,300	156,810	0.00
3 Travel and Travel Related Expenses	$ 10,000	10,000	0	3,000	7,000	0.00
4 Meeting Expenses	$ 5,000	5,000	0	1,000	4,000	0.00
5 Office Expenses	$ 47,360	47,360	0	16,900	30,460	0.00
6 Other Direct Costs	$ 12,500	12,500	0	0	12,500	0.00
7 Indirect Costs	$ 114,176	114,176	0	26,085	88,091	0.00
						0.00
	$ 875,346			199,985.00	675,360.50	0.00

Please use no more than eight budget categories. Typical budget categories include: Salaries & Benefits, Consultants; Travel & Travel-Related Expenses; Meeting Expenses; Office Expenses (e.g. telephone, postage, etc.); Other Direct Costs[2] (please specify); and Indirect Costs[2]. You should choose budget categories that are appropriate to the program or project in question. Your program officer may require additional detail about this budget.

If you are seeking funding for a project that includes lobbying expenditures within the meaning of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, please provide a break-down of lobbying versus non-lobbying expenditures. Please note that the support provided through Wellspring Advisors cannot be earmarked for lobbying activities, and Wellspring's contribution cannot exceed the non-lobbying portion of the overall project budget. If there are no lobbying expenses associated with this program or project, please enter a zero in that column for each line item.

[1] *If the project period spans multiple years, please provide a budget for each year.*

[2] *Direct Expenses can be defined as any cost which is specifically attributable to a program or project. Indirect costs can be defined as those which cannot be identified with a program activity but are needed for the general administration of the organization. Also known as "overhead" these expenses are often distributed among programs based on a formula. Examples may be a percentage of your organization's rent or mortgage, heating and electricity costs, etc.*

Consultancy Agreement

between

Education Above All Foundation (EAA) – Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict Program (PEIC)
as EAA

and

Tides Center
as Consultant

CONTENTS

117

THIS AGREEMENT is dated   4 March 2013   and made

BETWEEN:

(1) **EDUCATION ABOVE ALL FOUNDATION (EAA) – PROTECT EDUCATION IN INSECURITY AND CONFLICT PROGRAM (PEIC)**, (the "EAA"), having its registered office at Education City, PO Box 34000, Doha, Qatar; and

(2) **TIDES CENTER** (the "Consultant"), registered in the United States of America as non-profit organization number 94-3213100 and having its registered office at P.O. Box 29907, San Francisco, CA 94129.

EAA and the Consultant are referred to collectively as the "Parties" and individually as the "Party".

BACKGROUND:

(A) **WHEREAS,** EAA is a Qatar-based international NGO working in partnership with other organizations to, among other objectives, strengthen the protection of education during conflict and insecurity.

(B) **WHEREAS,** GCPEA is a unique inter-agency coalition formed in 2010 to address the problem of targeted attacks on education during armed conflict.

(C) **WHEREAS,** until the date hereof GCPEA was managed as a programme of the Institute of International Education.

(D) **WHEREAS,** until the date hereof the Institute of International Education was the fiscal sponsor of GCPEA.

(E) **WHEREAS,** the Steering Committee decided to transfer to a less costly fiscal sponsor from 1 January 2013, and the Consultant was selected by the Steering Committee as the fiscal sponsor of GCPEA due to the Consultant's record of serving as a fiscal agent for a range of NGOs.

(F) **WHEREAS,** GCPEA will be legally a project of the Consultant from 1 January 2013.

(G) **WHEREAS,** the Consultant has the required professional skills, personnel and technical resources to provide Services in line with EAA's goals; as detailed in Appendix 1 based on the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.

(H) **WHEREAS,** GCPEA is funded mostly by EAA, UNICEF and other donors.

(I) **WHEREAS,** EAA has agreed to make available to the Consultant the Lump-Sum Remuneration (as set out in Clause 3.1) for the purpose of funding GCPEA for the period from 01 January 2013 till 31 December 2013.

NOW IT IS HEREBY AGREED as follows:

1.   **Definitions and Interpretation**

1.1   **Definitions**

In this Agreement, unless the context otherwise requires:

"Advisory Committee" means the GCPEA Advisory Committee comprising representatives of Human Rights Watch and Save the Children. For avoidance of doubt, the composition of the Advisory Committee may be amended from time to time during the Term of the Agreement, as agreed between the Parties. The Advisory Committee will have formal responsibility for guidance to the Director, on behalf of the Steering Committee, in line with processes established for projects of Tides. The representative of Human Rights Watch will chair the Advisory Committee.

"Applicable Law" means the laws and any other instruments having the force of law in the State of Qatar.

"Agreement Price" means the price to be paid for the performance of the Services, in accordance with Clause 3;

"Business Day" means any day other than a Friday, Saturday or a day which is a public holiday in the State of Qatar.

"Director" means the Director of GCPEA.

"Force Majeure" means an event which is beyond the reasonable control of a Party and which makes a Party's performance of its obligations under the Agreement impossible or so impractical as to be considered impossible under the circumstances.

"Foreign Currency" means any currency other than the Qatari Riyal;

"GCPEA" means the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack;

"Government" means the Government of the State of Qatar;

"Local Currency" means the Qatari Riyal;

"Management Working Group" means the GCPEA Management Working Group currently comprising representatives of EAA, Human Rights Watch, UNICEF, Save the Children Scholar Rescue Fund. For avoidance of doubt, the composition of the Management Working Group may be amended from time to time during the Term of the Agreement, as agreed between the Parties. The Management Working Group will provide substantive, financial and administrative guidance to the Director. Representative of Human Rights Watch will chair the Management Working Group.

"Member" in case the Consultant consists of a joint venture of more than one entity, means any of these entities; "Members" means all these entities, and "Member in Charge" means the entity specified to act on their behalf in exercising all the Consultant's rights and obligations towards EAA under this Agreement;

"Party" means EAA or the Consultant, as the case may be, and "Parties" means both of them;

"Personnel" means persons hired by the Consultant or by any Sub-consultant as employees and assigned to the performance of the Services or any part thereof;

"Secretariat" means the Secretariat of GCPEA.

"Services" means the work to be performed by the Consultant pursuant to this Agreement, as described in Appendix 1;

"Steering Committee" means the GCPEA Steering Committee comprising representatives of EAA, Council for Assistance to Refugee Academics (CARA), Human Rights Watch

2

(HRW), UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, Save the Children, and Scholar Rescue Fund. For avoidance of doubt, the composition of the Steering Committee may be amended from time to time during the Term of the Agreement, as agreed between the Parties. The Steering Committee will be responsible for advising the Advisory Committee and setting the priority activities of GCPEA and its Secretariat. The representative of Human Rights Watch will chair the Steering Committee.

"Sub-consultant" means any entity to which the Consultant subcontract any part of the Services.

1.2 Headings

The headings and sub-headings are inserted for convenience only and shall not affect the construction of this Agreement.

1.3 Schedules

Each of the Appendixes shall have effect as if set out herein. IN CASE OF ANY CONTRADICTION, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail over any other provisions set out in the Appendixes.

2. Term, Commencement and Location of Services

2.1 This Agreement shall be valid until 31 December 2013 ("Term"). The Parties may extend or renew this Agreement by mutual agreement.

2.2 The Services shall be performed at such locations as are specified in Appendix 1 and, where the location of a particular task is not so specified, at such locations, whether in the Government's country or elsewhere, as EAA may approve.

3. Payments to the Consultant

3.1 Lump-Sum Remuneration

The Consultant's total remuneration from EAA shall not exceed the Agreement Price and shall be a fixed lump-sum including all staff costs, printing, communications, travel, accommodation, and the like, and all other costs incurred by the Consultant in carrying out the Services described in Appendix 1. A breakdown of the lump-sum price is provided in Appendix 4.

3.2 Agreement Price

The fee and payment schedule in foreign currency is set forth in Appendix 4.

3.3 Payment for Additional Services

Remuneration for additional services shall be mutually agreed by the Parties in writing.

3.4 Terms and Conditions of Payment

Payments will be made to the account of the Consultant in accordance with Appendix 4. The first payment shall be made against the provision by the Consultant of a bank guarantee for the same amount, and shall be valid for the period stated in Appendix 4 unless stated otherwise. Any other payment shall be made after the conditions listed in Appendix 4 for such payment have been met, and the Consultant have submitted an invoice to EAA specifying the amount due.

4. Obligations of the Consultant

4.1 The Consultant shall perform the Services and carry out its obligations with all due diligence, efficiency, and economy, in accordance with generally accepted professional techniques and practices, and shall observe sound management practices, and employ appropriate advanced technology and safe methods.

4.2 The Consultant shall always act, in respect of any matter relating to this Agreement or to the Services, as faithful advisers to EAA, and shall at all times support and safeguard EAA's legitimate interests in any dealings with Sub-consultants or third parties.

4.3 Neither the Consultant nor their Sub-consultants nor the Personnel shall engage, either directly or indirectly, in any of the following activities:

(A) during the term of this Agreement, any business or professional activities which would conflict with the activities assigned to it under this Agreement; or

(B) after the termination of this Agreement, such other activities as may conflict with the activities assigned to it under this Agreement.

4.4 The Consultant and the Consultant's officers, directors, employees, or agents thereof have not and will not pay, offer or promise to pay, or authorize the payment directly or indirectly, of any money, gift or anything of value to any government official or employee or any political party or candidate for political office for the purpose of influencing any act or decision of such official or of the government to obtain or retain business, or direct business to the Consultant.

5. Obligations of EAA

5.1 EAA shall use reasonable efforts to ensure that it shall provide the Consultant assistance as required to provide the Services set out in this Agreement.

6. Reporting and Publication

6.1 The Consultant shall submit to EAA the reports and documents specified in Appendix 2 in the form, in the numbers, and within the periods set forth in the said Appendix.

6.2 All plans, drawings, specifications, designs, reports, and other documents and software submitted by the Consultant to EAA shall become and remain the property of EAA, and the Consultant shall, not later than upon termination or expiration of this Agreement, deliver all such documents and software to EAA, together with a detailed inventory thereof.

6.3 The Consultant will be acknowledged as the commissioning body of the Report.

7. Indemnification

7.1 The Consultant shall, during and after the term of this Agreement, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless EAA and EAA's trustees, directors, officers, employees, affiliates, and agents, past or present, against all losses, claims, demands, actions, causes of action, suits, liabilities, damages, expenses, and fees (including but not limited to reasonable attorney fees) arising out of or related to any actual or alleged:

(A) personal injury or property damage, but only to the extent caused by the negligent or wilful acts, errors or omissions of Consultant in performing the Agreement;

(B)   misrepresentation, breach of warranty, or breach of covenant or other promise by Consultant of any representation, warranty, covenant or other promise in this Agreement; and

(C)   infringement by Consultant of any third party's patent, trademark or copyright, or misappropriation of any third party's trade secret.

7.2   EAA shall, during and after the term of this Agreement, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the Consultant and the Consultant's trustees, directors, officers, faculty, employees, affiliates, and agents, past or present, against all losses, claims, demands, actions, causes of action, suits, liabilities, damages, expenses, and fees (including but not limited to reasonable attorney fees) arising out of or related to any actual or alleged infringement by EAA of any third party's patent, trademark or copyright, or misappropriation of any third party's trade secret.

8.   Confidentiality

8.1   Except as otherwise required by law, the party to whom disclosure is made (the "Recipient") shall not, and shall cause each of its trustees, directors, officers, employees, agents, and representatives (collectively, "Representatives") not to,

(A)   disclose the Confidential Information (defined below) to any person or entity other than Representatives of the Recipient that:

    (1)   need to know the Confidential Information for the purposes contemplated by this Agreement; and

    (2)   agree to be bound by the provisions of this Section; or

(B)   use the Confidential Information for any purpose other than the purposes contemplated by this Agreement.

8.2   Promptly upon the written request of the party making the disclosure (the "Disclosing Party"), the Recipient shall, and shall cause its Representatives to, return to the Disclosing Party or destroy all Confidential Information. If the Recipient destroys the Confidential Information, it shall certify that it has done so in writing and promptly deliver that certificate to the Disclosing Party.

8.3   "Confidential Information" means:

(A)   any information about the party or its business stamped "confidential" or identified in writing as confidential to the Recipient and by or on behalf of the Disclosing Party at the time of the information's written disclosure or within 3 Business Days after the disclosure; and

(B)   all notes, analyses, compilations, studies and other materials containing any information described in subsection 8.3(A).

8.4   "Confidential Information" excludes information that:

(A)   becomes generally publicly available other than as a result of disclosure by Recipient or any of its Representatives; or

(B)   becomes available to the Recipient on a non-confidential basis from a third party that is not bound by a similar duty of confidentiality.

