

Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

Title: GIRLS' EDUCATION SOUTH SUDAN (GESS)		
Programme Value: £60 million	Review Date: 22 March 2015	
Programme Code: 202511	Start Date: April 2013	End Date: March 2018

Summary of Programme Performance

Year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Programme Score	A	A			
Risk Rating	M/H	M/H			

The exchange rate used in this report is £1 :SSP 3.174.

Summary of progress and lessons learnt since last review

Progress against all three outputs of the programme has been good. The continuing insecurity in the three Greater Upper Nile States (Upper Nile, Unity and Jonglei) has clearly impacted project progress, and a programme level Interim Strategy has been put in place to ensure GESS is able to deliver in these states. Overall progress has been generally at or above expectations in remaining states. Concerns over fiduciary risks in relation to disbursement of Capitation Grants¹ and Cash Transfers² resulted in a pause in activity in October 2014, pending an assessment of the due diligence of the banking system and the levels of accountability of the money transferred by Mott MacDonald. As a result, a Joint Accountability Strategy and an updated Detailed Operational Design have been put in place and activities resumed in February 2015, including Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers.

GESS has very strong ownership by both National and State governments. A significant achievement of the programme has been the gradual funding of all Capitation Grants by the Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS).

GESS is strongly placed to support and influence other major programmes. Its key advantages are its specific focus on girls, its national coverage with presence in all states and its engagement across a number of key sectoral areas. Close engagement with other Development Partners (e.g. through technical working groups, scoping and design activities, monitoring and review processes and dissemination of its knowledge, research and evidence work) provides entry points for GESS to ensure efforts and resources fully take into account the education of girls, both outside and inside school.

The major achievements of GESS over the past year have been:

- Rolling out the community awareness and mobilisation programme, reaching almost one million people through the radio broadcasts and over five hundred schools through the community mobilisation programme
- Currently completing the process of reaching over 67,000 girls with Cash Transfers of SSP 125
- Almost all of 2,718 primary schools and 204 secondary schools approved in 2014 have now received the first tranche (50%) of their Capitation Grant

¹ Capitation Grants are based on enrolment and a specific amount is allocated per student according to the number of students in a school. Each primary school receives a standard allocation annually of SSP5,000 (about £1,575) then SSP 39 (£12.30) per student, in two tranches. Each secondary school receives a standard allocation annually of SSP10,000 (about £3,150) then SSP 80 (£25.20) per student in two tranches. In both cases the first tranche has to be accounted for before the second is released.

² Cash transfers are given directly through bank accounts to girls to help them purchase uniforms, learning materials, sanitary products, solar lights, transport, etc. But the girls can also use them to support family needs such as food, health and similar commodities. Each girl receives SSP 125 (about £40) per year.

- Distributing the School Governance Toolkit to 3,225 schools and providing one-day briefing/training for 2,143 schools
- Completing four major studies³ and the first Learning Assessment survey as part of establishing programme Baselines.

The project has responded positively to the seven main recommendations of the 2014 review. Comment is provided under specific outputs in Section C to four of these. The three broader, non-output specific responses to recommendations have been:

Recommendation	Response
Come up with an Action Plan for working in 3 main conflict affected areas	The development of an Interim Strategy and Greater Upper Nile Strategy allow for the continuation of GESS in the three conflicted-affected states (Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile); there is an expectation that Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers will soon be released to opposition areas through non-state channels
Make use of the latest opportunity to co-ordinate with EU and USAID and in particular the possibility of EU funds being managed through the GESS programme to complement the Capitation Grant programme	There has been improved collaboration and coordination with the other major development partner programmes (EU, Global Partnership for Education and USAID) to ensure alignment and non-duplication in areas including school grants, teacher development and school support and supervision. Some challenges remain before a robust division of labour is established.
Stronger support to state anchors in terms of clear communication channels, adequate training and budgets; try to avoid overburdening their roles.	Greater support has been provided to State Anchors through additional staffing, training, and clearer communication channels.

³ The studies completed, with their report dates, were (1) the School Survey (July 2014), the Household Survey (Sept 2014), the County and Payam Survey (Sept 2014), and the Sub-National Public Financial Management (PFM) Survey (Sept 2014)

A. Introduction and Context (1 page)

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	3785384
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	4407473

Outline of the programme

GESS responds to the pressing needs for education in South Sudan where girls in particular are disadvantaged. Girls' education indicators are particularly poor; there are only seven girls for every 10 boys in primary school and five girls for every 10 boys in secondary. In 2012, in the whole country, only 864 girls were in the last grade of secondary school. Just 12% of teachers are female. Literacy rates for girls are 40% compared to 60% for boys. Girls' access to educational opportunity has been exacerbated by certain cultural practices and by internal and external conflict. Whilst education is voiced by many communities as a priority, the opportunity costs and other social pressures, particularly early marriage, result in low enrolment of girls. . These problems occur within a fragile state, where education provision, which was extremely limited during the civil war, continues to be disrupted mainly now by internal political and tribal conflict within South Sudan since 15 December 2013.

The expected **impact** of the programme is to transform the lives of a generation of girls in South Sudan through education by increasing their enrolment, retention and levels of achievement. The programme, which will work in all ten states of South Sudan, will:

- enhance household and community awareness of the value and importance of girls' education through change communication and community mobilisation;
- support the delivery of a community-owned school improvement programme through Cash Transfers to all girls attending classes from Primary 5 to Secondary 4; Capitation Grants to primary and secondary schools; and a package of inputs that includes strengthening school governance, offers mentoring to girls and provides teacher training and teaching/learning resources to improve learning outcomes;
- increase knowledge and evidence around what works in girls' education in South Sudan to inform policy, through research and evaluation studies, the introduction of a pupil and teacher attendance monitoring system, and conducting three learning assessment surveys.

The expected results are:

- 150,000 individual girls in primary and 50,000 in secondary schools will be directly supported by the programme
- 240,000 girls benefit from the programme's broader package of support
- 300,000 boys also benefit from the programmes' broader package of support
- 1,000,000 adults (aged 15 years and above) reached through behaviour change communications to families, communities and leaders
- 2,600 schools benefitting from Capitation Grants
- Learning outcomes improve, drop-out and repetition rates decreased in all 10 states.

The programme offers a direct response to the Bilateral Aid Review and Operational Plan in delivering a substantial increase in enrolment and completion for boys and girls, essential to the achievement of South Sudan's education results. The programme aligns with *Gender House*, DFID's Strategic Vision for girls and women that commits to getting more girls through secondary education and will contribute to the achievement of that Strategic Vision.

