

**Samoa – Education Sector Project II  
8th Joint Review Mission (JRM) - Joint Review Record  
11-15 March, 2013**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Government of Samoa (GoS), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (NZ MFAT)<sup>1</sup>, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) conducted a progress review of the Samoa Education Sector Project (ESP II) between 11 and 15 March 2013.

The mission had four main objectives:

- (i) Assess overall progress of ESP II and review any outstanding issues of importance and recommend strategies to address these issues;
- (ii) Review the extension agreement between the development partners (DPs) and GoS and reach agreement with Government of Samoa on completing the goals and objectives of ESP II and using the ESP II extension as the vehicle to transition to the new education program;
- (iii) Clarify activities for the extension of ESP II and ensure there is a robust results focused plan for program completion;
- (iv) Determine an agreed approach for conducting a joint Program Completion Review.

The Mission ToRs are attached at **Annex A**. A list of persons met by the JRM team is attached at **Annex C**.

The JRM team<sup>2</sup> commends the work of Ministry of Education, Sports and culture (MESC) staff for their achievements in meeting the challenges of ESP II and wishes to express its gratitude to MESC for the hospitality shown to the visiting mission.

**II. MISSION FINDINGS**

**IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS**

In general, the project has made good progress in terms of completion of most outputs and deliverables. At the same time, implementation of many of these outputs is in the infancy stage and in some cases implementation has not even begun. Following is a summary of the main achievements to date under ESP II as well as the remaining activity areas that must still be conducted in order to achieve the goals and objectives of ESP II and prepare the way to future sector support.

**Component 1: Introducing curriculum and assessment**

Activities completed:

- (i) Developed curriculum materials (curriculum statements) for Samoan language, English language, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts and health and PE
- (ii) Prepared teachers manuals for all the curriculum areas
- (iii) Developed, launched and supported the implementation of the national assessment policy framework including associated technological systems (i.e., Item-bank, Student Education Number [SEN])

---

<sup>1</sup> NZ MFAT is responsible for managing the New Zealand Aid Programme previously managed by the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID).

<sup>2</sup> The JRM team consisted of the following members: Peseta Noumea Simi (MoF); Chimi Thonden, Susan Francisco & Mr Shigehiko Muramoto (ADB); Richard Crichton (NZAP); Sato Umino & Hiroshi Kawabata (JICA); David Coleman (Lead), Leota Valma Galuvao & Kate Wiencke (AusAID).

## FINAL

- (iv) Supported the development of SPECA, a tool to replace Year 8 Exams
- (v) 1,000 teachers trained on classroom assessment
- (vi) Developed Bilingual Policy
- (vii) Developed and supported the Multimedia Unit of MESC.

### Activities uncompleted:

- Translation and publishing of subject curriculum statements
- Review and revise teachers manuals
- Receive and finalize math Year 8 assessment approach (SPECA)
- Write teachers manuals for social studies and music
- Implement phase 2 of community learning centre including recruitment of staff
- Finalize Year 8 national assessment tool
- Training of new assessment officers on item bank.

Staff must be hired urgently to fill several vacancies in the Technical Assessment Unit. Limited availability of assessment expertise raises some serious concerns on the sustainability of the National Assessment Policy Framework. Higher level technical expertise, probably through International Technical Assistance (ITA), will be needed to properly support the Technical Assessment Unit, as the gap in expertise has inhibited the effectiveness of supportive capacity building.

There is currently no link between assessment data and the SEN. Simple enhancement of the SEN would allow more powerful usage of assessment scores to be monitored and analysed.

Core Trainers work should be extended to ensure that the findings of their monitoring of curriculum and assessment reforms are embedded in schools and classrooms. It is unclear how much monitoring at the classroom level is happening by MESC division staff.

Coordination and integration with Schoolnet e-learning resources should also be prioritized, particularly given the imminent end of the RTI contract. A formal agreement between CMAD and SOD is desirable, and longer-term plans for how to institutionalize Coaches should also be developed.

## **Component 2: Developing effective teachers**

### Activities completed:

- (i) Finalized the National Teacher Development Framework (NTDF) including implementation policies and documents
- (ii) Developed and implemented pre-service and in-service teacher training to support the new primary curriculum (1000 teachers trained)
- (iii) Capacity building of principals, SROs for school improvement (170 participants).
- (iv) Development of Professional Standards for Graduate, Registered and Master Teachers
- (v) Completion of Alternative Teacher Training program (Primary) and Fellowship Program (Secondary) for teachers

### Activities uncompleted:

- Initial implementation of NTDF
- Full implementation of Minimum Service Standards
- Accelerated hiring and training of Quality Assurers
- Registration system for teachers
- Training of a new cohort of mentor teachers
- Core trainers extension
- Conducting another cohort of fellowships.

## FINAL

Expanding the pool of qualified mentors is critical to assisting teachers to meet the required standards for registration. Only 11 Mentors have been trained to date, therefore training of additional cohorts of mentors need to be conducted as soon as possible.

Continuous follow up support is critical to help schools to become familiar with the new approach and associated materials, and the move towards greater focus on student learning outcomes. It is unclear how teachers are managing the new bilingual policy. A more systematic approach may be needed to identify exactly what should be taught in Samoan and what should be taught in English.

Recruitment of sufficient Quality Assurers (QAs) is crucial to begin implementation of the NTDF, in particular for the teacher performance appraisal system. Some training will be required once QAs are hired.