8.5 The provisions of this Clause 8 (Confidentiality) shall continue in force notwithstanding termination of the Agreement.

9. **Consultant Personnel**

9.1 **Description of Personnel**

The titles, agreed job descriptions, minimum qualifications, and estimated periods of engagement of the Consultant's Key Personnel carrying out of the Services are described in Appendix 3. The Key Personnel and Sub-consultants listed by title as well as by name in Appendix 3 are hereby approved by EAA.

9.2 **Removal and/or Replacement of Personnel**

(A) Except as EAA may otherwise agree, no changes shall be made in the Key Personnel. If, for any reason beyond the reasonable control of the Consultant, it becomes necessary to replace any of the Key Personnel, the Consultant shall provide as a replacement a person of equivalent or better qualifications.

(B) If EAA has reasonable cause to be dissatisfied with the performance of any of the Personnel, then the Consultant shall, at EAA's written request specifying the grounds thereof, provide as a replacement a person with qualifications and experience acceptable to EAA.

(C) The Consultant shall have no claim for additional costs arising out of or incidental to any removal and/or replacement of Personnel and shall repair any damages caused by the replacement of any Personnel.

10. **Authorized Representatives**

Any action required or permitted to be taken, and any document required or permitted to be executed, under this Agreement by EAA or the Consultant may be taken or executed by:

For EAA: Dr Margaret Sinclair, Technical Adviser/Interim Director, EAA

For Consultant: Casey Budesilich, Director of Client Services, Tides Center

11. **Termination**

11.1 **Termination by EAA**

EAA may terminate this Agreement, by not less than 25 Business Days (**Notice Period**) written notice of termination to the Consultant, to be given after the occurrence of any of the following events:

(A) if the Consultant do not remedy a failure in the performance of their obligations under the Agreement, within 25 Business Days after being notified or within any further period as EAA may have subsequently approved in writing;

(B) if the Consultant become insolvent or bankrupt;

(C) if, as the result of Force Majeure, the Consultant are unable to perform a material portion of the Services for a period of not less than 45 Business Days; or

(D)   if the consultant, in the judgment of EAA has engaged in corrupt or fraudulent practices in competing for or in executing the Agreement.

11.2 Termination by Consultant

The Consultant may terminate this Agreement, by not less than 25 Business Days (*Notice Period*) written notice to EAA, such notice to be given after the occurrence of any of the following events:

(A)   if EAA fails to pay any monies due to the Consultant pursuant to this Agreement and not subject to dispute within 45 Business Days after receiving written notice from the Consultant that such payment is overdue; or

(B)   if the EAA becomes insolvent or bankrupt.

11.3 Effects of termination

(A)   Termination of the Agreement shall become effective on date of expiry of the Notice Period.

(B)   In the event of termination, payments by EAA shall be limited to payment for the Services up to the date of expiry of the Notice Period. Payments and/or costs relating to current commitments that are not due to be executed until expiry of the Notice Period will not be taken into account.

12. Insurance

12.1   The Consultant shall take out and maintain, and shall cause any Sub-consultants to take out and maintain, at their (or the Sub-consultant's, as the case may be) own cost, insurance against the risks, and for the coverage, of liability; and

12.2   At EAA's request, the Consultant shall provide evidence to EAA showing that such insurance has been taken out and maintained.

13. Notices

13.1 Delivery Requirements

All notices, communication or declarations, which are made under or in accordance with this Agreement shall be made in writing and shall be delivered in person, by mail or email to the attention of the persons named herein (Addressees) and shall be deemed to have been duly given or made:

(A)   if delivered by letter, at the time of hand delivery or (as the case may be) five Business days after being despatched by registered airmail, postage prepaid; and

(B)   if given by email, when received in legible form (provided that if the date of despatch is not a Business Day is after the close of business in the country of the addressee it shall be deemed to have been received at the opening of business on the next such Business Day).

13.2 Addressees

All notices, communication or declarations, which are made under or in accordance with this Agreement shall be addressed or sent to the appropriate address or number as follows:

(1)   if to EAA:

Education Above All Foundation (EAA) – Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict Program (PEIC)
Address: PO Box 34000, Doha, Qatar.
Attention: Dr Margaret Sinclair, Technical Adviser/Interim Director, EAA
Email: msinclair@educationaboveall.org
Phone: +974 6616 0530

(2)   if to the Consultant :

Tides Center/Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Address: P.O. Box 29907, San Francisco, CA 94129, USA
Attention: Casey Budesilich, Director of Client Services
Email: casey@tides.org
Fax: 415-561-6301
Phone: 415-561-6300

13.3   Change of Address

The EAA shall be informed of any change of address of the Consultant by prior written notice. The Consultant shall be informed of any change of address of the EAA by prior written notice. After such notice has been given deliveries, notices and the surrender of documents may only be made at the changed address.

14.   English Language

14.1   Any notice given under or in connection with this Agreement must be in English.

14.2   All other documents provided under or in connection with the Agreement must be:

(A)   in English; or

(B)   if not in English, accompanied by a certified English translation and, in this case, the English translation will prevail.

15.   Assignment of Agreement

15.1   The Consultant shall not assign any of its rights and/or obligations under this Agreement without a prior written consent from EAA

15.2   EAA may, at any time, assign all or any of its rights and benefits under this Agreement.

16.   Taxes and Duties

The Consultant, Sub-consultants, and their Personnel shall pay such taxes, duties, fees, and other impositions as may be levied under the Applicable Law, the amount of which is deemed to have been included in the Agreement Price.

17. **Amendments**

Any amendment to the Agreement shall be made in writing in the form of a supplementary agreement. No oral agreement may bind the Parties to this effect.

18. **Governing Law**

18.1 This Agreement shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of Qatar.

19. **DISPUTES**

19.1 The Parties shall use their best efforts to settle amicably all disputes arising out of or in connection with this Agreement or its interpretation.

19.2 If any dispute or claim is not resolved between the parties within 30 Business Days of the matter having been referred to them, then the matter shall be referred to and finally resolved by arbitration under the International Chamber of Commerce Arbitration Rules (ICC), which rules are deemed to be incorporated by reference into this Clause.

19.3 The arbitral tribunal shall consist of three arbitrators, one to be nominated by each party and the third (the "Chairman") to be appointed by the International Chamber of Commerce. The Parties shall provide their nominations for arbitrators within 21 Business Days following service of the request for arbitration.

19.4 The seat of the arbitration shall be the State of Qatar. The language of the arbitration shall be English. The procedural law of Qatar shall apply where the ICC rules are silent.

19.5 The decision of such arbitrator(s) shall include a determination as to how the costs of such arbitration are to be allotted between the Parties.

19.6 Pending submission to arbitration and thereafter the delivery of the decision of the arbitrator(s), the Parties shall, as far as may be possible, continue to perform all their obligations under this Agreement, unless this Agreement has been terminated.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be signed in their respective names as of the day and year first above written.

For and on behalf of Education Above All Foundation (EAA) – Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict Program (PEIC)

Marcio Barbosa
Chief Executive Officer
Education Above All Foundation (EAA)

For and on behalf of the Consultant:

127

~~Casey Budesilich~~   NICK HODGES

~~Director of Client Services~~   COO

Tides Center

San Francisco, California

USA

APPENDIX 1

SCOPE OF THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE CONSULTANT

1. Goals and Objectives of GCPEA

Background:

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack is an interagency coalition that brings together expertise in the converging fields of education in emergencies and conflict-affected fragile states, in child protection and international human rights and humanitarian law. The aim of GCPEA is to address the urgent, global problem of attacks against students, teachers, scholars, and education at all level in many countries facing conflict and/or repression around the world. GCPEA was created to increase awareness of attacks on education; prevention of such attacks; improved knowledge and understanding; better monitoring and reporting; stronger international norms and standards; and increased accountability.

The Consultant will be responsible for project and financial oversight, in accordance with its standing policies and procedures, including the following:

(A)   Oversight of GCPEA's 2013 work plan to successfully implement the agreed thematic activities; and

(B)   GCPEA's broader advocacy, research support, dissemination, coordination, representation, and fundraising, including engaging where necessary the recruitment of specified consultants and additional staff to perform this work.

2. Key actors

The project will be administered and managed by the Consultant. Personnel and subcontractors engaged for the project will be overseen by the Director, based at the offices of Human Rights Watch in New York City, and directly supervised by the Chair and, when appropriate, the Vice Chairs of GCPEA. The Director will oversee all project activities and manage and be responsible for administrative and financial activities.

3. Deliverables and Timeline

The outputs for the project will be as follows:

3.1 Director's Reporting:

(A)   In accordance with GCPEA operating procedures the Director will prepare:

(1)   written narrative reports of activities and outcomes;

(2)   formal financial reports outlining expenditure against income in accordance with the approved 2013 budget;

(3)   these narrative and financial reports will be prepared on a quarterly basis, and submitted to the Steering Committee by end of January, April, July, October in 2013 and end of January 2014; and in summary form at the end of each calendar month. The last monthly narrative and financial statement will be circulated at least three days in advance of each teleconference/meeting of:

       (a)   The Steering Committee; and

       (b)   Management Working Group.

(B)   Provide EAA with a quarterly narrative and financial report of GCPEA activities and actions against the approved GCPEA 2013 work plan based on the thematic working group work plans in accordance with the timeline outlined in Appendix 2.

3.2   Advocacy and communications:

(A)   Ensure that advocacy strategies included in the work plan of the thematic Working Groups are implemented accordingly.

(B)   Implement the approved communications strategy of GCPEA which will include newsletters (biannually).

3.3   Thematic activities

(A)   Ensure that the Education under Attack 2013 report is finalized for publication and release on December 10, 2013.

(B)   Identify key advocacy targets and activities resulting from the publication of the report and timetable these actions in the 2014 work plan of GCPEA.

(C)   Undertake agreed advocacy and policy development outlined as a result of the Military Use of Education Institutions Roundtable.

(D)   Undertake specific research, advocacy and programmatic responses that enhance the protection of higher education in accordance with the work plan of the Higher Education Working Group.

130

APPENDIX 2

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1.   **Progress reports**

The Director will provide written narrative reports on GCPEA progress against the agreed work plan in 2013 on or before the following dates:

(A)   Quarter four of 2012 (Oct-Dec)- Delivered by March 28, 2013

(B)   Quarter one (Jan-Mar)- Delivered by April 30, 2013

(C)   Quarter Two (Apr-Jun) – Delivered by July 30, 2013

(D)   Quarter Three (Jul- Sept) – Delivered by October 30, 2013

(E)   Quarter Four (Oct-Dec) – Delivered by January 31, 2014.

2.   **Financial reports:**

2.1   GCPEA will ensure that the Institute of International Education provides a certified statement of EAA's expenditure for the 2012 fiscal year- this report should be received by EAA before March 30, 2013.

2.2   The Consultant will provide a certified expenditure statement to EAA that outlines expenditure of the EAA grant against funds received for the financial year 2013 by March 30, 2014. Such statement will be attested by the approved officer of the Consultant. The Consultant will also provide its standard annual audit report to EAA once such report is completed in accordance with the laws governing the Consultant.

3.   **Acknowledgements**

All GCPEA reports, publications and web site must acknowledge the financial support of EAA, suggested text is:

"*Generous support for the activities of the Coalition is provided by Education Above All*".

APPENDIX 3

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Mike Anguera, Advisor, Tides Center: Mike has been with Tides since 2000 and has been involved with implementing various initiatives while holding different positions. Mike came to Tides as an HR Specialist, supervised a Work Team, helped implement a CRM system at Tides as well as the training of that system to staff and projects, and worked to improve the intake and orientation processes. Prior to coming to Tides, Mike worked at a local community based youth serving organization, Huckleberry Youth Programs. Mike has a BSW from the State University of New York at Albany.

Diya Nijhowne, Director, GCPEA. Diya Nijhowne oversees management of all the Coalition's operations, including program implementation, human resources, fundraising, and the budget. She has over a decade of experience working on children's rights and protection issues, including in emergency contexts. Diya served as a Child Protection Worker in Canada investigating child abuse allegations. As a Program Officer with Global Rights, an international non-governmental organization, she built the capacity of local organizations to protect human rights, designing and implementing programming for women and minorities in Afghanistan and Nepal. In 2008, following the post-election violence in Kenya, she served as a Child Protection Officer with UNICEF, developing protection strategies for internally displaced children. In 2011, she held a similar position with UNHCR in Ethiopia, managing a camp for Somali refugees and developing registration and tracing procedures for unaccompanied children. Diya also worked at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights as a Children's Rights Consultant, and developed advocacy strategies to promote the women, peace, and security agenda within the UN. Diya has a Master of Social Work degree and a Juris Doctorate degree from the University of Toronto.