Generally the political situation has not significantly changed over the last year. Armed conflict has continued between government and Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM-IO) in opposition. Despite various efforts towards peaceful resolution of the conflict, Greater Upper Nile is occupied between government and forces in opposition with intermittent sporadic clashes. Access to most of the counties in these states from Juba is predominantly by air rendering it extremely expensive to run education projects. The recent collapse of the peace talks and continued recruitment of young men and boys into the armed forces on both sides raises the fear of escalation of the conflict.

During the period under review there has been gradual increase in the numbers of returnees to the government controlled areas and relatively stable settlements of communities far from the front line

within the opposition controlled area in the Greater Upper Nile. As a result a number of schools have reopened and education activities resumed, although at a reduced rate especially in the opposition held areas due to limited supplies and non-payment of teachers' salaries.

The impact of the conflict in Greater Upper Nile is felt in many ways. The region is experiencing a food crisis, problems in communication and the breakdown of market services. Children, especially girls, are often withdrawn from school to either collect grass or firewood to sell, or taken to food collection centres to queue and carry rations home for their families. Abduction / forced recruitment of school children, especially boys, by both sides in the conflict has been common and continues. This abduction is not necessarily from schools, but from communities in general.

The continued decline in the production and price of oil has great impact on Government revenue and their ability to finance services. Besides the widespread poverty and general economic squeeze, the other seven states have been relatively stable, with the exception of some tribal conflicts and cattle raids that have left many people dead in Lakes State and significantly obstructed education activities in four counties within that state.

B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS (1-2 pages)

Annual outcome assessment

It is difficult at this stage to assess progress towards the project outcome given lack of data; only Indicator 2 can be measured against the 2014 milestone (total girl enrolment in upper primary and secondary). Final 2014 data shows this to have been achieved for upper primary and very narrowly missed for secondary in 2014. Data to measure progress against the 2015 milestone will be available through the South Sudan School Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS) by September 2015. Attendance reporting is not yet robust enough to report on Indicator 3 for which milestones need to be agreed. A significant improvement in SSSAMS attendance reporting will be needed to generate reliable data. Much will also depend on the course of the conflict in the north, though implementation of the Greater Upper Nile Strategy is expected to allow programme benefits to reach these conflict affected areas.

Achieving the outcome of the programme requires not only girls to enrol and remain in school, but for them also to learn more. Currently the focus is more towards enrolment and retention; much more now needs to happen in improving the quantity and quality of instructional time. GESS cannot do this alone, and a good platform of collaboration with other partners is developing in which GESS plays a key role with its specific focus on girls.

Overall output score and description

GESS has made much progress in difficult circumstances. All three outputs are expected to meet their September 2015 milestones, however within each output there are both elements that are exceeding and failing to meet the 2015 expectation. The overall output score is A.

Key lessons

Much of the success of GESS may be attributed to the close relationship with and ownership of Government at both central and state levels. This has its origins in a thorough and participatory design process, and continues with an implementation model that works with and through government policy, people and systems. It is constantly referred to by Government officials as “our programme”. Key to this is the long standing and good relationships between the State Anchors and State governments. This is particularly evident at the county level with the County Liaison Officers’ relationship with the County Education Directors and the all-important Payam Education Supervisors who are increasingly being engaged in programme activities. The Payam Education Supervisors are key in providing school level support and supervision.

The pausing of the Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers in October 2014 was to assess the due diligence of the South Sudanese banking system, as well as the levels of accountability of the money transferred by Mott MacDonald. This was a responsible decision taken at the time by the DFID SRO⁴ and GESS management and provided a clear signal to all actors. The rigorous review resulted in revised and improved systems. The timing of the decision took into account the upcoming closure of schools as well as the threat of insecurity at the time. The paused amounts are now being paid out.

GESS is a programme driving behaviour change in relation to girls’ education. The programme has developed an impressive range of thoughtful strategies and approaches to this from which a number of high quality guidelines have been developed, e.g. Mentoring Guide, School Governance Toolkit. Whilst these provide the overall framework for the work of key agents such as Community Mobilisation Officers and County Liaison Officers, effecting change requires a sound understanding of the content and confidence in facilitating change. The field visits undertaken during this review point to a need to strengthen these areas.

⁴ SRO = Senior Responsible Owner – every DFID programme is allocated an SRO whose role includes oversight of the whole programme including financial management, and who is usually based in the local DFID country office.

The fact that almost all schools approved have now received at least the first tranche of their Capitation Grant and over 60,000 girls are now receiving their Cash Transfer (expected to rise to close to 100,000 by September) is a huge achievement. Giving schools and their communities the flexibility to plan and execute their own visions of improvement is an important process in itself – and that is clearly being enabled through the Capitation Grant and supporting capacity strengthening actions. The initial focus is quite rightly more around ensuring the money reaches schools and is properly accounted for, though there needs to be a greater effort to support the most effective use of the resources, particularly in how it benefits girls.

GESS is a complex programme with responsibilities for delivery shared between the consortium partners. The tendency to *silo* has been noted in the previous review and efforts have been made to promote greater cohesion across the various workstreams through more regular, structured meetings. More could be done however, at a technical level, to promote a deeper appreciation and understanding of the linkages between the various components to improve coherence so they become mutually reinforcing. This could, for example, involve a regular internal technical forum (added on to routine management events) at which materials and approaches are explained and shared, with technical leads identifying what key aspects of their work have implications for others. In addition regular short briefings and updates would serve to raise wider awareness and understanding across a very large team.

GESS is a genuinely National programme that works in all ten states. This is vitally important in the current context of tension and conflict where perceptions of favouring a particular side or area may further contribute to conflict or the sense of grievance. Furthermore, GESS has demonstrated considerable flexibility in responding to the conflict through developing the Interim Strategy that allows support to continue under three scenarios: full operation, reduced operation and out-of-country support.

GESS has developed a comprehensive approach to measuring and monitoring Value for Money (VfM). Significant attention was paid during programme design to issues of VfM and GESS has built in adequate resources to continuously monitor VfM. The second report after the first full year of implementation has now established baselines for future monitoring. A key feature is the ability to compare unit costs between states.

Lessons from the project are routinely shared with major stakeholders including GRSS and Development Partners. Major studies undertaken by GESS provide a valuable resource not only to MOEST and GESS, but also to other programmes. The value of these resources would have been improved had they paid greater attention to issues of gender. GESS also promotes internal lesson learning through the quarterly Good Practice sharing workshops for all State Anchors.

There is a continual need to future-proof the gains made through the programme. The frequent transfer of staff at all levels, including schools, needs to be addressed through prompt induction into the purposes, processes and responsibilities of the post holder with regard to girls' education. As evidenced in the review teams' field visits, one cannot make assumptions that in-coming staff are aware of how the programme works and what their responsibilities are. A simple induction pack and briefing session would be a good start.