### Component 3: Infrastructure Activities

To date, eight (8) schools have been completed under ESP II, one school (Avele) is under construction and one school (Sagaga) remains outstanding. The land issue surrounding Sagaga School are to be resolved by no later than end March 2013, after which point the Sagaga community would lose the school. If a new site is determined, a new due diligence would need to be undertaken.

Thus, only one school remains outstanding and to be procured. If the land issues are not resolved, this construction may be cancelled.

	Schools	Status	Date
1	Savaii Sisifo Secondary	Completed	August 2011
2	Alofi o Taao Secondary	Completed	October 2011
3	Itu o Tane Secondary	Completed	October 2011
4	Aleipata Secondary	Completed	December 2011
5	Safata Secondary	Completed	December 2011
6	Samoa College	Completed	January 2012
7	Lefaga Secondary	Completed	December 2012
8	Aana Secondary	Completed	December 2012
9	Avele College	In Progress	December 2013
10	Sagaga Secondary	TBD	TBD
11	Vaipouli College	Cancelled	
12	Fagaloa Learning Centre	Removed from ESP II	
13	Falealili College	Completed using tsunami funds	

A School facilities handbook is being updated by Kramer (consultants). Extension of a supervisory contract services is underway.

### Component 4: Strengthening capacity to undertake research, evaluation, policy analysis and planning

Activities completed:

- (i) Capacity building of PPRD and MESC staff for research and evaluation. **(3 overseas attachments, 2 overseas Conferences, 8 national semi-formal programs identified from the Research and Capacity Building Plan)**
- (ii) Analyzed MESC data to inform policy development and planning. **(8 analysis reports)**
- (iii) Conducted individual evaluation of ESP II Components **(5 Evaluation Studies Completed)**
- (iv) Conducted research studies requested/identified by PPRD/MESC **[4 studies fully completed]**.

## FINAL

Activities uncompleted:

- Conduct impact evaluation of curriculum implementation within 6-12 months of rollout
- Conduct Language and Literacy in Primary Classroom research
- Schoolnet evaluation
- Multimedia usage study.

It is unclear if any of the research studies conducted by PPRD have provided analysis that has been directly applied to MESC policy planning or has provided the evidence for investment prioritisation (e.g. in budget bids or Annual Operational Planning). PPRDs role in conducting research is relatively clear. PPRDs role in monitoring, analysis and the use of evidence to inform MESC planning is less clear. Some of this confusion relates to the ESP II Secretariat's involvement in M&E activities. This issue is further discussed in Section 3 (Cross-cutting Reform Issues), under Monitoring and Evaluation.

### **Component 5: Strengthening capacity to implement and management development projects**

The ESP II Secretariat had three major outputs under its mandate:

- (i) Improved strategic project management and coordination of implementation
- (ii) Integrated financial management system
- (iii) Effective program performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting system.

Considering the low number of staff at the Secretariat, it has coordinated very well amongst and across MESC Divisions, with the Education Advisory Committee (EAC), consultants and DPs, while balancing the slow shift towards sector level support. Nevertheless, major staff shortages and capacity issues are undeniable, with one or two persons in the Secretariat carrying the bulk of the responsibilities. This topic is discussed in detail in Section 3 (Cross-cutting Reform Issues), under Human Resources/Capacity.

On integrated financial systems, work is also needed. It has been challenging for the JRM to obtain an accurate set of consolidated financial statements from the Secretariat, which provides an overview of the entire financial picture on CFA funds, parallel funds, and GoS funds. It was not possible to provide the entire financial picture during the JRM as the Bank has yet to request the relevant financial information from GoS/MESC. As the SPA records are maintained in MoF, it is suggested that the ESP II Secretariat should do a regular reconciliation with MoF. ADB provides a quarterly report on disbursements to MoF and once this is received it should be shared and reconciled with Secretariat's records. On parallel financing funds, MoF could provide the DPs on the status of utilization on a regular basis. The question arises as to whether this responsibility for integration of financial data should reside and be managed by MOF.

The Secretariat has made little traction on providing DPs with a holistic M&E Framework that tells the story of almost seven years of investment. This topic is discussed in detail in Section 3 (Cross-cutting Reform Issues), under Monitoring and Evaluation.

### **Component 6: SchoolNet**

The main components under SchoolNet are:

- (i) Improving the quality of teaching and learning in secondary schools
- (ii) Improving access to education through ICT
- (iii) Establishing the Community Access Program and developing its partnerships
- (iv) Strengthening education management and coordination, including improving analyses of economic efficiency, equity and sustainability.

Activities completed:

Six of the original nine Coaches continue to train teachers in creative ways, such as going to schools, using the pilot learning resource site at MESC, and shuttling teachers to the pilot learning resource

## FINAL

site. E-resource materials for seven subjects (4 x sciences, math, and 2 x language) are in country following 1.5 years of procurement processes. Electrical wiring has been done for the majority of learning resource centres and cabling has just begun.

### Activities uncompleted:

While SchoolNet was signed in late 2007, implementation has still not been rolled out in schools, due mainly to internal bureaucracies surrounding procurement. While the E-resource materials are now in country, procurement processing for the acquisition of hard equipment (computer, servers, etc.) remains a work in progress.