Charles von Rosenberg, Program Officer, GCPEA. Charles von Rosenberg provides administrative and logistical assistance to GCPEA, managing day to day coalition activities. He is a graduate of the Masters program at Teachers College, Columbia University in International Education Development. His focus at Columbia was on bilingual education but his studies also included an emphasis on policy and research. He has been a teacher and learner in different contexts and environments across three continents in Colorado, New York, Paris, France, and Busan, South Korea.

1. The Consultant will act as the fiscal sponsor for receipt of funds for the support of the Secretariat and specified activities for a period of twelve months.

2. Secretariat staff of GCPEA will comply with all the Consultant operating policy and procedure.

3. The Steering Committee (advising the Project Advisory Committee to the Consultant) will be responsible for setting the priority activities of the secretariat.

4. Daily supervision of the Director will be undertaken by GCPEA chair in close consultation with the Management Working Group.

APPENDIX 4

FEES AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE BASED ON DELIVERABLES

1. Budget

Total EAA resource support for 2013 is **412,478** Currency – United States Dollars (USD)

Programmatic Initiatives	GCPEA 2013 Annual Budget	EAA 2013 Funding
Education Under Attack 2013	$256,435	119,546
Field Based Programmatic Measures	123,000	0
Military Use of Education Institutions	$65,300	45,000
Higher Education Working Group	$30,000	30,000
Staff Costs	$253,110	130,580
Other Direct Costs	$74,860	42,858
Management Fee		44,194
TOTAL EAA Funding 2013		$412,178

NB: Variation to programmatic initiatives funding (above the red line) must be sought from EAA in writing.

2. Payment Schedule

Funds will be released in two instalments. Payment one is expected by end of March 2013 and the second payment at early July 2013.

Payment	Percentage	Amount	Milestone
			Mile Stone 1: Agreement Signed:
	100%	119,546	Education Under Attack
	50%	22,500	Military Use of Education Institutions
	50%	15,000	Higher Education
First Payment	50%	65,290	Staff Costs
	50%	21,429	Other Direct Costs
	66%	29,276	Management Fee
		273,041	TOTAL FUND TRANSFER

Payment	Percentage	Amount	Milestone
			Milestone 2: After receipt of the following:
			• 2012 financial year finance statement
			• 2012 Oct-Dec Narrative Report
Second Payment			• Higher Education Working Group Work Plan 2013
			• 2013 Jan- Mar Narrative Report
			• 2013 Monthly finance statements up to May 2013.
	50%	22,500	Military Use of Education Institutions
	50%	15,000	Higher Education
	50%	65,290	Staff Costs
	50%	21,429	Other Direct Costs
	34%	14,918	Management Fee
		139,137	Total Funds Transfer

(A)   EAA agrees that the Consultant is not required to submit a Bank Guarantee.

(B)   Payments shall be made via bank transfer to the account listed on the invoices to be supplied by the Consultant.

(C)   Payments shall be made within Thirty (30) Business Days of receipt of the invoice and the relevant documents specified in Clause 3.4. Maximum period for revision and commenting on reports is 25 Business Days. If the consultant did not receive any communications within the set period, the report is considered as accepted by EAA.

AGREEMENT NO. FC 100056928

Project Cooperation Agreement
between
UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund
and
the TIDES CENTER

•

THIS PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT and its annexes (this "Agreement") is made on 01 April 2013 and is valid until 28 Feb 2015.

BETWEEN: UNICEF, THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND ("UNICEF"), an international inter-governmental organization established by the General Assembly of the United Nations, having its office in 3 UN Plaza New York, NY 10017

AND: The TIDES CENTER ("TIDES") an organisation having its offices at 55 Exchange Place, Suite 402 New York, NY 10005.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

A. UNICEF works with governments, civil society organisations and other partners worldwide to advance children's rights and is guided by the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. All share UNICEF's commitment to the principles enunciated in these documents.

B. Within these frameworks, UNICEF and TIDES have developed the Support to the Global Campaign for Protecting Education from Attack project (the "GCPEA Project"). The GCPEA Project is covered by this Agreement and is more fully described in the project document attached to this agreement as Annex A (the "GCPEA Project Budget"). TIDES will enter into a separate agreement with Education Above All ("EAA") to provide additional funding to TIDES to be used for the activities of the GCPEA Project.

C. UNICEF and TIDES are committed to the principles of participatory and sustainable development and to providing assistance impartially. They are mindful of culture and custom, and of building local capacity, and of their respective accountabilities to their funding partners and to those whom they assist. They will not expose intended beneficiaries, including children to any form of discrimination, abuse or exploitation.

D. TIDES affirms that it is not profit-oriented and non-partisan, and that it has the capacities to carry out the activities outlined in this Agreement.

E. UNICEF and TIDES have agreed to cooperate to implement the Project, in accordance with the Project Budget the GCPEA Concept Note (both attached to this Agreement as Annexes), and the agreement between TIDES and Education Above All (EAA). They will carry out their respective responsibilities in the spirit of partnership and in consultation.

Page 1 of 6

135

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. UNICEF and TIDES will work together in the implementation of the Project(s), and complete the tasks identified as their respective responsibility in conformity with the agreed Project Proposal and Budget.

2. UNICEF and TIDES will each designate a person who will be given authority for overseeing the Project(s) on its behalf. UNICEF, Human Rights Watch and EAA will jointly designate the Project Manager(s), if any.

3. UNICEF and TIDES, with other partners as needed, will develop detailed Annual Work Plans, describing the specific activities to be carried out each quarter. The basis for the transfer of any resources will be the Annual Work Plan.

4. UNICEF and TIDES will keep each other informed on the progress of their work in relation to the Annual Work Plan. Consultation meetings will take place at least every three (3) months or more frequently as circumstances demand. UNICEF will make all relevant information and advice available to TIDES.

5. TIDES may use the UNICEF name, logo, and emblem, but only in connection with the Project and only with the prior written consent of UNICEF. The UNICEF name, logo, and emblem may only be reproduced in ways set out in UNICEF's "Brand Toolkit".

6. In order to determine the most effective and efficient resource transfer procedures, TIDES may be subject to an assessment of its financial management capacity. UNICEF and TIDES will jointly conduct assurance activities to establish the good use of UNICEF-provided resources. As an implementing partner of UNICEF, TIDES may also be subject to audits commissioned or requested by UNICEF.

SUPPORT TO THE PROJECT

7. The Project Budget identifies the inputs that will be funded by UNICEF. UNICEF will either meet the costs of those inputs through cash transfers to TIDES ("cash input") or will provide the necessary supplies and equipment directly to TIDES.

CASH INPUT

8. The amount of cash input to be provided by UNICEF is set out in the Project Budget, and the Annual Work Plans. UNICEF will provide the agreed amount of cash input in a number of instalments. UNICEF will transfer the first instalment, covering three (3) months costs, to TIDES within two (2) weeks after both UNICEF and TIDES have signed both this Agreement and the first Annual Work Plan, and TIDES has provided a written request for the funds in relation to the activities lines of the AWP. Subsequent instalments will be made on a three (3) monthly basis after that, following a similar request. A request for payment of the applicable amount should be received at least one (1) month prior to the commencement of the activities planned for that period.

9. TIDES will account for each instalment of cash input within six (6) months from the date it is received. It will do so by providing UNICEF with a financial statement certified by the TIDES official responsible for TIDES's financial affairs. UNICEF may review the acceptability of the documents as proof of the use of the funds as agreed. Further transfer of funds will not normally be

made if any instalment of cash input has not been accounted for within six (6) months after the date when receipts, bills of payment etc. that confirm the use of funds have been received. UNICEF may review the acceptability of the documents as proof of the use of the funds as agreed. Further transfer of funds will not normally be made if any instalment of cash input has not been accounted for within six (6) months after the date when it should have been.

10. TIDES can vary the budgeted cost of any single input in the Budget to be funded by UNICEF, provided that (a) the variation is no more than ten percent (10%); (b) the variations are within the scope of the Project Proposal and its expected results; and (c) the total Budget is not exceeded. Any variations exceeding ten percent (10%) require the prior written consent of UNICEF. TIDES will not be obligated to disburse any payments or incur any costs on behalf of UNICEF if the funds provided by UNICEF are insufficient to cover such payments or costs.

11. UNICEF will fund the TIDES's Project Support Costs (Salary of the Coordinator and Administrative Assistant, and programme costs), but for no more than fourteen (14) months from the day this Agreement becomes effective regardless of the term of this Agreement, unless this period is specifically extended by the Parties through written agreement. In any year, the total of TIDES's Project Support Costs will not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the total funds provided by UNICEF that year.

12. Within three (3) months of either the termination of this Agreement or completion of the Project, whichever happens first, TIDES will return to UNICEF the balance of any funds provided by UNICEF to TIDES under this Agreement.

PERSONNEL

13. TIDES is responsible for all work and services which its personnel, and any contractors, perform. It affirms that its employees and any contractors, also technical experts and consultants, meet the standards of qualification and technical and professional competence necessary for the achievement of the Project objectives. TIDES will ensure that all relevant national labour laws are observed.

14. Employees of TIDES, its contractors or anyone else working for TIDES in the execution of the Project or otherwise, are not employees of UNICEF and are not covered by the privileges and immunities applying to UNICEF and its staff pursuant to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations or otherwise. UNICEF is not liable for any claims of death, bodily injury, disability, damage to property or any other hazards which an employee of TIDES may suffer in connection with the execution of the Project. Where legally required to do so, TIDES will obtain and maintain all appropriate workmen's compensation and liability.

KNOWLEDGE GENERATION & INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

15. UNICEF and TIDES shall co-own all information, data, research findings, educational and evaluation materials produced as a result of this Project, provided concurrence was obtained, if necessary, from the host government for use and dissemination of country-specific data and results. TIDES and/or UNICEF can publish data, writings, or material resulting from the Project, but the publishing party will give the other partner the opportunity to review and comment on any material intended for publication prior to publication and will reasonably consider and discuss comments with the partner.

TIDES can also use data for educational and research purposes which are clearly for non-commercial use.

16. In case of the use of data or research findings for publication, TIDES and/or UNICEF shall provide a copy of any proposed publication at least 30 days in advance of the proposed publication date. Work of both partners shall be properly acknowledged and recognized and UNICEF and TIDES will be considered co-principal investigators.

RECORD KEEPING and FINANCIAL REPORTING

17. TIDES agrees to keep separate records with respect to funds provided to it by UNICEF. They will be accurate, complete, and up-to-date in respect to funds received and expenditures incurred with funds provided by UNICEF, and show that all disbursements are made in conformity with the Project Proposal and Budget. TIDES should keep original bills, invoices, receipts and any other pertinent documentation.

18. In addition to the reports referred to in Clause 9 of this Agreement, TIDES will prepare acceptably certified annual statements of expenditure in the local currency and submit them to UNICEF within three (3) months of the end of the calendar year in which it receives or spends funds provided by UNICEF under this Agreement.

19. In addition to the reports referred to in Clause 9 of this Agreement, TIDES will prepare acceptably certified annual statements of expenditure in the local currency and submit them to UNICEF within three (3) months of the end of each calendar year in which it receives or spends funds provided by UNICEF under this Agreement.

20. TIDES will retain all records relating to the funds and supplies and equipment provided by UNICEF under this Agreement for a period of at least four (4) years after either the termination of this Agreement or the completion of the Project, whichever happens first.

21. UNICEF staff, including auditors if so commissioned by UNICEF, may conduct on-site reviews of the financial records of TIDES pertaining to the activities funded by UNICEF, upon mutual agreement on date and time. UNICEF staff, including internal auditors and operations officers, and its agents, or the United Nations Board of Auditors may review and/or copy the records of TIDES relating to the Project, upon mutual agreement on date and time.

PROGRAMMATIC REPORTING

22. Six (6) months after signature of this Agreement, and every six (6) months thereafter, except where otherwise agreed, TIDES will provide to UNICEF a narrative progress report on its work in connection with the Project. Such report should contain an assessment of the achievements and impact for children and women of the activities to date, an assessment of whether the Project is being implemented in accordance with the Project Proposal and Budget, and a description of any obstacles to full and timely implementation.

138

FINAL REPORTS

23. A final report on the outcome of the Project, which includes a financial report, will be submitted to UNICEF within three (3) months of either the termination of this Agreement or the completion of the Project, whichever happens first.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLAIMS

24. UNICEF and TIDES are each responsible for their own acts or omissions, and those of their employees, contractors or any other personnel engaged by them in the execution of the Project. Each Party is responsible for its own grossly neglectful or intentionally harmful actions.

TERM AND TERMINATION

25. This Agreement will become effective once it is signed by both UNICEF and TIDES. It will continue until the date identified in the Project Proposal, unless terminated before then by either Party in accordance with this Agreement or extended by written agreement between the Parties.