Key actions

1. There is a need to refresh and constantly reinforce the focus on girls throughout all elements of the project. Further capacity building of key project actors, including most importantly the Community Mobilisation Officers, will help ensure they can more effectively promote gender equality, address barriers to girls' participation and facilitate the change process. This should include (i) gender mainstreaming that takes into account the different experiences, needs and expectations of boys and girls, (ii) changing gender norms in education, (iii) strategies for action by male teachers and pupils.
2. The GESS Secretariat should increase its quality assurance and guidance effort to improve the coherence of the key gender messages being given out through the project: what behaviour and attitudinal change are we seeking to bring about?

3. Improve the support and scrutiny mechanisms through county and payam level staff to enable schools to spend wisely and challenge choices. This should promote the inclusion in School Development Plans of actions at school level that do not require money (or require very little money) and focus on promoting improved learning and the specific needs and interests of girls, consistent with what is set out in the GESS school improvement strategy. A girl friendly-school needs more than a latrine.
4. Focus the knowledge, evidence and research agenda more on wider lesson learning of *what* works and *why* for girls' education in South Sudan. The initial focus has understandably been on surveys and establishing baselines, but there should be space now for more qualitative work. There should be a far greater focus on girls in all research.
5. SSSAMS needs to be made more user-friendly and find ways to ensure that information is readily available and used at school, payam and county level where issues of attendance can be addressed. The data flow is currently very one way: what goes up must come down.

Has the logframe been updated since the last review? Yes

A number of targets and milestones have been changed in response to the conflict and in line with the DFID South Sudan Interim Strategy developed in early 2014. These are:

- Output 1 indicator 1.2: (reach of community mobilisation) changed the September 2014 milestone from 20% to 15% and later on changed the measurement from "Number of Bomas⁵ reached with Community Mobilisation" to "Number of 'school communities' reached with the community mobilisation activities."
- Output 2 indicator 1 (Cash Transfers) milestone for 2014 changed to 13,500 girls receiving Cash Transfers from 50,000 (due to reduced banking facilities related to conflict)
- Output 2d (School construction) is being deprogrammed with resources to be reallocated within the programme, including for operations in the Greater Upper Nile States and to support for the Joint Accountability Strategy.

⁵ A "boma" is the smallest geo-political sub-division in South Sudan. There are several bomas in one Payam, and several Payams in one County. A rural boma may only contain one village or a few houses.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	Enhanced household and community awareness of and support for girls' education		
Output number per LF	1	Output Score	A+
Risk:	<i>Medium to High</i>	Impact weighting (%):	25%
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
1.1 Number of adults (15 Years+) reached with girls' education radio outputs	Sept. 2016 ⁶ : 1,400,000	946,000 reached by end of 2014 (estimated from baseline survey). Well on track to achieve milestone in 2016 (A+)
1.2 Number of school communities reached with the community mobilisation activities	Sept 2015: 629	437 school communities reached by end of September 2014 (reaching 19% of Bomas and over achieving the 15% target). An additional 104 school communities reached between Oct 2014-Feb 2015 which totals 541 school communities reached to date. Well on track to achieve 2015 milestone (A+)
1.3 Percentage of people in the sample study who demonstrate awareness and understanding of elements of the school system that supports girls' education	(Baseline 22%) 2016 ⁷ : 27% (Baseline + 5%)	Baseline survey was conducted in Sept. 2014. On track to achieve 2016 milestone (A)

Key Points

The quantitative outputs above have been met and are well on track and the output team has put a very robust system in place for both of its major activities. Although the key learning points from the brief did come through clearly in some of the programmes reviewed, there remain some fundamental issues in terms of the extent to which the radio programmes and community mobilisation activities are being used as effective tools for transforming the social norms and behaviour that currently impede girls' attendance at and achievement in school.

Baseline data indicates that a large number of households have heard at least one of the Our School radio programmes. A total of 150 radio programmes have been produced around 20 key topics in eight languages. This is a very positive result. The programmes are well constructed, receive positive feedback and inspire and encourage people to act. While the topics are set and guidance provided by the Juba team, the ten state-level producers produce programmes on each topic in the way that best fits their local situation. However, in some of the programmes the key learning point did not come through sufficiently strongly to challenge prevailing gender norms and thereby run the risk of reinforcing the status quo. This issue is being addressed by the Juba team but there is a need for greater guidance and quality assurance in terms of the key messages in each state programme as well as training for producers in gender issues and how these are portrayed and interpreted in the programmes.

In October 2014 the strategy for community mobilisation changed from awareness raising to a more focused approach to behaviour change and, focusing on a smaller number of school communities over a six month period each rather than targeting wider geographic areas. However, this change in strategy requires greater skills of the community mobilisers and a deeper-understanding of the changes required so that they are able to support communities explore issues that are often left un-confronted and that negatively affect girls' education. The progress against the milestone is calculated on the number of school communities in which Community Dialogue or Listening Clubs have been held.

⁶ There is no milestone for 2015.

⁷ Surveys are conducted every two years: the Baseline in 2014, the Midline in 2016 and the Endline in 2018.

The quantitative baseline study was completed in September 2014. With a sample size of 1,902, it has provided the baseline data for both 1.1 and 1.3. Indicator 1.3 is assessed in terms of the number of people who, when asked directly, say that they have heard about at least one initiative to support girls' education (Cash Transfers, Capitation Grants, mentoring and/or teacher training).

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Introducing measures to strengthen collaboration amongst the consortium partners through increased frequency of management meetings, planning and review, as well as synergies across the main elements, producing better links between the Radio broadcasts and Community Mobilisation activities for example. BBC Media Action has now forged greater linkages between the radio programmes and the community mobilisation with the latter now often using the recorded radio programmes as a stimulus for discussions. Community mobilisation topics are also being timed to better fit with the Cash Transfer and Capitation Grant process.

The output team has strengthened the community mobilisation component through the development of a community mobilisation strategy and the recruitment of three Community Mobilisation Officers in each state. However, State Anchors and local partners require more capacity building support, especially in relation to their understanding of barriers to girls' education, the gender issues involved and strategies for addressing these and greater clarity about the key messages.