The following actions still need to occur:

- 1) Leadership from CEO, MESC is requested to ensure that SchoolNet does not fail.
- 2) Procurement of Package 1 needs to be processed, and the contract is with the Attorney General's office now.
- 3) Procurement of Package 2 needs to move to Tenders board, having just now received variations approval.
- 4) WAN Connectivity Package needs to be procured. Determination needs to be made on duration of connectivity and service agreement bundle given the imminent end of the RTI contract and the relatively short duration to ESP II closure.
- 5) ICT Champions within MESC are needed. There is no formal integration between Schoolnet and CMAD and SOD.
- 6) Coaches from SchoolNet need to be extended until such time that the MESC makes a formal determination on the sustainable means to institutionalize e-learning support to schools.
- 7) Extend individual consultant contracts to Procurement Specialist, Management Consultant, Coach Coordinator and Structural Engineer in advance of RTI contract closure.
- 8) Socialize idea of returning technology-focused JICA volunteers, as done in the pilot of SchoolNet.

SchoolNet is an “at risk” project, prompting a special review by ADB. The year 2012 saw zero disbursements. Movement on SchoolNet is a high priority for ADB. MESC leadership will be important to accelerate SchoolNet. A separate MOU is being issued between ADB and MOF, to highlight the urgent priority for progress on SchoolNet.

The Community Access Program (CAP) designed to enhance financial sustainability of SchoolNet was eliminated because it was considered not viable after the baseline study. The Medium-term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) School Finance Report (2010) highlights efficiencies gained from the Ministry's own operation system, which will result in much lower projected SchoolNet costs for schools. Another MTEF review will be conducted once SchoolNet is implemented in the schools. The engagement of private service providers will need to be assessed, as a vehicle to sustainability. There is general movement toward more school operational grants which could potentially be used toward funding ongoing costs related to IT. The SchoolNet team advised that recurrent costs are negligible (electricity and maintenance: no connectivity costs are anticipated, as SchoolNet will utilize a WAN set-up, providing materials as a ‘virtual library’).

The RTI contract which implements the SchoolNet program has done an excellent job and considering the major obstacles encountered, the team has been creative and resourceful in working around them. Nevertheless, SchoolNet needs MESC's urgent attention. Unfortunately, given the low level of human resources within the Secretariat, and lack of movement on major procurements critical to starting implementation, the future for SchoolNet is of grave concern.

With the present procurement environment and staffing makeup, SchoolNet might begin implementation before the RTI contract ends in December 2013. However, once the RTI contract ends, SchoolNet will need MESC support and will need at least one Management Consultant and one

## FINAL

Structural Engineer to coordinate and support the project during the initial implementation stage. Coaches are a critical priority to continue until plans for institutionalization are made. Connectivity packages and technical support and maintenance contracts need to be conducted beyond the life of ESP II. The question arises as to the coverage of cost beyond the end of ESP II.

The question of the place of ICT4E (ICT for Education) in the Education Sector Plan remains and is key to continuing the momentum under Schoolnet. The Education Sector Plan does not identify a Divisional lead on ICT. If ICT is deemed a priority under MESC, it would appear there should be lead ICT staff recruited within MESC to champion a strategic vision across the school system. Resources will need to be allocated to implement this vision. From another perspective, much work has been done on instituting ICT4E through the SchoolNet project, with hardware and a full complement of e-resources planned for all secondary schools. But, ultimately it will be up to MESC to make sure these resources are sustained over the coming years, and leadership will be needed to get the project on track.

### **A. PROJECT EXTENSION REQUEST & RATIONALE**

In November 2012, ADB received a formal request from the Ministry of Finance for a 1.5 year extension for the ESP II and SchoolNet projects, which would bring the projects to a new close date of December 31, 2014 (with activities ending October 31, 2014). The rationale provided at that time was that time was needed primarily for the completion of civil works. Since then, we have understood that more time is warranted for a number of other reasons:

- 1) Practical implementation is at an early stage, despite the completion of most outputs and deliverables. For example, the new curriculum has just begun roll-out, but there is little understanding of how it is being received in schools. Continuous support to teachers is critical during this initial period to make sure that collective investments are taken up and utilized.
- 2) Monitoring and evaluation does not capture any outcome results for a seven year program. As implementation gears up this year, there will be more outcomes that will need to be captured to properly tell the story of the ESP II investment.
- 3) The SchoolNet project suffered major delays and has not yet begun implementation rollout in schools.
- 4) Construction on the planned Sagaga school has not yet begun. Avele College has just begun, with construction completion scheduled for December 2013.
- 5) The next phase of education sector support is not yet ready to begin, and the extension period would allow GoS to prepare for that point.

For these reasons, the JRM team believes that a no-cost extension is warranted and justified to complete the original project scope. More time will better allow ESP II to achieve the identified objectives and goals of the program. The team reminds that new project activities outside the scope of ESP II are not allowable under an extension period.

That said, there are a number of key cross-cutting reform areas that must be addressed in order to maximize the short timeframe under the ESP II extension. Addressing these will enhance achievements under the extension period as well as prepare for partnership arrangements following ESP II completion.

### III. KEY CROSS-CUTTING REFORM ISSUES

#### A. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

##### Contract Awards and Disbursements

As of 2 March 2013, the overall utilization of loan and grant funds are \$25.51 million in contract awards (83% of total loan/grant amount) and disbursements of \$21.69 million (85% of commitments). Table 1 provides the summary by DP, while details per category are in **Annex D**.