26. If either Party cannot meet its obligations and in the view of the other Party this would seriously endanger the achievement of the Project objectives, such other Party will have the right to terminate this Agreement. In addition, UNICEF reserves the right to terminate this Agreement at any time should it conclude that TIDES does not share its commitment to the principles referred to in the first Recital to this Agreement. Unless consultations have resolved the problem, this Agreement will terminate thirty (30) days after such other Party sends a written notice of termination. When such a notice of termination is received, the Party receiving it will immediately take all steps to terminate its activities so that expenses are kept to a minimum. Immediately upon sending or receiving, as the case may be, a notice of termination UNICEF will cease all disbursement of funds to TIDES; and TIDES will not make any forward commitments. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by UNICEF, all unspent funds and unused equipment will be returned to UNICEF within thirty (30) days of such notice of termination.

RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

27. In the case of any dispute, controversy or claim, the Parties will attempt to reach agreement amicably by direct negotiations. If no agreement can be reached within thirty (30) days, the dispute, controversy or claim will be decided by the signatories meeting together, in person or otherwise, to consider the matter.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

28. Nothing in or related to this Agreement shall be deemed a waiver, either express or implied, of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and UNICEF under the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations or otherwise.

GENERAL

29. This Agreement and its Annexes can only be modified by written agreement between the Parties.

30. Neither Party has the authority to make decisions for the other, or to enter into obligations on behalf of the other.

UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund

By: _____
Nicholas Alipui, Director Programmes

Tides

By: _____
Gary Schwartz, Interim CEO

Annex A   Project Proposal and Budget

Budget and Cash Flow

Annex 3

Activity : Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack : Version B

Type of expenditure	Estimated Unit Cost	Quantity	Total	UNICEF Contribution per line as reflected by the unit cost and quantity March 2013- February 2014				UNICEF Contribution Total	Partner Contribution *
				I quarter Mar.-May.2013	II quarter Jun.-Aug.2013	III quarter Sep.-Nov. 2013	IV quarter Dec.-Feb. 2014		
Programme Costs									
PC3 Materials Production/ Distribution/Advocacy/Webinars			0					0	0
Education under Attack			0						0
Launch Event	20,000	1	20,000			10,000		10,000	10,000
Printing per copy	3	2,000	5,500			5,500		5,500	0
Production of Executive Summaries and Country summaries in four UN languages (production in each language)	5,250	4	21,000			10,000		10,000	11,000
Photosourcing, graphic design and layout (per copy)	5	2,000	10,600		6,000			6,000	4,600
Web authoring of executive summaries and country summaries	1	6,500	6,500					0	6,500
Briefing Papers (per paper)	11,500	2	23,000				23,000	23,000	0
Evaluation Project			0					0	0
PC4 Technical Assistance								0	0
Consultants/Researchers (rate per day)		.	0					0	0
Education under Attack			0					0	0
Project Team Contracts	450	200	90,000	40,000	15,000			55,000	35,000
Experts to prepare thematic papers	450	60	27,000	3,500				3,500	23,500
Additional Researchers on country specific issues	350	68	23,800	5,000				5,000	18,800
Briefing Papers	500	96	48,000	48,000				48,000	0
Evaluative Research Project (scoping)	500	40	20,000	20,000				20,000	0

Budget and Cash Flow

Annex 3

Activity : Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack : Version B

Type of expenditure	Estimated Unit Cost	Quantity	Total	UNICEF Contribution per line as reflected by the unit cost and quantity March 2013- February 2014				UNICEF Contribution Total	Partner Contribution *
				I quarter Mar.-May.2013	II quarter Jun.-Aug.2013	III quarter Sep-Nov.2013	IV quarter Dec.-Feb. 2014		
Travel of Consultants (per trip) includes flight, per diem, logistical support such as car rental, translation services									0
Education under Attack	5,500	1	5,500	5,500				5,500	0
Briefing Paper	8,000	4	32,000	32,000				32,000	0
PC9 Communication Costs (Technical Support eg telephone and IT support for conducting surveys for Education under Attack) (per month)								0	0
Education under Attack	500	10	5,000					0	5,000
Briefing Papers			0					0	0
Evaluation Project								0	0
Total Programme Costs			337,900	154,000	21,000	25,500	23,000	223,500	114,400
Direct Programme Support Costs (directly attributable to the programme)								0	0
DPSC2 Salaries of implementing staff (per month at 15% of full salary in 2014 and 45% in 2013.)								0	0
Director 2014	1,250	2	2,500					0	2,500
Director 2013	3,750	10	37,499	6,500	6,500	6,500		19,500	17,999
Program Officer 2014	625	2	1,250					0	1,250
Program Officer 2013	1,875	10	18,752	2,325	2,325	2,338		6,988	11,764
Program and Communications Officer 2014	750	2	1,500					0	1,500
Program and Communications Officer 2013	2,250	10	22,500					0	22,500
Benefits 2014	788	2	1,575					0	1,575
Benefits 2013	2,363	10	23,625					0	23,625

Annex 3

Budget and Cash Flow

Activity : Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack : Version B

Type of expenditure	Estimated Unit Cost	Quantity	Total	UNICEF Contribution per line as reflected by the unit cost and quantity March 2013 - February 2014				UNICEF Contribution Total	Partner Contribution *
				I quarter Mar.- May.2013	II quarter- Jun.- Aug.2013	III quarter- Sep.-Nov. 2013	IV quarter- Dec.- Feb. 2014		
DPSC4 Travel for management and monitoring (Secretariat Travel - per trip)	5,000	2	10,000					0	10,000
DPSC8 Financial Management	750	10	7,500	2,500	5,000			7,500	0
DPSC9 Rent of Premises/ utilities/ telecommunications/ office supplies/mail/ and other direct costs									
Direct Costs in 2014 (15% of total costs)	717	2	1,434					0	1,434
Direct Costs in 2013 (60% of total costs)	2,868	10	28,680	1,810	900	900		3,610	25,070
Total Support Costs (Up to 25%)			156,814	13,135	14,725	9,738	0	37,598	119,216
Indirect Programme Costs			74,207	11,699	2,501	2,467	1,610	18,277	55,930
Total Indirect Programme Related Costs (15% for program, 7% for UNICEF)			74,207	11,699	2,501	2,467	1,610	18,277	55,930
Quarterly Disbursements			568,921	178,834	38,226	37,705	24,610	279,375	289,546
TOTAL COST OF PROGRAMME (Quarterly Disbursements plus Partner's contribution)									$ 568,921

* Detail of Intangible Assets to be contributed by the Partners

Budget Notes:

1) This budget and cash flow document involves a slight variation in the ordering of the activities set out in the original proposal. Instead of completing one briefing paper on field-based programmatic measures to protect education from attack, as well as a scoping paper for the evaluation project on the effectiveness of select programmatic measures, and then beginning the research, GCPEA proposes completing two briefing papers and the scoping paper but postponing implementation of the evaluative research project until the next funding cycle. This will provide time to evaluate the methodology proposed in the scoping paper and prepare to implement the methodology, including hiring the appropriate consultants. The activities associated with *Education under Attack 2013* are the same as set out in the original proposal.

2) All programmes mentioned in the original proposal are implemented by consultants with support from the GCPEA Secretariat and GCPEA working groups. In the original proposal budget, all costs associated with implementing the programmes are included in the cost of the consultants unless otherwise mentioned. In this document, the consultant line items have been divided into the salaries for the consultants and the travel involved in carrying out the research and preparing the final products. The travel costs include the flights, per diems, and logistical support required during the trip including translation, car rental or expediter services.

3) Partner contributions refer to confirmed funding from two partners. Parnter A has committed to providing 45% of the total funding required for the *Education under Attack 2013* project. This, in combination with the funds from Partner B and UNICEF's funding, will enable the project to be completed. Partner A has also committed to providing GCPEA with three years of funding at $250,000 per year beginning in 2011, for non-*Education under Attack 2013* support, including for non-programmatic activities. Some funding from Partner B will also support non-programmatic activities.

Budget and Cash Flow

Annex 3

Activity : Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack : Version B

Type of expenditure	Estimated Unit Cost	Quantity	Total	UNICEF Contribution per line as reflected by the unit cost and quantity March 2013- February 2014				UNICEF Contribution Total	Partner Contribution *
				I quarter Mar.- May.2013	II quarter- Jun. - Aug.2013	III quarter- Sep.-Nov. 2013	IV quarter- Dec.- Feb. 2014		

4) Salaries refer to the salaries of GCPEA staff to complete the projects in this proposal which are estimated to be 45% of each staff members' salaries and benefits in 2013 and 15% in 2014. GCPEA will hire a Program Officer in March 2013. GCPEA rents office space at Human Rights Watch. In 2013, 60% of the costs of rent and other direct costs have been included in this budget and in 2014, 15% of these costs have been included per month.

Global Coalition to **Protect**
GCPEA **Education from Attack**

Peacebuilding and Education

Proposal Submitted to UNICEF

GCPEA

3/18/2013

***Submitted by:* Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack**
Secretariat Office
350 5th Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10118
Contact: Diya Nijhowne, Director, GCPEA, 212-377-9413
dnijhowne@protectingeducation.org
Zama Coursen-Neff, Chair, GCPEA, 212- 216-1826 neffzc@hrw.org

***Fiscal Agent:* Tides Center**
PO Box 29907
San Francisco, CA 94129-0907
Contact: Ava Therkelsen
415-674-7388 atherkelsen@tides.org

1. Background

Students, teachers, and schools have been the target of intentional attacks in more than 30 countries around the world in the last five years according to UN studies. These attacks have included teachers and students being threatened and killed, disappeared and abducted, raped, or forcibly recruited from schools. Armed groups have burned, bombed, looted, or otherwise destroyed schools and learning materials. In addition, government security forces and other armed groups have used schools as bases for military operations, putting students at risk and further undermining access to education.

Attacks on schools, teachers, and students violate the right to education enshrined in key international human rights treaties. They may also violate international humanitarian and criminal law and constitute war crimes or crimes against humanity.

The impacts on children and their communities can be devastating. The immediate effects can include death, injury, and the destruction of schools, together with disrupted access to education. In the long term, attacks can lead to diminished education quality, loss of teachers, and weakened educational systems. Weakened education adversely affects a country's economic, political, and social development and undermines efforts to reduce poverty and improve maternal and child health.

The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) was established in 2010 by organizations from the fields of education in emergencies and conflict-affected fragile states, higher education, protection, international human rights, and international humanitarian law who were concerned about on-going attacks on educational institutions, their students, and staff in countries affected by conflict and insecurity.

GCPEA is governed by a steering committee made up of the following international organizations: the Council for Assistance of Refugee Academics (CARA), Education Above All (EAA), Human Rights Watch (HRW), Save the Children International (SCI), the Institute of International Education (IIE), UNESCO, UNHCR, and UNICEF.

GCPEA's mission is to catalyze enhanced prevention of attacks on education, effective response to attacks, improved knowledge and understanding, better monitoring and reporting, stronger international norms and standards, and increased accountability. The Coalition's goals are as follows:

1. *To highlight the incidence and impact of attacks on education in conflict-affected and fragile situations among key actors, and cultivate public support for education in safe and secure environments*
2. *To promote the strengthening of existing monitoring and reporting systems as well as the creation of new systems where needed*
3. *To promote effective, coherent, timely and evidence-based programmatic measures, including prevention and response*
4. *To encourage adherence to existing international law protecting education and the strengthening of international norms and standards as needed*
5. *To fight impunity for attacks on education by promoting and supporting a range of accountability measures.*

2. GCPEA's Initiatives and Activities Planned as Part of UNICEF's Peacebuilding and Education Project

To accomplish its goals, GCPEA is undertaking the following initiatives:

1. Strengthening Monitoring and Reporting of Attacks on Education

Timely and accurate monitoring and reporting on attacks on education is crucial for responding to attacks, for holding perpetrators accountable, and for seeking to prevent attacks from occurring in the first place. Yet reliable, first-hand information may be difficult to collect as areas most vulnerable to attacks may be the least accessible because of poor security and infrastructure. UNESCO's *Education under Attack 2010* did much to publicize the problem, particularly beyond a few well-known contexts. It also served as useful evidence in GCPEA's advocacy. But *Education under Attack 2010* is rapidly aging and new evidence is needed.

GCPEA seeks to strengthen monitoring and reporting of attacks on education by publishing *Education under Attack 2013*, which will document attacks on education that have occurred since publication of UNESCO's *Education under Attack 2010*. This publication will include thematic chapters as well as country specific sections that will document the situation in every country where attacks have occurred during the reporting period.