Recommendations

- Greater capacity building of all players in the system, including the programme producers, in relation to gender equality, barriers to girls' education and change processes.
- Improved quality assurance by, and guidance from, the Juba team in relation to key messages for radio programmes and community mobilisation.
- Provide further capacity building for Community Mobilisers to deepen their understanding of the issues relating to girls' education and gender equality, the messages contained in the radio programmes and further training in facilitation and group management and facilitating change.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	Effective partnerships between government and local organisations to deliver a community based school improvement programme		
Output number per LF	2	Output Score	A
Risk:	Medium to High	Impact weighting (%):	60%
Risk revised since last AR?	Y	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	N

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
2.1 Cumulative number of (unique, individual) girls receiving Cash Transfers	2015: 75,000 (GESS = 75,000; GRSS = 0)	82.6% of the milestone for September 2015 has been met as at March 2015. Expectations are that the milestone will be exceeded by over 25,000 (A+)
2.2 Cumulative number of schools receiving Capitation Grants	2014: GRSS = 2,885; GESS = 215	85% of the September 2015 milestone has been met as at March 2015. The final numbers are likely to exceed the milestone by 200 schools. (A+)
2.3 Cumulative number of schools receiving full package of community-based school improvement programme	2015: 1,000	The milestone will not be achieved by September 2015 (B). The anticipated number of schools expected to be reached on the five pillars that make up the package by September 2015 is: (i) School Governance = 703 (B) (ii) Supportive Supervision = 1000 (A) (iii) Teacher Development = 520 (B) (iv) School based mentoring = 660 (B) (v) Low cost learning materials = 1200 (A+)

Key Points

Nearly all girls and schools have now received Cash Transfers and Capitation Grants at least once except for girls and schools in conflict areas. Schools in these areas are expected to start receiving their Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers by mid-2015 once the Greater Upper Nile Strategy begins to be implemented. The Capitation Grants are being used by schools to deliver interventions, using School Development Plans as guides to spending, although sometimes not taking into consideration girl friendly activities in budgeting. Typically, the grants are spent on minor infrastructure developments, latrines, generators and payment of volunteer teachers.

Delays in the accountability of the Capitation Grants received are affecting the approvals and payment of the second tranches. There are unexplained delays in some State Ministries of Finance in transferring grants to schools. Some schools in remote parts of States are experiencing difficulties and expense in collecting the Capitation Grants. Regulations for the Mobile Money transfer mechanism have been drafted and are awaiting approval by the Central Bank of South Sudan. This has the potential to significantly ease the flow of funds to beneficiaries.

There are a number of factors that have affected progress on this work stream. The conflict has clearly stalled progress in the Greater Upper Nile States, where there has been limited opportunity to carry out activities. Other donors are active in the areas covered under the programme, and the approach adopted by GESS has been to avoid duplication and inputs that might not align with the approaches of others. The programme has sensibly resisted jumping into both school support and supervision and teacher continuous professional development in the absence of an overall government-determined strategy. Whilst this has set back achievement of targets, it is good development practice. GESS has done much to link with other programmes. Though achievement is currently well below expectation for Governance, Teacher Development and School Based Mentoring, the targets are expected to be achieved in the final quarter of 2015. This slight delay has been taken into account in the scoring.

The full programme of support is being rolled out in phases that currently reach three schools per county per quarter (total around 200 schools), though the number of schools in each cluster is expected to expand in the next quarter, accelerating coverage. GESS has provided considerable support for school governance, through provision of the School Governance Toolkit and a single day School Management Committee briefing which have already reached 3,062 and 2,143 schools respectively. Over 3,000 schools have school governance bodies in place, have submitted School Development Plans and have opened bank accounts. Almost half of these schools have now submitted their accountability ledgers and are eligible for their second tranche. This is a considerable achievement. However, the number of schools expected to be reached through the school-based governance training by September is 703, below the milestone of 1,000. Recruitment of additional County Liaison Officers in April 2015 by State Anchors to support the work of the government Payam Supervisors will further accelerate the roll out of the full package of school-based governance training.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendation	Response
Identify measures to safeguard Cash Transfers and Capitation Grants while exploring all options for delivery .	The process of release and monitoring of Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers has been strengthened through operationalization notes, the School Governance Toolkit, and the establishment of an Education Transfers Monitoring Committee. Alternative money transfer processes, including Mobile Money are being explored
Ensure that schools and communities receive clear and unequivocal messaging about the use of Capitation Grants and their role in school governance and support to their children's school.	The messaging to schools on the use of Capitation Grants has been improved through press, radio, community mobilisation and the school governance toolkit.

Recommendations

- Planning and budgeting by School Governance Bodies could be improved by better prioritisation of spending in addition to including "girl friendly" budgets. The County Liaison Officers and Payam Education Supervisors need to work together and be trained on how to guide school governing bodies in the prioritisation of spending during the budgeting process and the checking of actual expenditure against achievement of activities
- Provide more support to schools to comply with the accountability and reporting requirements of the Capitation Grants. This should include simple provision of basic information at school and community level, e.g. posting details of Capitation Grants receipts and uses on notice boards.
- Government to take measures to compel State Ministries of Finance to release Capitation Grants to schools on time.
- GRSS might consider introducing a differentiated capitation grant that provides (a) additional resources to small remote schools to offset the costs incurred in travel to banks and (b) a higher capitation for girls, adding additional incentives to schools to enrol and recruit girls. This would go some way to offsetting the sometimes negative attitude of boys around the transfers to girls only, as the school would be rewarded for their girl enrolment and boys and girls would benefit from the additional cash.
- State Anchors, should undertake some quality assurance checks on the delivery of the mentoring programme, particularly in terms of mentors' grasp and interpretation of the issues, ability to handle sensitive topics and general facilitation skills that promote open discussion rather than rely on teaching.
- A greater level of support and challenge is needed from State Anchors, county and payam staff to schools on both the process of developing and identifying priorities in School Development Plans. Currently the focus of attention is skewed more towards tracking the money, rather than what it is buying. There needs to be a clearer statement in School Development Plans of how the education experience of girls will be improved by proposed interventions, beyond the obvious construction of latrines. School Development Plans might also include actions that can be achieved at no cost, many of which can exert a strong influence on learning outcomes, e.g. improving teachers time on task, homework clubs etc.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	Increased knowledge and evidence available to policy makers of what works to promote girls' education in South Sudan		
Output number per LF	3	Output Score	A
Risk:	Medium	Impact weighting (%):	15%
Risk revised since last AR?	N	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	N

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
3.1 Cumulative number of relevant research and evaluation studies conducted and disseminated to policy makers	2014: 3 2015: No milestone 2016: 6	Milestone (2014) exceeded: 4 studies completed (A+) (i) School Survey (ii) Household Survey (iii) County and Payam Survey (iv) Sub-national Public Financial Management survey
3.2 Mathematics and English Learning Assessment administered to sample of schools	2014: 1 2015: No milestone 2016: 2	The Learning Assessment Report has been produced and discussed at a joint donor/Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) workshop in March (A)
3.3 Percentage of primary and secondary schools with SSSAMS reporting attendance of pupils and teachers regularly	2015: 60%	Target is unlikely to be met without significant additional support to schools to encourage reporting. GESS reports 32% of 3,058 schools on SSSAMS have made at least one report (C)

Key Points

Four national studies: the School Survey, the Household Survey, Country and Payam Survey and the Subnational Public Financial Management Survey have been completed. This has been a significant achievement in the timescale and has met all milestones to date. As research studies the quantitative baseline surveys are of high quality, and provide a sound baseline for some elements of the programme. However, to achieve the output of "Increased knowledge and evidence available to policymakers of what works to promote girls' education in South Sudan", it is utility of the studies for identifying actions for specifically improving girls' education and measuring that improvement that could be enhanced.