Funding Source	Loan/Grant Amount (in USD)	Commitments	Disbursements	Uncommitted Amount
2220-SAM (ADB Loan)	8.678 a/	7.407	5.709	0.961 b/
0031-SAM (AusAID Grant)	8.600	7.011	6.235	1.589
0032-SAM (NZAID Grant)	8.600	7.011	6.235	1.589
Government of Samoa	4.740	4.082	3.506	0.658
<b>Total</b>	<b>30.618</b>	<b>25.510</b>	<b>21.685</b>	<b>4.798</b>

a/ USD equivalent of SDR5.565 million as of 2 March 2013.

b/ excluding IDC of \$0.309 million

The JRM was informed that withdrawal application (WA) No. 28 amounting to \$1,547,485.14 has recently been sent to ADB. WA No. 29 for \$940,932.63 representing expenditures for December 2012-January 2013 is under preparation.

##### Civil Works Component and Parallel Financing

The last JRM (September 2011) had identified that about \$5.346 million was still required to complete the construction of the remaining 4 schools (Lefaga, Aana, Sagaga and Avele). As the remaining available funds then under the civil works category was only \$1.36 million, a funding gap of about \$3.99 million for this category was identified<sup>3</sup>. The computation was based on the assumption that other cost categories will remain the same. As a result of the cost overrun for civil works component, financing for the shortfall were to be covered by : (i) reallocation of \$1.19 million from the unallocated portion from ADB Loan 2220 (with 84% ADB financing); (ii) additional \$1.20 million from AusAID; and (iii) MES/MoF would identify source for the remaining \$1.59 million.

Contracts for the Lefaga and Aana schools are now being funded from Loan 2220, at 84% financing.

Following the 2011 JRM, the Government of Samoa obtained additional financing from AusAID, NZAID and JICA to cover (ii) and (iii) above, which were decided to be used separately and in parallel to the original financing arrangements. The use of parallel funds is specific for the cost overrun for school construction. Details of fund commitments are shown below. Construction of the Sagaga Secondary School, if it is to be constructed, will be funded from this source.

Donor	Amount (in USD)		
AusAID	1,258,040.00		
NZAID	384,498.00		
JICA	1,242,699.15		
Total Amount of Parallel Financing			2,885,237.15
Less:	ST Amount	Approx USD	
Avele School	5,216,000.00	2,307,000.00	
(84% financing)		1,937,880.00	(1,937,880.00)
Balance Available			<b>947,357.15</b>

<sup>3</sup> JRM (2011) '7<sup>th</sup> Joint Review Mission Record', p. 6.

## FINAL

It now appears that some activities under other Components (see **Annex D**) remain uncompleted. As the Government was successful in mobilizing additional funds to cover the civil works cost overrun, this fundraising – linked with a range of uncompleted activities – has resulted in ESP II fund under-utilization overall. At the time of the JRM, unutilized funds total approximately \$4.79 million from CFA funds, and \$0.947 million under the parallel financing.

MESC had submitted a list of remaining activities yet to be undertaken during the extension period, which will partially utilize these funds (see **Annex E** and further discussion below, under the sub-section ‘Proposed Utilization of Remaining Loan and Grant Funds’).

### **Project Financial Management**

MESC’s submission of withdrawal application requests could be further fast-tracked to show efficient utilization of SPA and loan funds. It was noted that expenditures as far back as 2009 have just been included in WA No. 28, which has recently been sent to ADB. Also the December and January 2013 expenditures are still being put together, when this could have been done much earlier.

It was noted that the Project Accountant still uses a spreadsheet with “revised allocations per category” that have not been approved by the DPs. A copy of the latest downloaded allocation per category and other financial data were provided for reference and guidance. In order to reconcile MOF/MESC records with ADB’s actual commitments and disbursements, the Project Accountant was requested to refer to the ADB’s Loan and Grant Financial Information Services for official project financial management accounting and monitoring information. This will facilitate reconciliation between the Bank, MESC and MoF.

### **Special Purpose Account (SPA)**

Balance available in the SPA as of end February 2013 is \$2.99 million. A copy of the latest bank statement was provided to the JRM, and is at **Annex F**. Development Partners requested MOF to provide a reconciled statement of the utilization of the SPA account.

### **Proposed Utilization of Remaining Loan and Grant Funds**

MESC had identified the remaining project activities for the extension period and submitted a list of planned utilization of uncommitted loan and grant funds, amounting to about \$3.62 million, details are provided at **Annex E**. As soon as the list is finalized and confirmed, ADB will initiate the following actions:

- (i) reallocation of loan/grant funds to align costs required per category; and
- (ii) officialise the contract awards and disbursement projections in **Annex G** to reflect activities and fund requirements for the extension period.

### **Audited Project Financial Report**

ADB’s comments on review of the audited project financial report was shared with MOF who will take up with MESC the audit findings, recommendations, and required follow on actions.

## **B. MONITORING & EVALUATION**

The state of monitoring and evaluation remains a major area of concern. To date, we do not have one consolidated M&E framework for ESP II, and we have little to no data for higher level outcome achievements. DPs have repeatedly emphasized the importance of tracking learning outcome indicators for all students, not just deficit model reduction of “at risk” students achievement. Baseline, targets, and achievements for each year – for all years over the life of the project – should be tracked. The use of digest – or context – indicators may reveal trends, but it is difficult to know this unless they are shown in the M&E framework.



## FINAL

As noted in the September 2011 JRM Record, “an annual joint review is appropriate for overall oversight by partners but its effectiveness as a review mechanism will depend on a focused sector monitoring system being put in place... [T]o maximize the opportunities...will require that GoS are able to report on firstly, gains against key policy objectives rather than on processes and inputs, and secondly, the direction and main content of sector plans and their anticipated costs for the following year”<sup>4</sup>.