2. Promoting Programmatic Measures for Prevention and Protection

In order to protect education from attack, field-based practitioners, communities and government education actors in a number of affected countries have developed a range of measures and programs to reduce or prevent attacks on teachers, students, and education institutions. Field-based programmatic responses to attacks on education can aim to protect civilian lives, limit the damage to school buildings and the disruption to education services, prevent future attacks of this nature, and protect the right to education for all. Yet, despite many practitioners across the globe implementing these measures, they have limited contact and little information about what each other is doing, what is working or not and why, or how successful initiatives might be adapted to take into account the unique contextual aspects of countries and conflicts.

In 2011, GCPEA held a global knowledge roundtable in Thailand with UN, and government and non-governmental organization representatives from 15 countries to exchange information on field-based approaches. In addition to publishing a report of the meeting proceedings, GCPEA produced a *Study on Field-based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack,* and developed priorities for a research agenda on programmatic measures. GCPEA also built a network of key field-based prevention and response actors in some 20 countries to share and disseminate information. In 2013 and beyond, GCPEA will prepare a series of briefing papers on good practice in implementing programmatic measures to protect education from attack. This series will contribute to the body of research on, and advance the understanding of, measures that have been identified by practitioners as effective in preventing and protecting education from attack. The briefing papers will also highlight lessons learned in developing these types of measures to encourage successful adaptation in different conflict-affected contexts. GCPEA will disseminate the briefing papers widely, including by hosting webinars on select practices in the briefing papers. In addition, GCPEA will commission a scoping paper to determine the most effective methodology for evaluating the efficacy of select programmatic measures to protect education from attack. While practitioners have anecdotal evidence about which measures are effective and which are less so, there is a dearth of rigorous research to evaluate the impact of various programmatic measures. The findings of the scoping paper will be used to develop plans to partner with a research institution to implement the evaluative study using funds to be raised in the future.

UNICEF has been a critical partner in implementing the above initiatives. Not only is UNICEF a founding member of GCPEA and one of eight Steering Committee members, but GCPEA received support from UNICEF through the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transitions (EEPCT) Grant. This support was used to achieve the two following objectives: 1) Create a sustainable operational basis and strategies for GCPEA; and 2) Support knowledge production and information sharing by the membership of the Coalition for evidence-based advocacy, policy development and programming. The grant supported GCPEA's field-based programmatic measures work, including contributing to the preparation of the *Study on Field-Based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*, and preparation of the paper *Prioritizing the Agenda for Research for GCPEA: Why Evidence is Important, What We Know, and How to Learn More.* Support from the grant, as well as support from UNICEF's Asia Pacific Shared Services Center, Bangkok, amongst other funders, enabled GCPEA to host the Knowledge Roundtable on Programmatic Measures to Protect Education under Attack in Phuket in November 2011. The roundtable, and the publications that UNICEF supported, form the foundation of the field-based programmatic measures work that GCPEA will be conducting.

GCPEA is seeking to continue its partnership with UNICEF in implementing its initiatives and building on the work that UNICEF has supported in the past. Each initiative has been partially funded by other donors: UNICEF's contribution will leverage this support.

Annex 1 of this proposal includes a timeline of activities for each of the initiatives in Year One of the UNICEF Project (March 1, 2013, to February 28, 2014), as well as activities that GCPEA is planning in Year Two (March 1, 2014 to February 28, 2015) and Year Three (March 1, 2015 to February 28, 2016). In this proposal, GCPEA is seeking to partner with UNICEF in implementing the Year One activities in each initiative. Although GCPEA is expecting to continue this partnership in years two and three, the descriptions of activities in later years are provided for informational purposes to understand how the activities in Year One fit into the larger plans for the initiatives.

Annex 2 provides a detailed description of the activities in each initiative and how they link to the outcomes in UNICEF's Peacebuilding and Education Project.

Annex 3 provides the budget and cash flow document for this proposal.

3. The Nexus between GCPEA's Activities in Year One and the Goals and Objectives of the Peacebuilding and Education Fund

a. Nexus with the Target States in UNICEF's Peacebuilding and Education Project

The activities that comprise GCPEA's activities in Year One will engage closely with field-based practitioners, government officials, and UN staff from the target countries specified in the Peacebuilding and Education Project. More specifically, *Education under Attack 2013* will include data from many of the target states in the UNICEF project, including DRC, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, Pakistan, Myanmar, the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and possibly others. The series of briefing papers on good practice in implementing programmatic measures to protect education from attack will include cases and research conducted in several of the target countries (the countries included will be determined by the methodologies selected for producing the briefing papers).

b. Nexus with the Outcomes in UNICEF's Peacebuilding and Education Project

The activities planned for each initiative in Year One will contribute to the Peacebuilding and Education Project outcomes in the following ways:

i)   *Outcome 1: Increased inclusion of education into peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation*

The topic of education under attack necessarily combines the two fields of education and conflict prevention or reduction. Any initiative or activity attempting to address the issue therefore emphasizes the inter-connectedness between the two fields and, logically, the importance of considering one when developing policies or plans to address the other. More specifically, highlighting the ways in which students, schools, and teachers are targeted in situations of conflict renders obvious the need to develop strategies for preventing or protecting against these attacks in education planning and delivery. Similarly, illustrating how conflict is enacted in the school yards and on the bodies of students and teachers, elucidates the need to consider education planning issues when developing conflict mitigation strategies and peacebuilding policies.

All of GCPEA's work is focused on advocating for an end to attacks on education and, therefore, promotes Outcome One by highlighting the nexus between conflict analysis and education planning. Nonetheless, there are several activities in Year One and beyond of the proposed partnership with UNICEF that will particularly advance this outcome. They are as follows:

- Gathering data to produce *Education under Attack 2013* will engage ministries of education, civil society organizations, and international organizations, including UN organizations, in compiling information on the topic. This will raise awareness about the confluence between educational policy and conflict prevention/mitigation planning. Moreover, publication of the report and its dissemination, including through launch events, will further raise awareness of the necessity to incorporate conflict analysis into educational policy and vice versa. The data provided in the report will also enable governments, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations to include more accurate information into their analyses, strategic plans, and policy documents. (Output 1.1)
- The production of a series of briefing papers on field-based programmatic measures will enable practitioners to more effectively implement measures to prevent and protect education from

attack. At the same time, it will enable policy makers, including within the ministries of education, as well as donors, to support more effective implementation of prevention and protection measures, or better practices. This will further encourage inclusion of educational measures in conflict analyses or peacebuilding policies as specific directions about how to implement particular measures can be included. One of the measures included in the series of briefing papers may be how to implement conflict-sensitive reform at the education systems level, including policy to address the causes of conflict, improving equitable access to education, and reforming the curriculum to respond to the learning needs of marginalized groups. (The topics included in the series of briefing papers will be determined by the responses to a survey completed by our community of practice as well as an assessment by GCPEA and its partners of what will be the most useful measure to examine given what other organizations are working on and GCPEA's niche area. The Coalition has already determined that the first briefing paper will focus on community involvement in protecting education from attack). (Output 1.1).

- Conducting research on the effectiveness of field-based programmatic measures will also enable more precise information to be obtained about what measures are most efficacious in protecting schools, students, or teachers from attack. This will enable the development of policy grounded in evidence. The availability of evidence regarding best practice will also serve to convince policy makers of the need to introduce these measures into their educational and conflict mitigation/peacebuilding policies. While implementation of the research methodology will not begin till Year Two, the scoping paper produced in Year One will set the groundwork for understanding how to evaluate the effectiveness of different measures. (Output 1.1)

ii)   *Outcome 4: Increased access for children to quality, relevant education that contributes to peace.*

Any measure that prevents or protects education from attack automatically increases access for children to higher quality education as an attack on education results in children being unable or, at least, less likely to attend schools. This inaccessibility caused by attacks can be due to the physical destruction of the school, the absence of teachers, the security risks at the school, or simply fear that the school will be attacked again. Similarly, even if a school continues to function after an attack, the quality of education provided will be diminished due to the destruction of infrastructure and supplies, the reduction in teachers, and the pervasive sense of fear amongst teachers and students. In this sense, all GCPEA's activities serve to increase access and quality of education for children. The following activities in Year One particularly contribute to this goal:

- The data included in *Education under Attack 2013* can feed into the monitoring and reporting mechanisms of states as well as their response mechanisms, enabling them to increase the security and protection of schools. (Output 4.3).
- The production of the series of briefing papers on good practice will strengthen the capacity of practitioners to implement a number of programmatic measures to protect education from attack by identifying lessons learned in adapting measures to different contexts. The first briefing paper will examine community involvement in protecting education from attack. Some of the measures that will likely be included in this paper are strengthening parent-teacher associations, school management committees and other community protection mechanisms, as well as implementing components of Schools as Zones of Peace. Later briefing papers in the series may examine curriculum reform and policy development that contributes to education that is more relevant to children by prohibiting discriminatory practices or references in teaching materials, or encouraging policy that supports education in children's mother tongue. If practitioners implement these measures based on the recommendations in the briefing papers, or policy makers implement some of the reforms, it will result in an increased number of program supported learning environments with quality and relevant education.(Outputs 4.3 and 4.1).

5

- The research on the effectiveness of different programmatic measures will identify the most efficacious ways of protecting education from attack. Once the report is published (in Year Three) and advocacy efforts are successful in convincing practitioners to adopt, and policy makers and donors to support, these measures, it will result in an increase in the number of program supported learning environments with quality and relevant education. (Output 4.1).

iii)   *Outcome 5: Adequate generation and use of evidence and knowledge in policies and programming on linkages between education, conflict and peacebuilding.*

A critical goal of GCPEA's work in Year One of this proposal is to conduct research to obtain data on the type, context, and impact of attacks on education around the world, as well as to conduct research to provide evidence to show whether responses intended to prevent attacks are effective. The aim of this research is to provide evidence which can be used to advocate for policies and strategies that serve to end attacks on education.

- *Education under Attack 2013* will serve as a tool for all GCPEA's advocacy activities by gathering data on attacks on education across the globe. It is expected that ministries of education as well as local and international non-governmental organizations, multi-lateral bodies including the UN, and practitioners will use the data in *Education under Attack 2013* to shape their advocacy messages and develop their country level advocacy plans. An aim of these advocacy activities could include pushing for increased education funding in conflict-affected contexts. (Output 5.1).
- The series of briefing papers will increase knowledge on education's role in peacebuilding by showing how select programmatic responses can be implemented more effectively to improve the safety of children and teachers. Included in the series of briefing papers may be measures related to curriculum reform or other forms of conflict-sensitive reform at the education systems level, including policy to address the causes of conflict. (Output 5.2). These briefing papers will be disseminated widely to communities of practice including through webinars. (Output 5.3)
- The research on the effectiveness of select programmatic measures to protect education from attack will also increase knowledge on the role of education in peacebuilding by actually evaluating the efficacy of measures. (Output 5.2). The information gathered will be widely disseminated to the community of practice in a roundtable scheduled for 2015. Early findings that may emerge from developing the scoping paper in Year One will be distributed through GCPEA's mailing list of practitioners and affiliates, as well as through Steering Committee members' and partners' networks (Output 5.3). The research will be conducted in collaboration with a research institution such as New York University, and possibly include partnerships with research institutions in the global south. (Output 5.4).

Further detail regarding GCPEA's activities to implement the Peacebuilding and Education Project, as well as linkages with the outcomes in Project, is contained in Annex 2.

4. REPORTING AND MONITORING

The Tides Center is the fiscal agent for GCPEA and has responsibility for providing oversight for all the Coalition's financial and administrative activities. Financial and narrative reports will be provided to UNICEF through the Tides Center on a quarterly basis. GCPEA will measure its progress towards achieving its goals and objectives set out in this proposal for Year One by completing activities according to the timeline set out in the Annex 1.

5. FUNDING REQUEST FROM UNICEF

GCPEA is seeking a total of **$280,000** in support from UNICEF for activities from March 1, 2013 to February 28, 2014.

This includes

1. $100, 500 in programmatic costs to support production of *Education under Attack 2013*
2. $123, 000 to support the Coalition's Field-based Programmatic Measures Initiative, including production of two briefing papers in a series that examines good practices in implementing field-based programmatic measures to protect education from attack; dissemination and launch activities for the briefing papers, including hosting a webinar on the papers; and commissioning a scoping paper to develop a methodology for conducting evaluative research on the effectiveness of select programmatic measures.
3. $55,875 in total support costs.

Proposed Budget:

Please see the attached Budget and Cash Flow document in Annex 3.