Two studies make no mention of girls, even when there were opportunities to do so and the household and school surveys, which provide some very useful information about girls, miss many opportunities for greater gender disaggregated analysis. Household surveys need to differentiate all data and analysis by gender. The Teacher Needs Analysis should have included questions relating to improving girls' learning in the classroom and creating a more girl-friendly environment.

The first (Baseline) Mathematics and English Learning Assessment has been administered to a sample of schools. The results show that girls are under-performing relative to boys and that improving girls' education in South Sudan is not only a matter of attendance and retention, but of examining the quality of the education that children receive. The next milestone is for the midline of 2016.

The South Sudan Student Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS)⁸ continues to be rolled out to more schools. However, the pace of roll-out and uptake of the system by schools continues to be slower than expected. 984 schools have made at least one Short Message Service (SMS) report which shows that

⁸ SSSAMS makes use of both traditional attendance registers but also mobile technology (mobile phones) to record attendance weekly which is sent to a central database on a website, so that MOEST officials at county, state, and national level can see at a glance attendance of boys and girls in any one school. It is also a means to check that girls receiving cash transfers are remaining in full-time education. A simple code is used for attendance and texted to the centre using SMS

there is a long way to go to meet the September 2015 target. It has been a very useful tool in terms of supporting the Cash Transfer and Capitation Grant schemes. However, some, especially smaller, rural schools are struggling with it and find it time consuming and an additional burden, when they already maintain their own registers. To create greater efficiency in the system and maximise its potential, there is a need to investigate ways in which the data can be used at school, county, payam or state levels to inform practice and improve the quality of education, especially for girls. The fundamental issue that is being addressed here is to improve teacher and pupil attendance.

Along with the Baseline Study in Output One and the Teachers' Needs Assessment in Output 2 and information from SSSAMS, this is an enormous amount of available knowledge for a programme of this size. While this provides a substantial baseline and contributes to the national and international body of knowledge and to follow up midlines, endlines etc, there is a danger that much of it may not be used sufficiently to justify the effort involved. It is time now for more operations research and smaller scale studies that focus on lesson learning and solving programmatic issues relating to what works effectively for girls' education.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- Apart from follow-up studies, the programme now focuses its research efforts on lesson learning and solving programmatic issues relating what works effectively for girls' education. If this is not feasible because of limited funds, then it will be crucial that follow-up and midline and end-line reviews include stronger focus on analysis by gender, especially when investigating such things as attitudes to education. Alternatively, or in addition, more in-depth, qualitative studies could follow-up on some of the key issues for girls' which only receive superficial analysis in the quantitative studies.
- Future research has a stronger focus on girls. All research studies need to differentiate and analyse all data by gender. For example the stated objectives of the County Education Department and Payam Education Office includes "To recognise gender aware procedures and approaches for inspection and supervision" but the analysis does not include this.
- SSSAMS provides greater support to schools with challenges in terms of using the system.
- SSSAMS investigates whether the system can be streamlined to reduce the burden on schools.
- SSSAMS investigate ways in which the data can be used at school, payam, county or state levels to inform practice and improve the quality of education, especially for girls.

D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (1 page)

The period under consideration for the calculation of Value for Money (VfM) indicators is the calendar year January 2014 to December 2014 in line with the academic year and the disbursement of Cash Transfers and capitation grants.

A key achievement of GESS has been to establish a rigorous VfM methodology which is capable of monitoring VfM over time, across programme components and by each State Anchor. The attention during design, and the allocation of expert time during implementation have enabled this rigorous approach to VfM. It is a sound investment.

Overall the relatively high set up costs of GESS have had an impact on unit costs at the start of the project and thus reduced VfM. Unit costs are expected to be in line with targets set in the Business Case. However, over time the effect of these costs reduce as programme initiatives reach increasing numbers of beneficiaries. The overall project is therefore assessed as being on track to deliver VfM targets set out in the Business Case.

The VfM highlights for GESS so far have been:

Output 1: Community Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant progress has been made with agreement with Radio Miraya to air programmes with GESS content for free and estimated to have reached nearly one million listeners The reach of Output 1 materials has also been extended at no cost to GESS through their distribution to NGO partners such as War Child Holland. Similar negotiations are ongoing with the USAID funded Room to Learn project.
Output 2: School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biggest VfM success of the project has been government financing of Capitation Grants, amounting to 90% of the total Capitation Grant disbursement in 2014. The Governments' investment in the programme has been £5.2 million and there is further commitment to fund 100% of the disbursements on Capital grants from July 2015. This intervention, in the early stages of the project was not anticipated in the business case Through an in-principle partnership agreement with the EU funded Improving Management of Education (IMED) project, GESS has extended the reach of Cash Transfers to include P5 girls at average age of 11.. Unit costs have been reduced through economies of scale. Schools are able to procure items with Capitation Grants, at significantly lower costs than other development programmes have delivered in South Sudan. The method of delivery of training, based in schools minimises disruption to schools and reduces costs associate with travel, accommodation and subsistence. This compares favourably with extra-mural training costs incurred by other donors both within South Sudan and internationally. Successful partnerships with other donors in South Sudan has enhanced VfM. GESS has reached an agreement with Global Partnership for Education (GPE) to develop a national strategy, training curriculum and materials jointly and for GPE to implement residential training of Payam officers and GESS to provide ongoing on-the-job support after training. Teaming up in this way should ensure complementarity and increased effectiveness of GESS interventions at no additional cost.
Output 3: Knowledge, Evidence and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the return to conflict in December 2013, EMIS failed to collect student enrolment data in 2014. GESS' achievement was in managing to report on student enrolment across South Sudan through SSSAMS and this has a huge value, not only to the project but also to the government and broader donor community.

In the context of fragility and conflict, GESS remains committed to ensuring equity in the distribution of benefits to all areas. This is particularly challenging in the context of fragility and conflict. The principle of impartiality is essential. Delivering the programme to both sides in conflicted areas involves higher costs compared to delivery in the non-conflict affected areas and GESS will have to consider the option of higher funding to some State Anchors.

Key Cost Drivers and Performance

The two significant programme **cost drivers** are (i) Cash Transfers and Capitation Grants, and (ii) fee rates and expenses across the programme, including the behavioural change campaign, the knowledge component and the provision of school-based teacher support. The third major cost driver, the classroom construction component, was discontinued in October 2014 to allow for consolidation of project resources in response to the changed security situation since December 2013.