This JRM found a continued focus on processes, inputs and outputs, with a limited outcomes orientation. This observation is reinforced by the Situational Analysis underpinning the Education Sector Plan:

Investment in the development of an M&E framework for the ESP II has not been returned as it has been neglected in the main by the component heads of the ESP II in their reports to the Education steering Committee...The development of an M & E Framework for the whole sector as part of the Policy Support program Design is imperative and the three stakeholders (MESC, SQA and NUS) must collaboratively engage to produce such an M & E framework<sup>5</sup>.

The JRM team learned that a higher level M&E framework was being developed as part of the Education Sector Plan. The M&E framework remains in draft, and is only partly integrated with the Sector Plan. The M&E framework and the MTEF need to be integral parts of the Education Sector Plan, and need to be presented for formal GoS approvals as a single, inter-linked document. As it remains in draft, the JRM team did not review the M&E framework in detail.

A focal area for discussion, however, was the calculation of learning outcomes over time, as this is highly relevant to assessing the impact of ESP II from 2006 to the end of the extension period. Per the M&E framework developed by consultant Dr. Guild, the learning outcome indicators are 20% improvement in Year 8 examinations, which is a problematic indicator for several reasons: 1) the Year 8 exam has been replaced by a new assessment (SPECA) developed under Component 1. However, this assessment will be implemented for Year 8 for the first time in 2013 on students who have not experienced the new curriculum. Therefore, only in end of 2014 will the project obtain some understanding of the impact of the new curriculum and teacher training, as reflected by SPECA results. Other ways to gauge learning outcomes might be the SPELL examinations but it is unclear whether these would serve the purpose well.

In particular, **the JRM recommends further development of the learning outcome baseline and target information under Goal 1 (Quality) of the Education Sector Plan.** Baseline information, for instance, should extend beyond an identification of ‘at risk’ students, to include information on students who are meeting and exceeding identified standards (e.g. in the SPELL tests at Years 4 and 6, if the SPELL is a valid and reliable assessment instrument<sup>6</sup>). All baseline and target information should be disaggregated (e.g. gender, rural/urban, type of school, socio-economic status, disability) and should provide intermediary targets to 2016 (end date for the Sector Plan).

The DPs would welcome the opportunity to comment on the M&E framework (and the Education Sector Plan as a whole) as it reaches a draft final stage.

While original responsibilities for M&E were housed within the PPRD, the unit appears more concerned with research than monitoring and evaluation activities. Activity level monitoring was moved to the ESP II Secretariat who reportedly coordinates with PPRD on digest indicators. The

---

<sup>4</sup> JRM (2011) Seventh JRM, p. 10. Emphasis added.

<sup>5</sup> MESC (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016 (Version 16), p. 65.

<sup>6</sup> See MESC (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016 (Version 16), p. 60, which questions whether SPELL is a valid or reliable survey tool.

## FINAL

overall system is not efficient, and questions remain as to why PPRD is not handling the monitoring responsibilities when it appears to have more expertise in this area.

The team also noted the intention for the ESP II Secretariat to lead on outcomes-based reporting in the extension phase. **The JRM team recommends that PPRD leads all monitoring and evaluation functions for MESC, consistent with its policy and planning mandate.** The ESP II Secretariat may provide support to PPRD, but an immediate move to PPRD leadership of M&E functions (and related analytical work to inform evidence-based planning) is essential for sustainability and to lock in institutional capacities. The JRM team suggests that MESC consider additional TA needs to build sustainable M&E capacity, in the context of the capacity building that has been provided thus far under ESP II.

The (draft) Education Sector Plan notes that the (to be established) Sector Coordination Unit will lead on M&E in the future<sup>7</sup>. There should be no expectation for the Sector Coordination Unit to take on M&E functions in the near term, as only the Sector Coordinator role (out of a proposed Unit team of 6 members) has been approved by the Public Service Commission. **The JRM recommends that the EAC/ESAC should formally review the Education Sector Plan proposal that the Sector Coordination Unit should serve as M&E lead, only at such time that the Sector Coordination Unit is fully staffed.**

After seven years of investment, the focus on learning outcomes must be a primary focus now. On the ground monitoring of teachers and schools must be a higher priority now too, by MESC staff as well as DP staff, including during monitoring missions. The DPs own monitoring of ESP II progress may be short-sighted if they rely only on reports during brief JRM meetings at headquarters. In the future, JRM visits should include discussions with beneficiaries and schools in order to verify what is happening on the ground.

This is the moment to really focus on monitoring of ESP II and to learn and understand how the various initiatives are impacting schools and ultimately student learning.

### C. PROCUREMENT

Procurement issues fall within two areas: 1) ADBs procurement requirements were not followed and caused some delays; and 2) GoS own internal bureaucracy around procurement which, compounded by lack of human resources in this area, is of grave concern.

The Mission team was informed that MESC has been having difficulties in securing GoS approval for various matters related to procurement, including bid evaluation, awarding of contract, and contract variation. It was also informed that several government committees or agencies are involved in reviewing procurement matters including the Tender Board, the Variation Committee, and the Attorney General's office, while the procedural flow, the authorization structure, or delegation of authorization depending on procurement package sizes were not made clear to the Mission.