ANNEX 1   Planned Activities for each of GCPEA's Initiatives

1. STRENGTHENING MONITORING AND REPORTING OF ATTACKS ON EDUCATION

Activities planned up to February 28, 2013
- *June- August 2012* – Development of a methodological framework for collecting data and preparing *Education Under Attack 2013* by the Lead Researcher and Senior Editor
- *August 2012 March 2013*- Data collection and pre-drafting

Activities planned from Year 1: March 1, 2013 – February 28, 2013
- *March 2013 – May 2013* – Data collection and pre-drafting
- *April 2013* – Review of first draft of commissioned thematic papers
- *April 2013* – Review of final draft of commissioned thematic papers
- *March- April 2013* – Review of country profiles
- *April 2013* – Review of introduction, global overview and recommendations
- *May –June 2013* – Review of the first draft of the report
- *July –August 2013* – Review of the second draft of the report
- *August - September 2013* – Approval of the final draft of the report
- *October- December 2013* – Production and printing of the report
- *December 2013* – Launch event in New York
- *January –February 2014* - Advocacy conducted on *Education under Attack 2013*

Activities planned for Year 2: March 1, 2014 – February 28, 2015
- *March – December 2014* – Continued advocacy conducted on the *Education under Attack 2013* including regional launches and distribution of the report
- *March – December 2014* – Fundraising for *Education under Attack 2016*
- *January – February 2015*– preparation of *Education under Attack 2016*

Activities planned for Year 3: March 1, 2015 – February 28, 2016
- *March 2015 – February 2016* – Preparation of *Education under Attack 2016*

2. PROMOTING PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES FOR PREVENTION AND PROTECTION

Activities planned up to February 28, 2013:
Series of briefing papers on good practice in implementing programmatic measures to protect education from attack

- *January -February 2013* – Consultants identified as potential authors of the briefing papers.

Research on Effectiveness of Programmatic Measures

- *January- February 2013* –Consultants identified as potential authors of the scoping paper setting out the methodological framework for conducting research to evaluate the effectiveness of different programmatic measures to prevent and protect education.

Activities planned for Year 1: March 1, 2013 – February 28, 2014
Series of briefing papers

- *March 2013* – GCPEA's Field Based Working Group determines the topics to be addressed in the first two briefing papers and develops terms of reference (TORs) for the consultants and consultants to prepare the briefing papers are hired.
- *April - June 2013* - Consultants complete preliminary mapping of community based mechanisms for protecting education from attack and the topic of the second briefing paper and prepare to conduct case studies. Consultants also prepare recommendations for the case studies for each paper and GCPEA's Field Based Programmatic Measures Working Group approves them.
- *June - July, 2013* – Consultants complete the mappings and prepare to conduct case studies
- *July -August, 2013* – Consultants travel to select states, write the case studies and integrate the mappings sections and case-studies into each briefing paper.
- *August- September, 2013* – Consultants submit the first draft of the papers to GCPEA's Field Based Programmatic Measures Working Group for review. The consultants incorporate the comments and circulate the second draft to the Working Group and Steering Committee for review.
- *October, 2013* – Consultants incorporate the input from the Working Group and the Steering Committee and prepare a final draft that is reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee.
- *November 2013–February 2014* - the briefing papers are published and widely disseminated through a launch event, through GCPEA's and partners' networks, and through a webinar in collaboration with INEE and other organizations.

Research on Effectiveness of Programmatic Measures

- *March – April 2013* – Terms of reference for the consultant to prepare the scoping paper on research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures is completed and GCPEA hires a consultant to prepare a scoping paper on evaluating the effectiveness of select programmatic measures.
- *May- July 2013*- The consultant prepares the first draft of a scoping paper and presents it to the Working Group
- *August 2013* –The Consultant incorporates the comments of the Working Group and presents a second draft to the Working Group.
- *August - September 2013* - The Steering Committee reviews the second draft of the scoping paper.
- *October 2013* - The consultant incorporates the comments of the Steering Committee and produces the final draft of the scoping paper.
- *November 2013- February 2014* – the Working Group and Steering Committee prepare to implement the research methodology set out in the scoping paper, including hiring the necessary consultants.

Activities planned for Year 2: March 1, 2014 –February 28, 2015

Series of briefing papers

- *March – April 2014* – TORs are prepared and circulated and a consultant is hired to prepare a third briefing paper on programmatic measures to protect education from attack.
- *May 2014 –August 2014* – Consultant prepares the third briefing paper in the series including a case-study that involves gathering information from a field visit to one or more states.
- *September – December 2014* – the third briefing paper is published and widely disseminated through a launch event, through GCPEA's and partners' networks, and through a webinar in collaboration with INEE or other organizations.

Research on the Effectiveness of Programmatic Measures

- *March 2014 –February 2015* – Research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures is implemented and leads to a research report and roundtable in 2015 to disseminate the findings of the research amongst donors, policy makers and practitioners. (The duration of the research will be determined by the methodology selected for conducting the research.)

Activities planned for Year 3: March 1, 2015- February 28, 2016

Research on the Effectiveness of Programmatic Measures

- *March 2015 –February 2016* –Research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures continues, and leads to a research report and roundtable in 2015 to disseminate the findings of the research amongst donors, policy makers and practitioners. (The duration of the research will be determined by the methodology selected for conducting the research.)

ANNEX 2 Detailed Description of GCPEA's Activities and Linkages with UNICEF's Peacebuilding and Education Project Outcomes

1. STRENGTHENING MONITORING AND REPORTING OF ATTACKS ON EDUCATION – PUBLISHING *EDUCATION UNDER ATTACK 2013*

UNESCO's publication, *Education under Attack 2007* was the first major international response specifically addressing widespread attacks on students, teachers, and educational institutions during armed conflict and insecurity. The more extensive 2010 volume brought this issue to the fore, contributing to its inclusion in the General Assembly Resolution of July 2010 on education in emergencies, and to Security Council Resolution 1998 (2011), which made attacks on schools and hospitals a trigger offense to the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on children and armed conflict. GCPEA agreed with UNESCO to take over responsibility for this series, beginning with *Education under Attack 2013*. Technical work commenced in June 2012, with the aim of launching the report on Human Rights Day in December 2013. This will position the document to feed into a range of publications and events expected in 2014 regarding the follow-up of the Millennium Development Goals for education. In particular, it will enable the Coalition to highlight the ongoing nature of the problem, including in new conflicts, and steps that have been identified to protect education in times of conflict and instability, including field-based prevention and response measures, the need to reduce or prevent military occupation and use of education premises, and the need to protect education activities at all levels including higher education.

i) *Producing Education Under Attack 2013*

Education Under Attack 2013 will be a sharp, credible, accessible, book-length publication that surveys attacks on education worldwide in order to provide convincing evidence that the problem is widespread and the impact devastating; motivate policy-makers to implement protections for education in conflict; assist GCPEA to advocate for those protections; and analyze new developments, while highlighting promising practice, gaps and opportunities.

Education under Attack 2013 will be similar in approach to *Education under Attack 2010*, providing an overview of key issues. Three thematic chapters will summarize the findings on areas of work taken up by the Coalition in 2011-2013 through research studies and roundtables on field-based responses, military occupation/use of educational premises, and attacks on higher education. The final section of the report (about 50% of the text) will comprise country summaries of recorded attacks on education, as well as significant initiatives for prevention and response. More specifically, each country page will include the following information: (i) an overview of the conflict and how attacks on education fit with the broader conflict; (ii) a description of the nature of the attacks (who, what, why, etc.); (iii) the impact of the attacks;(iv) in-country responses to the attacks including: (a) the legal framework; (b) accountability; and, (c) prevention and other programmatic responses; and finally (v) international responses within the country (accountability, treaty bodies, the Special Representative to the Secretary General on Children and Armed conflict, etc.)

The collection of data for *Education under Attack 2013* has been planned in a manner that will lay the foundation for the Coalition's ongoing monitoring and reporting work. Technical issues are considered, including ways of integrating data arising from all aspects of the Coalition's work. Data included in the report will include attacks on the following: education facilities (all levels); teachers, academics, and other education personnel; students (all levels); military use and occupation of education facilities; and field-based responses to attacks on education. The time period covered will be July 2009 – December 2012 (plus major issues arising in early 2013 prior to finalization of the report). The quality and reliability of data will be improved through support from GCPEA members, by commissioning papers to give a stronger picture of some country situations, and by having a senior editor review the draft text.

An Advisory Board is guiding the work on the preparation of the report. The Board is comprised of 5 outside experts (academics, practitioners, etc.), with selection approved by the GCPEA Steering Committee. Final editorial control rests with the Steering Committee, which reviews issues highlighted by the Advisory Board, the GCPEA Monitoring and Reporting Working Group, and the GCPEA Secretariat. Steering Committee members will have the opportunity to review and sign-off on process and content at several stages in the preparation of the report and on the final text.

Education under Attack 2013 will be a major advocacy tool for all GCPEA outreach, including efforts to restrict military use of schools and promote effective programmatic response. It is envisaged that a major launch will be held around December 10, 2013 (Human Rights Day). This will help maintain the momentum established with the General Assembly and Security Council Resolutions on education in emergencies. Additional launches will be planned in Europe and elsewhere, based on leadership by the Steering Committee members. The report will be available on the GCPEA website, and announced on list-serves of concerned networks. Steering Committee members will disseminate the report through their networks in a coordinated approach.

GCPEA has hired the following consultants to produce the report.

Project Coordinator: This person conducts some research and editing but is primarily responsible for coordinating input from the Lead Researcher, the Senior Editor and the other researchers involved in gathering data for the project. She also handles the later stages of incorporating feedback from the Advisory Board and GCPEA's Steering Committee.

Lead Researcher/Writer. The Lead Researcher conducts the majority of the research and will prepare the first draft of the report. This position is held by Brendan O'Malley, the same consultant who authored *Education under Attack* in 2007 and 2010.

Senior Editor. An experienced/senior editor will review the draft texts to ensure that information is presented in a way that is hard hitting and the data most accurate and valid. This position is held by Mark Richmond who was responsible for producing *Education under Attack* in 2007 and 2010.

Other Researchers. In order to better cover language groups and to improve on the quality and validity of data, additional researchers have been hired to collect data from specific countries and language groups.

ii)   Linkages of the Activities with UNICEF Project Outputs

The production of *Education under Attack 2013* will contribute to advancing Outcome 1 (Increased inclusion of education into peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation) by providing data on types of attacks on education, where, how, and why they occur, as well as the impact they are having. This type of information is critical in recognizing that education sites and personnel, including teachers and students, are not just collateral issues to be considered when developing policies to mitigate conflict and promote peace and security, but are actually part of the conflict and can literally constitute the battlefields and the belligerents in a conflict. Once this intimate relationship between conflict and education is recognized, it will be difficult for policy makers to avoid inclusion of education into peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation and vice versa.

The report will not only provide data on the attacks themselves, but also the programmatic measures that actors in states have implemented to prevent these attacks or mitigate their impact. In addition, the report will note the domestic legislation that has been introduced to address attacks as well as a state's adherence to international standards. All of this data will substantially increase the knowledge base regarding the nexus between education and conflict and the effectiveness of policies and programs in reducing conflict and promoting peacebuilding. *Education under Attack 2013* will thus significantly contribute to advancing Outcome 5 (Adequate generation and use of evidence and knowledge in policies and programming on linkages between education and peacebuilding).

One of *Education under Attack 2013's* main functions is to serve as an advocacy tool for GCPEA and any other agency advocating for increased support for education in conflict situations. By collecting a wide range of data in one location and presenting it in a concise and persuasive format, the report will be a useful tool for demanding increased funding for education in conflict affected contexts (Output 5.1). Moreover, its publication will, itself, increase the dissemination of evidence and knowledge on the relationship between education and conflict prevention and education and peace (Output 5.3).

Publication and dissemination of *Education under Attack 2013* will also specifically contribute to advancing Outcome 4. 3 by providing states with data on a variety of variables associated with attacks on education and programmatic responses which can feed into and strengthen their monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

iii)   Support Sought from UNICEF in Year 1, March 1, 2013- February 28, 2014.

GCPEA secured funds from an anonymous donor to develop the initial methodological framework for preparing the report from June –August 2012 (prior to Year One) and to contribute to preparing the report. Education Above All has committed to provide 45% of the overall funding for *Education under Attack 2013*. GCPEA is seeking support from UNICEF of $100,500 in programmatic costs for the project in Year One. Between the anonymous donor and Education Above All's support and the funds requested from UNICEF, the report will be fully funded.