GESS had just released a second VfM report at the time of this review. Headline VfM achievements are:

- The biggest VfM success has been the agreement of GRSS to gradually take over all Capitation Grants, funding 90% in 2014, moving to 100% in 2015 (Output 2)
- Partnerships with other donors to reduce unit costs, improve complementarity and extend programme initiatives to more beneficiaries e.g. Improved Management of Education Delivery (EU) and P5 Capitation Grants, (Global Partnership for Education) (Output 2)
- The adoption by others of materials produced by GESS, thus extending the number of beneficiaries (e.g. Room to Learn, War Child Holland) (Output 1)
- Capitation Grants allow schools to procure materials at significantly lower costs than centralised procurement (Output 2)
- Adopting a school-based approach to training incurs minimal costs with savings on travel, accommodation and subsistence allowances, comparing favourably with training costs incurred by other donors both within South Sudan and internationally.
- Through SSSAMS, GESS has been able to compensate for the absence of official education statistical data in 2014, serving not only GESS but also MOEST and other donors.

Efficiency Indicators

The following table shows the proportion of overall programme costs spent on management, administration and overheads

Project Management Costs: above target	12.6% of total spend
The target rate of 9% assumed in the Business Case has not been met due to Initial set up costs incurred during the inception phase. The percentage is expected to decrease to 8.8% by the end of the project in 2018.	
State Anchor indirect costs :below target	24% of total spend
Costs are below the target set in the business case estimate of 30% and the State Anchor negotiated rate of no greater than 25% and this represents good value for money.	
Percentage of Cash Transfer unit cost which is not disbursement	35% of total spend
Percentage of Capitation Grant unit cost which is not disbursement	18% of total spend
Unit costs for both Cash Transfers and Capitation Grants expected to decrease as the number of girls and schools registered on the scheme increases after inclusion of P5 girls and the unpausing of payments. In time.	

Effectiveness

Some effectiveness indicators have not been reported on due to the lack of availability of reliable and regular attendance data from the SSSAMS. Currently an insufficient number of schools report on a regular enough basis to be able to assess attendance. However GESS has now established baselines for effectiveness indicators which demonstrates the scale of the challenge faced by the programme in terms of girl's participation and learning in schools, against which effectiveness will be assessed. GESS intends to move to a quarterly update on VfM, The reporting of indicators should be possible in the next VfM report due at the end of May 2015.

Quality of financial management

The programme's estimated costs for the year ended 30th September 2015 are £13.24 million and this is to be compared with the £13.8 million estimated in the Business case. The programme is on track in terms of performance within its target.

The management of programme assets is satisfactory. The programme maintains asset registers to record acquisitions, transfer values, location and condition of each item including vehicles, motorcycles and office equipment for Head Office and State Anchor offices. Assets stolen/lost during the conflict in

December 2013 are identified, but have not been removed and treated as disposals in the register. Two motorcycles that were stolen from the State Anchor (Windle Trust) in Bentiu, Unity State have been written off and replaced with agreement from DFID. A solar system stolen in Bor has been replaced through insurance. The total value of the three items lost was £9,280.

Mott MacDonald has put in place adequate measures to manage risk to assets in the more at-risk areas, including comprehensive insurance, 24 hour compound protection, strengthened perimeters, and curfew. Contingency also includes moving vehicles out of South Sudan during high insecurity, as was the case in December 2013 when vehicles were moved to northern Uganda. All movements are given prior security clearance through the security provider (Warrior) and Thuraya satellite phones are carried on field visits.

Motor vehicle logs are used to record journeys on a daily basis and consumption of fuel per kilometre is calculated for control purposes. GESS has emphasised the need for State Anchors to maintain logbooks for both cars and motor cycles, though this is not rigorously enforced. There was no evidence of motorcycle logs being used by State Anchors. The GESS Secretariat needs to ensure greater compliance and make this a part of their regular Financial Management monitoring.

Details of the last Financial Management Report are at Annex 1 (see end of report).

E: RISK (½ page)

Overall risk rating: Medium/High

Overview of programme risk

The only significant change to the risk environment is the uncompetitiveness of the official exchange rate against the real exchange rate. In addition, a related risk is that of economic collapse with the result that both Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers would not be affordable. As GESS exchanges Sterling Pounds at the official rate (£1=SSP 3.174), its purchasing power is effectively a half of the real market rate used to purchase goods and services (£1 = SSP 6.3 to 7.0). GRSS has to some extent mitigated this risk by taking over the full funding of Capitation Grants. However, other areas of the programme are exposed to this risk, effectively reducing the overall benefit of the programme. All other risks identified in the Business Case and set out in the latest Risk Management Framework are still valid and relevant. However, delays in release and diversion of Capitation Grants by State Ministries of Finance for various reasons emerge as one of the high risks to programme implementation across the country.

The level of likelihood of risks from inter-tribal conflicts, insecurity and its impact on programme implementation are currently highest in Upper Nile, Unity, Jonglei and Lakes states. The tribal dimension makes even movement between counties in the same states risky. The other high risk factors to immediate programme implementation include the reduction in capacity at state and lower levels to effectively implement GESS strategies, especially the focus on girls' education. The financial aspects of Capitation Grants tend to overshadow the objectives for the programme. The development of a Greater Upper Nile strategy and signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between GESS and the Emergency Education Cluster has the positive effect of mitigating some of the identified contextual and programmatic risks.

The institutional risk associated with frequent staff turnover remains real at all levels. Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers are new, and it cannot be assumed that incoming staff, at Central and State Ministries, as well as at lower levels, are aware of their responsibilities. New staff at the school level, particularly Head Teachers, need to be quickly oriented into the administration of the Cash Transfers, School Development Planning and how to use and account for the Capitation Grants.

Outstanding actions from the risk assessment

- To counter any simmering negative attitude about the girl-only Cash Transfers among boys there is a need to emphasize the relationship between the cash transfer and capitation grant, their benefit to the school and how and girls' Cash Transfers contribute to the overall improvement and development and improvement of the community. Moreover, it provides an opportunity to help boys

understand the previous disadvantaged position of girls and how the Cash Transfers are making up for some of that disadvantage.

- To maintain impartiality of GESS staff when dealing with both government-controlled and opposition-held communities..
- To conduct more dialogue with the Ministry of Finance on the GESS programme and integration of the State Ministries of Finance in the state implementation committee in order to reduce the risks. In view of high staff turnover, at all levels, it is important to continuously renew and reinforce awareness of Capitation Grants in particular.
- Conduct seasonal planning to minimize the impact of rainy seasons on programme implementation.
- Renew the Memorandum of Understanding with the Education Cluster and widely share with state anchors to strengthen collaboration at state and county level.

F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (½ page)

Overall, the programme is still considered to be on track to achieve its planned spending targets.

The forecasts in the Approved Business Case are no longer appropriate because of the delay between design and approval of the programme. New forecast figures, awaiting contract amendment from DFID will form the basis of the calculation of progress against timescales.