The Variation Committee was recently created by GoS under the revised procedures for approving contract variation more than 10%. While this revised procedure may be appreciated in the spirit of good governance, in the case of Schoolnet project, this is creating further delays by two months in an already delayed environment. The path to seeking exceptions to this process for high priority “at risk” projects is unclear. It appears that there is need of streamlining and simplifying government procurement procedures so that the procedures and parties involved in reviewing the procurement matters and the authorization given to each party is clear to the public.

---

<sup>7</sup> MESC (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016 (Version 16), p. 43.

#### D. HUMAN RESOURCES/CAPACITY

The lack of human resources and capacity is a very real factor in the inability to move quickly on most all matters.

Secretariat staff There are reportedly 3 or 4 vacancies within the Assets Management Unit of the Secretariat. In effect, there is no one working on Assets Management or managing procurement and contracts currently. The result is that all the work of the Secretariat fall on the shoulders of one person.

There is a real risk that the remaining work under ESP II may not be properly completed if there is not sufficient attention paid to these debilitating human resource shortages. The question arises as to how additional human resources can quickly be deployed to support this final push to completion and movement to sector support. **The JRM team recommends that national consultants be recruited immediately to fill the following positions within the Secretariat:**

- **Assets Management Unit**
- **Monitoring and evaluation**
- **Financial Management.**

The ESP II Coordinator noted challenges in attracting and retaining staff in the Secretariat. This is exacerbated by the lack of employment contracts for Secretariat staff, meaning that these non-ongoing positions do not provide contractual certainty to employees. This situation is problematic, and needs to be addressed by Corporate Services Division (CSD), with CEO engagement. **The JRM team recommends that non-ongoing positions need to be reviewed, to ensure that terms and conditions are consistent with relevant GoS regulations.**

Sector Coordinator The JRM team were informed that the Sector Coordinator position has been advertised for the second time. It is expected that the Sector Coordinator will provide a critical liaison function between MESC, NUS and SQA, particularly as the Education Sector Plan comes on-stream.

As noted above, only the Sector Coordinator role (out of a proposed Unit team of 6 members) has been approved by the Public Service Commission. As such, caution is necessary around the expectations for this role, and what a single person can achieve. Of particular relevance to ESP II, **the JRM team strongly recommends that the ESP II Coordinator role and the Sector Coordinator role must both be filled.** It is unrealistic to expect that the Sector Coordinator can easily subsume the more than full-time responsibilities of the ESP II Coordinator, while taking on the inter-agency coordination functions and other related duties.

Staff gaps MESC noted a number of staffing gaps. Some relate to normal recruitment processes, while other positions await approval by the Public Sector Commission (PSC).

The mission team was informed that the MESC 'Proposed Organisation Structure' has been with the PSC since March 2012<sup>8</sup>. However, the mission team was also told that the MESC CEO is considering a review of the organisation structure, which may affect the version provided to the PSC. In either case, a lack of finalisation on the MESC organisation structure is impacting on recruitments, meaning that the Ministry is: (a) carrying a number of vacancies; and (b) cannot take action on proposed positions.

Carrying staffing gaps has a direct effect on Ministry effectiveness, with a related impact on ESP II. As such, **the JRM recommends that the MESC CEO takes immediate action to resolve the issues associated with staffing gaps and recruitment.**

---

<sup>8</sup> MESC 'Proposed Organisation Structure'. Sent to PSC on 14 March 2012.

## FINAL

Making best use of existing staff To successfully complete ESP II and to move to whole of sector planning (as per the Education Sector Plan), MESC staff must perform functions appropriate to their role. MESC has several advantages here: (a) there is a clear hierarchy of public service grades<sup>9</sup>; (b) each grade is defined by generic Role Descriptions; (c) each position is defined by a Job Description.

MESC also faces challenges. Due to staff gaps, uneven capacity and inefficient delegation, some staff find themselves over-loaded. Senior staff undertake administrative tasks best performed by Officers, are saddled with additional duties and risk burn-out.

We need to be realistic about just how much can be accomplished under limited human resources. There is a need for a higher level of Ministry management commitment and oversight of staff, including on staff attendance, equity in workload across staff persons, and ensuring delegation or outsourcing of work where appropriate. Addressing the human resource issue for the short term must be prioritized in order for ESP II to succeed in the final extension phase.

There is a way forward. MESC is a pilot Ministry for the PSC-coordinated Performance Appraisal System. With similarities to the Minimum Service Standards for Teacher Competencies, the Performance Appraisal System is a mechanism to assess the performance of duties against a Job Description and an agreed work plan. Properly implemented, managed and reviewed, a Performance Appraisal System can achieve a clearer distribution of duties linked to roles, with integrated sanctions and rewards.

**To achieve a more efficient use of existing MESC staff, the JRM team recommends that the CEO immediately puts into practice the Performance Appraisal System pilot, with a clearly identified process, implementation timeline and assignment of coordination responsibility (e.g. CSD).**

### E. SECTOR GOVERNANCE

MESC requires effective leadership to steer ESP II to successful completion. As such, the JRM team was concerned by the absence of the MESC CEO, despite a rescheduling of the mission dates to accommodate the CEO.

Role of ESP II Secretariat The JRM team was impressed by the quality of work presented by the ESP II Secretariat, and the highly professional engagement of the ESP II Coordinator throughout the mission.

The reliance of MESC Core Executive on the proper functioning of the ESP II Secretariat was manifestly evident. This therefore presents capacity and sustainability risks, as: (a) non-going Secretariat staff members seek more secure employment as the end of the extension phase approaches; and (b) when the ESP II Secretariat is dis-established at the end of the extension phase.