2. PROMOTING PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES FOR PREVENTION AND PROTECTION

GCPEA aims to assist organizations working in communities facing attacks on education to implement effective, coherent, timely, and evidence-based programmatic measures to prevent and respond to these attacks. Over the next few years, GCPEA intends to support field-based practitioners by carrying out the following activities:

i) *Publishing a Series of Briefing Papers on Good Practices in Implementing Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack*

GCPEA will research and publish a series of briefing papers on good practices in implementing programmatic measures to protect education from attack. The briefing papers will aim to assist field-based practitioners in conflict-affected situations to effectively implement similar measures in their own contexts. The series will contribute to the body of research on, and advance the understanding of, programmatic measures that practitioners at GCPEA's global knowledge round table and elsewhere identified as being effective in preventing and protecting education from attacks. Each briefing paper will include the following:

- *An Overview* –a mapping of how the programmatic measure has been implemented. This will involve conducting a mapping of studies on the particular programmatic measure, including evaluations of how effective this measure has been in different contexts.
- *Case Study* – an in-depth case-study illuminating how the measure has worked in practice and what elements are necessary to increase the likelihood of success if adapted to other contexts. Production of the case study will involve travelling to one or more countries and interviewing organizations involved in implementing the measure as well as community members who have been impacted by the measure.
- *Lessons learned / points of consideration for adaptation*– lessons learned from the mapping and the case study in terms of what contributes to the success of the measure or, conversely, contributes to its failure, particularly with a view towards identifying how these measures can be adapted to other contexts.
- *Executive summary*- a concise summary of the report.

GCPEA circulated a survey to its community of practice to determine which programmatic measures practitioners are interested in learning how to implement more effectively. The topics to be included in the series of briefing papers will be based on the findings from the survey as well as an assessment by GCPEA and its partners of the Coalition's niche focus area and gaps in understanding of different programmatic measures. Based on the survey results and its assessment, GCPEA has decided to focus the first briefing paper in the series on community involvement in the protection of education from attack. GCPEA will prepare terms of reference for a consultant to produce each briefing paper and circulate the TORs to appropriate researchers identified by Coalition members' networks. The TORs will request that the applicant include a methodology for preparing the briefing paper, based on some guidelines included in the TORs. The Coalition will select the consultant based on the strength of his or her proposed methodology, in addition to the standard factors included in selecting a candidate such as substantive expertise.

Once the consultant has prepared the briefing paper, it will be disseminated widely through GCPEA's and partners' networks. GCPEA will host a webinar in collaboration with INEE and other organizations: practitioners associated with good practices documented in the briefing paper will discuss their experiences implementing the practice and respond to questions from participants interacting with them virtually. GCPEA will also implement an advocacy campaign to promote implementation of good

practices identified in the briefing papers. GCPEA plans to produce at least three briefing papers in the series and to actively disseminate them through launches and webinars.

As a companion piece to the briefing papers, GCPEA is proposing working with a videographer to prepare video clips of interviews with persons who have implemented successful programmatic measures in the field. These video clips can be hosted on a web portal that is linked to GCPEA's website. A practitioner can click on the heading "school management committees", for example, and will see a clip of an interview with a person or persons describing how this measure was carried out in Pakistan, and another depicting how it was carried out in Liberia, for instance. Written text can also be attached to the website to highlight key points or further explain how this measure can be replicated in other contexts. Eventually, the web portal could become a virtual library of examples of different programmatic measures used in different countries around the world. It would provide a visual means of guiding practitioners in implementing a variety of measures to prevent or protect against attacks on education.

ii) Conducting Research on the Effectiveness of Field Based Programmatic Responses.

There is a dearth of rigorous research evaluating which programmatic measures are effective in protecting education from attack and which measures are less effective, ineffective, or may even place children and schools at greater risk. While there is anecdotal evidence about what works and what does not, these assumptions have not been tested. Evidence of the efficaciousness of certain measures will be an important advocacy tool for educating policy makers about the importance of funding and supporting implementation of certain programmatic measures. It will also save lives by ensuring that attacks upon education are countered with the most impactful responses. More specifically, the availability of evidence-based research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures will have the following consequences: 1) Relevant educator and protection actors at the global and country-level will have access to information about best practices in prevention and response to attacks on education; 2) relevant ministries and education actors in countries where attacks on education occur will establish preventive and protective measures, such as early warning and rapid response systems and other programmatic, community-based, and education system measures; 3) international organizations will offer support for and promote these efforts; and 4) education service providers and education policy practitioners will develop best practices in protecting education from attack.

GCPEA will submit a request for proposals to research institutions to prepare a scoping paper detailing the methodology for conducting research to evaluate the effectiveness of some of the field-based programmatic measures identified in GCPEA's *Study on Field Based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack.* These measures include: 1)*Physical protection,* such as unarmed or armed school guards, the reinforcement of school infrastructure, student or teacher housing, alternative transportation or escorts, avoidance of high risk routes to school, arming of teachers, or rapid response plans; 2) *Community involvement in protection,* such as community-based protection committees, school-based protection committees, school management committees, community involvement in peace building, or involvement of religious leaders; 3) *Alternative delivery of education,* including community-based schools, temporary schools, schooling for refugees, mobile training teams, summer sessions, or distance learning; 4) *Negotiations* with stakeholders to make schools conflict-free zones; and 5) *Conflict-sensitive reform* at the education systems level, including policy to address the causes of conflict such as improving equitable access to education and reforming the curriculum to respond to the learning needs of marginalized groups. In Year Two, GCPEA will contract with the institution to carry out the research based on the methodology set out in the scoping paper. It is anticipated that the research process will take approximately two years with the final study being completed in 2015. GCPEA, in collaboration with UNICEF, plans to host a workshop for field-based practitioners, donors and policy-makers to disseminate the research.

iii)   *Linkages of the Activities with UNICEF Project Outputs*

The publication and dissemination of the series of briefing papers, and the research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures, will contribute to achieving Outcome 4 (increased access for children to quality, relevant education that contributes to peace.) These research and documentation projects will enable field-based practitioners to develop more effective programs for preventing and responding to attacks on education, which in turn will result in more accessible and better quality education for children. In particular, the research will examine measures such as parent-teacher associations, school management committees and other community protection mechanisms, as well as Schools as Zones of Peace and evaluate their effectiveness and offer guidance on how they can be implemented more efficaciously (Output 4.1). In addition, dissemination of the research and documentation to practitioners is itself a form of capacity building: it will increase their knowledge base regarding the type of programmatic measures they can implement in their own contexts, as well as provide guidance on how they can implement these measures in a way that will have the greatest impact and be most likely to succeed in protecting education from attack (Output 4.3).

The research and documentation on programmatic measures will also contribute to Outcome 5 (adequate generation and use of evidence and knowledge in policies and programming on linkages between education, conflict and peacebuilding). The reports and documentation represent thematic studies on innovative aspects of programming and will increase the evidence base for education's role in peacebuilding (Output 5.2). Dissemination of the briefing papers on good practices and the research on the effectiveness of different programmatic measures, which will involve close collaboration with research institutions, will also advance Outputs 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4.

The research on the effectiveness of programmatic measures will also serve as an advocacy tool that can illustrate the interconnectedness between certain educational programmatic measures and conflict reduction thereby also advancing Outcome 1 (increased inclusion of education into peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation).

iv)   *Support Sought from UNICEF in Year 1, March 1, 2013 –February 28, 2014.*

GCPEA is seeking $80,000 to produce two briefing papers in the series on good practices in implementing programmatic measures to protect education from attack. The Coalition is seeking an additional $23,000 to launch and disseminate the papers, and conduct an advocacy campaign promoting the good practices discussed in the papers, including through webinars.

GCPEA is seeking $20,000 to conduct a scoping paper to develop a research methodology for preparing a study on the effectiveness of certain programmatic measures for protecting education from attack.

Global Coalition to **Protect**
GCPEA **Education from Attack**

OUR VISION

We seek to establish a world in which all who wish to learn, teach and research, at all levels and in all forms of education, and all those who support them, can do so in conditions of safety, security, dignity and equality, free from fear, consistent with the principles of mutual understanding, peace, tolerance and academic freedom.

Our Steering Committee currently comprises:
Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA), *Stephen Wordsworth*
Education Above All, *Margaret Sinclair*
Human Rights Watch, *Zama Coursen-Neff (Chair)*
Save the Children International, *Emily Echessa (Co-Vice Chair)*
The Institute of International Education, *Jim Miller (Co-Vice Chair)*
UNESCO, *Kate Moriarty*
UNHCR, *Ita Sheehy*
UNICEF, *Brenda Haiplik*

Secretariat Office
Human Rights Watch, 350 Fifth Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, NY 10118-3299
Director: Diya Nijhowne +1.212.377.9413
Chair: Zama Coursen-Neff +1.212.216.1826

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

PRESENT:

JOHN GREGG, MARGARET SINCLAIR, COURTNEY ERWIN, MUBARAK AL-THANI
(EDUCATION ABOVE ALL)

DIYA NIJHOWNE, CHARLES VON ROSENBERG (GCPEA SECRETARIAT)

ZAMA COURSEN-NEFF, BEDE SHEPPARD (HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH)

JIM MILLER (THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION'S SCHOLAR RESCUE FUND)

EMILY ECHESSA, ELIN MARTINEZ (SAVE THE CHILDREN INTERNATIONAL)

JORDAN NAIDOO (UNICEF)

KATE MORIARTY (UNESCO)

ITA SHEEHY (UNHCR)

(OBSERVING)

STEPHEN WORDSWORTH (COUNCIL FOR ASSISTING REFUGEE ACADEMICS)

LORI HENINGER (INTER-AGENCY NETWORK FOR EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES)

JOHN AKKER (UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX)

UPDATE ON THE FIELD-BASED PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES WORKING GROUP (FBWG)

The vision of the FBWG is to develop a suite of evidence-based resources on appropriate programmatic measures to be applied in different situations to protect education from attack.

- The first set of resources will be a couple of briefing papers: the first will be on community based responses to attacks on education and the second on institutional based responses, namely, responses of schools and universities.
- The second resource will be a scoping paper setting out a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of community based and institution based responses to attacks on education (or other select programmatic responses to attacks on education.)
  - This methodology does not necessarily have to be implemented by GCPEA. The scoping paper could still be useful to produce for other organizations to implement the methodology contained within it.
- UNICEF is funding this initiative and has allocated $103,000 to produce the briefing papers (of which $23,000 should be spent on printing, dissemination, including hosting a webinar, and implementing an advocacy campaign), and $20,000 to prepare the scoping paper.
- The larger goal of the initiative is to have a number of new materials to publicize in 2015 as the post-2015 agenda is coming into play.
- Institutional responses to attacks on education have already been covered under the Disaster and Risk Reduction (DRR) framework including in literature on South America and South Asia as well as a recent World Bank conference. Nonetheless, there is still value in synthesizing existing literature and cases.
- Displacement should be an issue examined in 2014. We could produce a focused paper on the topic but must consider how displacement fits in with GCPEA's goals and mission.
- There is a potential connection between higher education and the briefing papers. Higher education could be an issue of focus in 2014.

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

- There is potential overlap with *Education under Attack 2013* and we must consider how the briefing papers will feed into that report, particularly the chapter in it that will deal with community based protection mechanisms.

Decisions

- **The second briefing paper will be on institutional responses but it needs to be very focused on GCPEA's issues. It must recognize, and not duplicate, other work in this field.**
- **Scoping Paper – the FBWG will meet to further discuss the nature of the evaluative research project and what it will seek to achieve.**

UPDATE ON THE NORMS AND ACCOUNTABILITY WORKING GROUP (NAWG)

The NAWG's vision is that by 2015 there is greater awareness of the negative consequences of military use of education institutions and global recognition of the need—and commitment--to restrict the practice.

What will the NAWG do to achieve its vision?

- The November 2012 Roundtable will provide substantial guidance on how to move towards a process of commitment by states and NGOs to the guidelines on restricting the military use of education institutions.
- 2014-2015 Advocacy Targets
  - The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) – it has already changed its manual to ban the use of education facilities by its forces.
  - The Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) – GCPEA initially asked the CRC to issue a General Comment on protection of education. At the time their agenda was full and GCPEA had less of an evidence-base. It may be time to try again. A private meeting with the CRC in January to discuss the guidelines document would be an excellent place to begin moving forward with a General Comment
  - Opportunities to raise GCPEA's voice in the discussion on Syria, Gaza, Mali, Pakistan, Nigeria etc.
- Potentially host a regional conference on restricting military use in East Africa (with the presence of the African Union).

Decisions:

- **The first goal will be to identify a champion state and to incorporate the recommendations from the November Roundtable on Military Use of Education Institutions into the draft guidelines.**
- **GCPEA will approach the idea of a General Comment from the CRC on the issue of protecting education from attacks in private discussions with them in January.**
- **GCPEA will work with Geneva Call to engage non-state actors in the process of developing the guidelines. Geneva Call has developed a Deed of Commitment which references prohibiting military use of schools.**

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

UPDATE ON THE MONITORING AND REPORTING WORKING GROUP (MRWG)

The vision of the MRWG in 2014 is for the issue of attacks on education to be recognized as a significant concern and for effective monitoring and reporting mechanisms to be set up to document the issue.