Expenditure is assessed to be on track. As at January 2015, the programme reported actual expenditure of £14,137,959 against budgeted disbursements of £60,059,426. This represents spend of 24% of the total allocated budget in 21 months, of the total of 66 months of the programme period. This includes 6 months of the inception period. GESS expenditure is projected to reach £25.1 million by September 2015. This will represent 42% of the allocated budget in 45% of allocated time.

Data from the GESS schedule of budgeted and actual disbursements have been used to highlight deviations between actual and planned spending. Outputs 2a and 2b are under spent because there were no disbursement in 2013 and a pause in disbursements during 2014. Output 2c is currently under spent as much effort thus far has been establishing the foundations. The programme of support is now being rolled out in phases and coverage is set to expand in the coming months. Output 3 is over spent because it is at an intense phase of setting up the system and spending is expected to slow down for the remainder of the programme.

Spending	GBP (£)
Approved spending (managed funds and BMB TA & PM) 1 Apr 2013 –30 Sep 2018	60,059,426
Actual spend in previous quarter (1 Oct 2014 – 31 Dec 2014)	2,220,812
Proposed spending in next quarter 1 Jan 2015 -31 Mar 2015	3,144,475
Cumulative spend to date 31 Dec 2014	14,137,959
Cumulative balance to date 31 Dec 2014	45,958,118

G: CONDITIONALITY (½ page)

Update on partnership principles (if relevant)

Not relevant to this programme as it does not involve general / sector budget support or pooled funding. However, government commitment to providing Capitation Grants to primary schools over the last 2 fiscal years, and a new commitment to secondary school Capitation Grants suggests stronger commitment by South Sudan government in terms of resources for education (approximately £10.7million annually).

H: MONITORING & EVALUATION (½ page)

Evidence and Evaluation

There has been no change in evidence that would have implications for the programme. In considering the option of introducing a differentiated Capitation Grant (ref Output 2 above) that allocates more to remote schools and to girls, evidence of similar approaches from elsewhere should be considered.

Disaggregation of data:

In programme research, strategies and presentation of evidence there is a need to remain focused on the outcome of the programme and to disaggregate all data and information by gender. For example, when talking about or reporting on teachers, are these male or female or both? Similarly, with parents, are these mothers, fathers or both, and students, are these girls, boys or both?

Theory of Change

There is a need to take greater account of the significant change processes required if the status quo of girls' low retention and, more especially, achievement is to be reversed in order to achieve the outcome of the programme. This is required not only in direct actions with girls and communities but also in the education service: girls and boys in the schools; teachers' practices and norms; the school environment; the Payam Education Supervisors and others in the system. While changes are not being suggested to the design of the programme, we are recommending that its interpretation and implementation better reflects the focus on girls and the step change needed to achieve the programme outcome.

Monitoring activities throughout review period

The GESS Secretariat has a robust system of quarterly planning and performance review that involves all Consortium Partners and State Anchors. The overall quarterly report provides the regular update of progress against the logframe supported by a narrative of challenges and lessons. Financial progress is also reported. Each State Anchor similarly reports physical and financial progress on a quarterly basis. In addition, the GESS Secretariat has developed a State Anchor Assessment protocol to monitor performance. This has been effective in identifying underperformance in two cases and provides a basis for managing improvement.

The conclusion is that GESS does not need to do more in terms of monitoring as the existing Executive Summary of the Quarterly Report provides an adequate and accessible framework.

Independent monitoring

Field visits by DFID staff have been more limited, but these may increase as restrictions on monitoring visits outside Juba because of security reduce. There are also opportunities for more independent monitoring through the overall sector monitoring and evaluation framework being developed by Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. In addition, independent assessments such as the due diligence assessment of banking capacity carried out by a regional auditing company are being utilised.

Direct Feedback from Stakeholders

MOEST staff, State Education staff including Ministers, County Education Directors, Payam Education Supervisors, head teachers and teachers, parents and students met during the review all expressed great enthusiasm for and knowledge of the programme. The Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers have clearly had a major impact on how the programme is perceived by stakeholders and consequently their openness to other changes that may be required within the programme. This provides the programme with significant leverage and opportunity to gain government support for addressing the barriers to girls' education within the system and the classroom that will lead to a lasting supportive environment for girls' education.

Concern was raised by a number of stakeholders at the volume of form filling involved in the grants and transfers which were felt to be excessive. GESS should look at this balance of efficiency over due diligence. A number of schools visited expressed frustration with attendance monitoring, raising a variety of problems of technical failure and time taken.

The review process

This Annual Review was undertaken by a team of four independent consultants who were in country from Sunday 8th to Wednesday 18th March 2015. The team comprised Roger Cunningham (Team Leader), Mary Surrige (Gender and Social Development Adviser), Sammy Musoke (Conflict Adviser) and Therese Forshaw (Public Financial Management and VfM Adviser). The team was joined by Laura Brannelly, the DFID Education Adviser from Nigeria, up until Saturday 14th March. The review included three days of field visits to Western Equatoria State and Western Bahr el Ghazal State. In addition, Laura Brannelly visited schools in the greater Juba area of Central Equatoria State.

A light-touch annual review is planned for October 2015, in order to allow more accurate assessment of the September milestones in future Annual Reviews will be re-scheduled to October each year. This will also provide a useful check on the forecast progress of this particular Annual Review.

ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	
OUTPUT 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Focus on building capacity of all players in the system, including the programme producers, in relation to gender equality, barriers to girls' education and change processes. b) Improved quality assurance by, and guidance from, the Juba team in relation to key messages for radio programmes and community mobilisation. c) Provide further capacity building for Community Mobilisers to deepen their understanding of the issues relating to girls' education and gender equality, the messages contained in the radio programmes and further training in facilitation and group management and facilitating change.
OUTPUT 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The County Liaison Officers and Payam Education Supervisors need to be trained to better provide both support and challenge in order to better guide school governing bodies in the prioritisation of activities and spending during the school development planning and budgeting process. This needs to include how the education experience of girls will be improved, and actions that do not require cash but will exert a positive influence on school improvement. b) Provide more support to schools to comply with the accountability and reporting requirements of the Capitation Grants. This should include simple provision of basic information at school and community level, e.g. posting details of Capitation Grants receipts and uses on notice boards. c) Government to take measures to compel State Ministries of Finance to release Capitation Grants to schools on time. d) GRSS might consider introducing a differentiated capitation grant that provides (a) additional resources to small remote schools to offset the costs incurred in travel to banks and (b) a higher capitation for girls, adding additional incentives to schools to enrol and recruit girls. e) State Anchors, should undertake some quality assurance checks on the delivery of the mentoring programme, particularly in terms of mentors' grasp and interpretation of the issues, ability to handle sensitive topics and general facilitation skills that promote open discussion rather than rely on teaching.
OUTPUT 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Focus research on lesson learning about what works effectively for girls' education. This should where possible, include more in-depth, qualitative studies could follow-up on some of the key issues for girls' which only receive superficial analysis in the quantitative studies. b) Ensure all future research has a stronger focus on girls. All research studies need to differentiate and analyse all data by gender. c) Ensure that SSSAMS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provides support to schools with challenges in using the system; ii. identifies ways to streamline the system to reduce the burden on schools; iii. focusses attention on using data at school, payam, county and state levels to improve the quality of education, especially for girls.