**As a matter of priority, the JRM team recommends that the MESC Core Executive plan for the closure of ESP II in December 2014, to ensure that institutional structures and staff capacity are in place to maintain the proper functioning of MESC services.**

Informal Meetings between GoS and the DPs The partners noted that the ESP II Informal Meetings are held on a monthly basis, and represent an effective means of discussing implementation progress and challenges. JICA's participation in the JRM process (and attendance at Informal Meetings) is simply an indication of the broader partnerships in the education sector. As the (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016 represents a total conceptualisation of the education sector (from Early Childhood Education through to Lifelong Learning), **the JRM recommends that the monthly Informal Meetings of the ESP II partners is transformed into a broad membership GoS-DP Education Sector Working Group.**

---

<sup>9</sup> These are: CEO; Assistant CEO; Principal Education Officer; Senior Education Officer; Officer; Casual.

## FINAL

Education Sector Working Groups are efficient mechanisms to conduct regular (monthly) dialogue between government (MESC, NUS, SQA), public and private stakeholders (e.g. representatives of private and church schools), Civil Society Organisations, parent/student/community representatives and DPs (bilateral and multilateral). This group should represent all parts of the sector as identified in the Education Sector Plan (ECE to Lifelong learning), and encompass cross-cutting issues such as inclusive education. As part of the Education Sector Plan consultation process, GoS has already mapped education stakeholders: this mapping could be used to identify a manageably sized (e.g. 20 member) and representative grouping to discuss sector issues.

The move to an Education Sector Working Group structure would reinforce the whole of sector GoS vision as set out in the Education Sector Plan, while allowing for regular dialogue on ESP II implementation as a sub-set of sectoral activities. Once established, **it is recommended that 2-3 development partners are represented on the Education Sector Advisory Council.**

Education Advisory Committee and planned Education Sector Advisory Council The JRM considered the functioning of the Education Advisory Committee (EAC). As noted in the September 2011 JRM Record, a “key challenge for GoS is to raise the value of the Education Advisory Committee (Education Advisory Committee) to the sector...the Education Advisory Committee serves more as a forum to which the ESP component heads report progress and issues, rather than as a body that considers policy issues”<sup>10</sup>. This appears to be an ongoing issue.

As proposed by the (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016, the EAC will evolve into the Education Sector Advisory Council (ESAC), in recognition of the whole of sector scope of the proposed Plan. This planning is summarised under Education Sector Plan Goal 4: Improved Sector co-ordination of research, policy and planning development, specifically “Articulation of the education sector governance structure: Roles and functions of the Education Sector Advisory Council (ESAC)”<sup>11</sup>.

The appropriate functioning of the ESAC, with a clear mandate, governance purpose, oversight roles, control functions, reach and boundaries will be critical to the effective implementation of the Education Sector Plan. Its scope will extend across the whole education sector and its various stakeholders, with direct implications on the ESP II extension phase. In support of the establishment of the ESAC, **the JRM recommends that technical assistance requirements to support the establishment of the emergent ESAC should be identified.**

The technical support (e.g. facilitated workshop) could focus on determining effective governance models, strategies for practically identifying and addressing higher order reforms, multi-partner accountability, clarifying mandates, inter alia. The outcome would be a GoS-developed ESAC ToRs, with clearly identified roles, functions, membership and relationships with other entities.

Education Sector Plan At the time of the JRM, the jointly owned (MESC, NUS, SQA) Education Sector Plan remained in draft, as did the closely related MTEF and M&E framework. MoF reminded the education partners about the imminent budget deadlines for FY2013-14, and the necessity for a finalised Education Sector Plan – underpinned by an MTEF and M&E framework – to justify budget bids. The relationship to the ESP II extension is clear. Therefore, **the JRM team recommends that the Education Sector Plan (with an integrated MTEF and M&E framework) needs to be completed and progressed for Minister/Cabinet approval as a matter of urgency.**

---

<sup>10</sup> JRM (2011) Seventh JRM, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> MESC (draft) Education Sector Plan 2012-2016 (Version 16), p. 43.

#### IV. NEXT STEPS

##### A. NEXT JRM

A JRM should be scheduled for early 2014, to coincide with a key point in the MESC planning cycle (e.g. budget preparation and Annual Operational Planning for FY2014-15, with associated analysis of performance reporting). As the extension period is scheduled to end in December 2014, it may be necessary to conduct a second mission in late 2014.

##### B. ESP II PROGRAM COMPLETION REVIEW

A joint Program Completion Review needs to be conducted within twelve months of ESP II completion (i.e. by December 2015). The partners, led by the Coordinating Development Partner (C-DP), need to determine a single approach that will meet each organisation's requirements for an end of program review. A finalised approach needs to be decided by JRM 2014, and endorsed by all the partners.

##### C. POST-ESP II PLANNING

To ensure readiness for the partnership environment following the anticipated completion of ESP II in December 2014, a series of processes are expected to roll out in 2013 and 2014.

If endorsed by the Minister/Cabinet, the Education Sector Plan 2013-2016 – with its in-built MTEF and M&E framework – will be the guidance document for all education sector activities. All DPs will be expected to align with the Goals, Strategies and intended Outcomes of the Sector Plan. As a result, the proposed Education Sector Working Group will be an important GoS/DP coordination mechanism, while providing a forum to strengthen DP harmonisation. The planned ESAC will provide governance oversight of the sector. The MTEF and M&E framework will be critical to mutual accountability.