- The MRWG will focus on producing *Education under Attack (EuA) 2013* as an advocacy tool for the Coalition and other organizations.
- The MRWG plans to revise the interactive map to incorporate the wealth of information collected by *EuA 2013* researchers to make it a more interactive tool, updated with more frequency, and including: incidences, responses, and impact of attacks.
- The MRWG will continue ongoing low-level interaction with the United Nations' Special Representative of the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict.
- It will consider implementing low-level *EuA 2013* launches in various locations in 2014 following the major launch in December 2013.
- The Dutch government has expressed interest in in hosting a launch event
- There is potential for INEE to include this report in materials for its global meet-ups (twice a year in 50 countries worldwide)
- There is a clear need to develop a media strategy.
    - Need to strategize on how to deal with countries that appreciate the document as well as those that contest it.
    - This will require some pre-launch conversations with relevant countries
- Potential to create an interactive document for the online version.

Decisions:

- **It is reasonable for the MRWG to limit the focus of its work to producing EuA in 2013, disseminating it widely, and using it for advocacy purposes in 2014.**
- **The MRWG will develop an advocacy strategy for *EuA 2013* and identify key targets.**

UPDATE ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION WORKING GROUP (HEWG)

- The paper *Institutional Autonomy and the Protection of Higher Education* commissioned by the Coalition in 2012 is coming together and could be publishable as an exploratory document with a little work.
- The HEWG is considering hosting a an expert consultation with about ten people in early to mid-2013 to discuss the paper, and gather information to improve it and possibly produce a follow-up paper.
- The HEWG is considering working on an evaluation of the response to attacks on higher education in Iraq based on information from the three higher education organizations and their networks.
    - The GCPEA Steering Committee questioned the focus on one-country.
    - This will be the first example of two organizations typically focused on home-country work attempting to do work in-country

165

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

- This project could be done in tandem with INEE. It could also be an extension of the FBWG briefing papers.

Decisions:

- **The HEWG will work towards publication of the paper on institutional autonomy.**
  - **Ideally this would happen before the end of 2012 or early 2013.**
- **The HEWG will host an expert panel to discuss the paper**
  - **Provisionally, this will be hosted by the University of Essex in June.**
- **The HEWG will consider evaluating the response to attacks on higher education in Iraq.**
  - **This will take into consideration how this topic fits with GCPEA's larger vision and mission, as well as how it may overlap with other areas of the Coalition's work.**

GCPEA'S STRUCTURE AND GCPEA MEMBERSHIP

- What is the role of the Steering Committee?
  - Working Groups do the work and the Steering Committee governs.
- There is a need for more "work-power" in the Steering Committee.
  - This could come from the working groups without enlarging the Steering Committee
- If the Steering Committee is to expand further there should be an identified gap that the additional organization fills.
- GCPEA needs to schedule a day before each Steering Committee meeting to hold working group meetings.
- This could allow for the working groups to bring in outside experts to strengthen their work
- This will also allow for more complete and well-thought out planning.

Decisions:

- **GCPEA will hold a work group planning day before each Steering Committee meeting.**
- **GCPEA will continue to explore expansion of the Steering Committee based on identified gaps in membership.**
- **Pending their own organizational approval the Steering Committee welcomes the higher education organizations joining the Steering Committee.**

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

- There is a need to coordinate between initiatives, and to find overlaps and synergies.
  - There may be times when a group works in isolation
  - We need to identify these times and also identify times for collaboration
- There is a very clear need to develop an advocacy and communications strategy
  - Why are we producing materials?
  - Who are our targets?
  - Advocacy is a thread that may help to connect our mission, vision, goals, and initiatives into an overarching strategy.

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

- o There is a large amount of advocacy embedded in to work plans. It would be relatively simple to create an effective strategy.
- o This strategy should be change-based and not activity –based
- Need a clearer timeline of when the work for each group will get done

Decisions:

- **Each working group will send in their work plans by December 15th.**
- **Charles will send out a calendar in advance of every Steering Committee meeting.**
- **Charles will look into having this calendar available on the web and consistently updating it.**

BUDGETS, STAFFING, AND TRANSITION TO A NEW FISCAL AGENT

BUDGET:

The 2013 budget was presented to the Steering Committee. This budget was reviewed and approved previously by the Management Committee

- The Steering Committee was concerned that the 2013 budget is very tight and does not leave much room for unexpected expenses.
- It was noted that the amount dedicated to other direct costs has decreased substantially. The Steering Committee was concerned that there might not be enough in some categories.
    - o A notable change from the 2012 budget is that some other direct costs such as printing have been incorporated into the relevant program initiative cost. As such, they are reflected in the more detailed initiative budget and not in the general budget.
- The management fee for EAA funds at Tides will be less than the 15% budgeted. The funds saved will be devoted to the Higher Education Working Group. This is a decision that has to be approved by the entire SC not just the donor.

Decisions:

- **The Steering Committee approved the 2013 budget, including the allocation of $30,000 to the HEWG instead of $20,000.**

FUNDRAISING FOR 2014:

- A large component of the Director's 2013 work plan will involve resource mobilization, particularly for higher education.
- It may be helpful for GCPEA to form a working group dedicated to fundraising.
- GCPEA has reached a funding plateau where it would be wise not to try to expand the current budget.
- By diversifying funders, GCPEA would be less reliant on any single donor.

Decisions:

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

- **The Steering Committee agrees to maintain the current budget and not to expand beyond current funding levels.**
- **The Steering Committee will not form a fundraising working group but will assist the Secretariat in developing and implementing a fund raising strategy in 2013.**
- **Steering Committee members will send in suggestions on potential donors. Members will then facilitate contact with donors and assist in any way possible to secure funding.**

TRANSITION TO TIDES CENTER UPDATE:

- The transition to Tides Center is on track.
- The goal is to be ready to transfer in early December with formal transfer taking place January 1, 2013.
- Transfer cannot occur until funds have arrived in Tides' bank account.
- Tides requires GCPEA to have an Advisory Board that can be any configuration of persons that GCPEA chooses, but members must sign conflict of interest forms that preclude membership by donors.
    o The suggestion from Tides Center is to keep this group small
    o The Advisory Board does not need to replace any of GCPEA's current structures or roles.

Decisions:

- **Advisory Board members will be HRW and Save the Children. If a third member is required, it will be SRF or IIE if IIE joins the Steering Committee as a separate member.**

PROPOSED TOR FOR A NEW POSITION IN THE SECRETARIAT

- It is proposed that GCPEA hire a full-time Program and Communications Officer in lieu of the initial half-time position that has been proposed.
- It is important that we understand why we are hiring this person. The TOR needs to be developed with the other two Secretariat positions in mind. The three roles must be clear and complimentary.
- The Steering Committee questioned whether it is prudent to hire one general person to work on specific initiatives or if the Coalition would be better served by consultants that would be able to provide more focused expertise on a specific initiative for a brief time.
- This discussion brought into question the structure of GCPEA:
    o To what extent should the Secretariat be responsible for the workload?
    o Is the need to hire a third person related to a gap in contribution from the working group members?
    o Does our funding support a third staff person and is this sustainable beyond 2013?
- Funding will come from combining the flexible labour pool of $26,000 with funding for the half time position, as well as $7500 allocated to financial and project management which will not be required at Tides, $2000 for computer utilization which also will not be required at Tides, and savings in management fees for the anonymous donor (these costs were budgeted at 15% but

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

they will actually be 9%). With these savings it will be possible to fund a full time person at about $60,000 a year with benefits. As the person will not begin until March at the earliest, two months of funding for this position will not be spent and can be used to provide some breathing room in the budget for any contingencies that arise.

Decisions:

- **The Steering Committee approves a full-time position instead of a half-time person**
- **The Secretariat will recruit for the position with the aim of the position being filled in March, 2013.**
- **Lori Heninger will meet with the Secretariat in December to discuss structure and roles of the Coalition.**

EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT CAMPAIGN

- The Education Cannot Wait Campaign was presented to the GCPEA Steering Committee.
    - This campaign was developed with GCPEA in mind and incorporates many of the same goals as GCPEA into its second component - keep education safe from attacks.
    - It is proposed that GCPEA champion the second component of the Campaign with Diya representing the Coalition on the Education Cannot Wait Working Group.
- There was some concern as to whether it is sensible or even feasible for a coalition to join a coalition.
    - This is especially relevant when a member of GCPEA may also be an independent member of the Education Cannot Wait Working Group.
    - If there is a coalition with the same agenda as GCPEA, it brings into question the need for GCPEA to exist.
- The Education Cannot Wait agenda was developed in line with GCPEA's agenda. It would seem contrary to the mission of GCPEA if we do not champion the second goal of the Campaign which is to keep schools safe from attack.
- The Campaign represents a fantastic opportunity for GCPEA to raise its public profile and its voice on the global stage.
- It is also an advocacy opportunity, giving GCPEA the opportunity to have its agenda recognized as an integral part of the education in emergencies agenda.
- The Steering Committee was concerned about the amount of time that this may take away from the Secretariat.
- There was concern that the Education Cannot Wait Campaign does not address higher education.

Decisions:

- **GCPEA will agree to lead the Keep Education Safe from Attacks component of the Education Cannot Wait campaign**
    - **GCPEA reserves the right to reconsider its participation at any time**
- **Diya will represent the coalition at these meetings**

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

GCPEA OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATIONS FOCUS FOR 2013-2015

- Should the Coalition be issuing statements on attacks on education and, if so, in what circumstances and in what form?
  - The Steering Committee debated whether these statements could focus on individuals, unique incidents, or countries.
- How should the events calendar prepared for the meeting be maintained and updated?
- Should the name of the Coalition be changed for greater name recognition?
  - Suggestions included: Protect Education, Protect Education from Attack, The Protecting Education Coalition.
  - Should GCPEA drop the acronym GCPEA from use and from the logo?
    - This poses some problems as the logo ceases to make sense if we remove the letters GCPEA.
    - Current email and twitter accounts use the acronym GCPEA.
  - It is agreed that GCPEA is a bad acronym and that the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack is a mouthful.
  - However, each member of the coalition seems to feel strongly about at least one word in the name and as such it is difficult to agree to a name change.

Decisions:

- **Elin and Charles will collaborate to develop a communications and outreach strategy for the coalition.**
- **GCPEA will not issue statements on individual cases (such as the call to aid for a specific individual, organization, or country)**
  - **If such a statement is made it must relate the individual case to the global problem of attacks on education (such as the Secretariat statement on the Malala Yousafzai shooting in Pakistan.)**
- **GCPEA will continue to employ its current policy on posting news articles.**
  - **Steering Committee member organizations are encouraged to forward newsworthy items to the Secretariat for posting.**
- **Charles will work with the web design team to post the calendar under password protection on the website.**
- **The Coalition will not change its name or the acronym GCPEA until further discussion.**

ELECTION OF 2013 OFFICERS

GCPEA Chair

- Zama Coursen-Neff (Human Rights Watch)

GCPEA Vice-Chairs

- Emily Echessa (Save the Children)
- Jim Miller (IIE's Scholar Rescue Fund)

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, November 16 - 17 2012, Doha, Qatar

GCPEA Management Committee

- Zama Coursen-Neff (Human Rights Watch)
- Emily Echessa (Save the Children)
- Daniela Kaisth (IIE if IIE joins as a SC member)
- Margaret Sinclair (Education Above All)

GCPEA Steering Committee (primary representative)

- Zama Coursen-Neff (Human Rights Watch)
- Emily Echessa (Save the Children)
- Margaret Sinclair (Education Above All)
- Ita Sheehy (UNHCR)
- Stephane Pichette (UNICEF)
- Jim Miller (IIE's Scholar Rescue Fund)
- Stephen Wordsworth (Council for Assisting Refugee Academics)
- Kate Moriarty (UNESCO)

GCPEA Advisory Board

- Zama Coursen-Neff (Human Rights Watch)
- Emily Echessa (Save the Children)
- Daniela Kaisth (IIE – if IIE becomes a SC member)

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- The next GCPEA Steering Committee meeting:
  - To be hosted by UNESCO in **Paris, FRANCE.**
  - 3 days between **May 20th and May 24th 2013.**
- Steering Committee and Management Committee Phone calls for 2013 (all calls will be at 9:30 am New York Time):
  - Steering Committee
    - Tuesday, January 8th
    - Tuesday, March 12th
    - *Face-to-Face TBD May 20th – May 24th*
    - Tuesday, July 9th
    - Tuesday, September 10th
    - *Face-to-Face TBD November*
  - Management Committee
    - Tuesday, February 13th
    - Tuesday, April 9th
    - Tuesday, June 11th
    - Tuesday, August 13th
    - Tuesday, October 8th
    - Tuesday, December 10th