ATTACHMENT 2

Financial overview split per sub-output

GBP	BMB TA	Output 1	Output 2a	Output 2b	Output 2c	Output 2d	Output 3	Total
Approved spending 2013-2018	£9,709,425	£5,080,000	£15,200,000	£15,250,000	£9,820,000	£2,000,000	£3,000,000	£60,059,426
Projected spend in previous quarter (01Oct – 31Dec 2014)	£460,044	£347,404	£510,171	£201,038	£265,587	-	£235,459	£2,019,703
Actual spend in previous quarter (01Oct – 31Dec 2014)	£496,696	£357,118	£306,663	£397,344	£373,084	-	£289,907	£2,220,812
Proposed spending in next quarter 01Jan – 31Mar 2015	£480,000	£327,468	£885,331	£790,630	£415,587	-	£245,459	£3,144,475
Cumulative spend to date	£3,122,929	£1,815,868	£2,342,989	£2,406,799	£1,101,539	-	£3,347,835	£14,137,959
Cumulative balance to date	£6,586,496	£3,264,132	£12,857,011	£12,843,201	£8,718,461	£2,000,000	- £347,835	£45,921,466

Notes: The allocation of approved spending between the Outputs needs to be updated through a contract amendment in line with the finalised strategies for each sub-component post-inception. Invoices for FHSS (Dec) and Winrock (Nov, Dec) were not approved by end of this quarter; implying that actual spend for the previous quarter reported here will be a minor understatement across all Outputs of what the final figure will be when these invoices have been approved. BBC MA invoices are with one month delay, so quarterly spend for Oct-Dec covers activities for Sep-Nov.

Projections for the previous quarter were: overestimated for Output 2a because of the decision to pause cash transfer payments; underestimated for Output 2b given unplanned additional inputs required to ensure effective delivery of this component; underestimated for Outputs 2c and 3 because implementation moved faster than projected. Overall the projection was within 7.5% of the reality.

Date of last narrative financial report	January 2015
Date of last audited annual statement	N/A

ATTACHMENT 3

LIST OF PERSONS MET

Name	Position/Location
JUBA	
Michael Lopuke	Under Secretary of Education
George Mogga	Director of Planning and Budgeting
Ester Akumu	Director for Development Partners Coordination
Ben Lou Pogo	Head of Social Inclusion, Dept Gender Equity, MOEST
Richard Arden	Senior Education Adviser, DFID
Roland Hodson	Project Coordinator, GESS
Akuja De Garang	Governance and Advocacy, GESS
Patricia Schwerzel	Project Director, GESS
Agnieszka Mikulska	Quality Education Adviser, GESS
Emma van der Meulen	Deputy Programme Coordinator, GESS
Fiona Bailey	Project Manager, GESS
Tim Monybundy	Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser, GESS
Yolanda ille Felix	Education Adviser and Gender Adviser, GESS
Paul Gitonga	Capitation Grants Lead, GESS
Allard Jasen	Finance Manager, GESS
Hamish Colquhoun	Economist, GESS
Robert Roba	Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser, GESS
Kate DeGennaro Torre	Senior Program Associate, Winrock
Charlie Goldsmith	Charlie Goldsmith Associates (CGA)
Staff at CGA	
Johnson Oman Yor	Director for Planning /Upper Nile State
Masua David	Director, Windle Trust International (WTI)
John Bentiu	M&E GESS Unity State, WTI
Justine Loke	Team Leader Unity, WTI
Alfred	Unity State GESS Coordinator, WTI
WESTERN BAHR EL GHAZAL	
Cleto Ireneo Kunda	Executive Director, HARD
Andrea Amet Ubiu	GESS Team Leader
Peter Gar Awar	State Coordinator
Emmanuel Onanga	County Liaison Officer
Asumpta Babtista	County Liaison Officer
Andrew Anguin	County Liaison Officer
Charles Manute	County Liaison Officer
Nicola Manza	Charlie Goldsmith Associates
Philip Otieno	Finance Officer
Pasquale	BBC Media Action Producer
Andrea Amet Ubiu	GESS Team Leader
Peter Gar Awar	State Coordinator
Malik Adam	DG, MoE, WAU State
Pasquale Kamilo Dimo	Deputy Director of Planning, MoE, WAU State
Michael Richardo Ugelli	School Feeding Coordinator
Gasper Ali Saleh	CE Director, Wau County
James Nuri Alkola	PES, Wau County
Angelo Kuac Aleu	Acting CED, Jur River
Albino Dimmo Aleu	PES, Jur River
Mohammed Abdulla	Acting CED, Wau Municipality
Elmalk Hassun Adam	Head Teacher, Ngo Haima Primary School
Teachers, SMC members, pupils	Ngo Haima Primary School
Peter Lamiyima Kimingogo	Head teacher, Islaam Primary School
Teachers, SMC members, pupils	Islaam Primary School
Ahmed Ibrahim	Payam Education Supervisor
Mariam	Head Teacher, Wau Girls Secondary School
25 girls in school drama club	Sikka Hadid Girls Primary School

12 community members	Listening Group, Sikka Hadid Girls Primary School
Ann Daniel Ai	DG, Ministry of Gender and Social Welfare
WESTERN EQUATORIA STATE	
Philip Pia	State Minister of Education
Gibson Abdul Waro	Director General of Education
Lucy Vivien Elipaza	Team Leader, Windle Trust, Yambio
John Gaaniko Salaam	Project Coordinator, Windle Trust
Gbianami John Badagbu	M&E Officer, Windle Trust
Jeremiah Ismail	County Education Director
Bornfree Clement Hassan	County Liaison Officer
Madeline Wodvapai	Community Mobilisation Officer
Community members	Community Dialogue session, Yambio
Nelson John Rakish	Payam Supervisor
John Sindani	Head Teacher – Kings College Yambio
Teachers, SMC members,pupils	Kings Collage (Community School), Yambio
Ernesti Nako	Head Mistress - Yabongo Girls Primary School
Teachers, SMC members,pupils	Yabongo Girls Primary School
Arkangelo Aisa	Head Teacher – Yambio Secondary School
Teachers, SMC members,pupils	Yambio Secondary School
Stephen Mugisha	Head Teacher Matondo Primary School
Teachers, SMC members,pupils	Matondo primary School