Therefore, the application of aid effectiveness principles will be central to shaping partnerships under the Education Sector Plan. A range of funding modalities may be in place, thus enabling the engagement of all DPs in a government-owned and coordinated sector.

GoS has indicated an interest in progressing towards sector budget support, and a sub-set of DPs have indicated a willingness to investigate further. Under ESP II, DPs already align with a large number of GoS systems and processes. To move towards sector budget support, and to more generally strengthen the operations of the Samoan education system, it is expected that the following areas need to be prioritised in 2013-2014:

- Analysis of the Education Sector Plan, MTEF and M&E framework as robust planning, implementation and reporting tools<sup>12</sup>
- Procurement systems – an independent review was undertaken in 2012<sup>13</sup>, providing recommendations and a roadmap towards increased alignment
- Public finance management – as above, an independent review was undertaken in 2012<sup>14</sup>, providing recommendations and a roadmap towards increased alignment
- M&E framework and results-based reporting – the sector M&E framework remains in draft, and results-based reporting will be demonstrated over time
- Evidence-based budget preparation and Annual Operational Planning – as drawn from the Education Sector Plan, and reviewed by the ESAC, MoF and DPs.

The DPs look forward to working with MESC and other sector partners including MoF to identify a clearly defined list of measures and essential actions, to provide a roadmap towards sector budget

<sup>12</sup> The scoping design of the Education Sector Support Program provides many useful insights, and issues for consideration.

<sup>13</sup> 'Assessment of the Education Sector's Public Procurement Systems of Samoa' (May 2012).

<sup>14</sup> 'Assessment of the Education Sector's Public Financial Management Systems of Samoa' (May 2012).

## FINAL

support. Such a roadmap should be milestone based (e.g. a given system is positively reviewed as meeting fiduciary standards) rather than time-bound (e.g. a given DP will move to sector budget support on a specified date). Therefore, it may be necessary to prepare alternative modality choices, ready to be put in practice in January 2015.

### V. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS – PRIORITY ACTION PLAN

RECOMMENDATION/ACTION	PRIORITY	STAFF
<b>MESC Human Resource/Capacity</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>MESC CEO takes immediate action to resolve the issues associated with staffing gaps, recruitment and staff performance</i></b></li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	MESC CEO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To achieve a more efficient use of existing MESC staff, the CEO immediately implements the Performance Appraisal System pilot, with a clearly identified process, implementation timeline and assignment of coordination responsibility</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	MESC CEO and CORE CSD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit, hire and train Quality Assurance Staff</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit and hire Assessment technical staff</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	CMAD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage International Technical Assistance (ITA) to support the Technical Assessment Unit</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend Secretariat staff contracts until end of extension period</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All non-ongoing positions need to be reviewed, to ensure that terms and conditions are consistent with relevant GoS regulations</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	CSD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that ESP II Coordinator role and the Sector Coordinator role are both filled through the extension period</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	CSD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New cohort of Teacher Mentors needs to be trained</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend contracts for Core Trainers for 7 months</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment of Quality Assurers (QAs) to support implementation of the NTDF, in particular for the teacher performance appraisal system</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit and hire National Consultants to boost Secretariat's ability to accomplish all responsibilities during final phase. Fill vacancies in the Secretariat, especially those in:</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assets Management Unit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC

**FINAL**

<b>RECOMMENDATION/ACTION</b>	<b>PRIORITY</b>	<b>STAFF</b>
○ Monitoring and Evaluation	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
○ Financial Management	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
<b>Activities not in work plan</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secretariat coordinates review and discussion across Divisions of confirmed financial statements and activities planned for extension. Secretariat informs ADB and DPs and confirms final work plan.</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC ALL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPRD and CMAD coordinate to enhance SEN so that it IDs link to assessment scores</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	PPRD CMAD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CMAD and SOD support teachers in bilingual curriculum implementation by identifying exactly what should be taught in Samoan and what should be taught in English across all subjects.</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	CMAD SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPRD to conduct and disseminate analyses of education sector data, to provide an evidence-basis for policy planning, Annual Operational Plan prioritization and budget preparation</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	PPRD
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize M&amp;E Framework based on Dr. Guild's draft and include actual achievements on indicators with a focus on outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As part of the Education Sector Plan, further development of the learning outcome baseline and target information under Goal 1 (Quality) of the Education Sector Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	PPRD SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EAC/ESAC should formally review the Education Sector Plan proposal that the Sector Coordination Unit should serve as M&amp;E lead, only at such time that the Sector Coordination Unit is fully staffed</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	EAC and EAC Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure all ADB DMF indicators are in M&amp;E framework</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	PPRD SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPRD leads all monitoring and evaluation functions for MESC, consistent with its policy and planning mandate</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	MESC CORE EXEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MESC Division heads and staff need to get out into the schools to understand the implementation rollout at the field level</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	ALL
<b>Financial Management</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reconcile Integration of Financial statements between MESC, MOF, and ADB systems</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	MOF



**FINAL**

<b>RECOMMENDATION/ACTION</b>	<b>PRIORITY</b>	<b>STAFF</b>
<b>Sector Governance</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Education Sector Plan (with an integrated MTEF and M&amp;E framework) needs to be completed and progressed for Minister/Cabinet approval, to meet the FY2013-14 budget cycle</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	MESC, NUS, SQA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress on the Priority Action Plan needs to be formally reviewed by the EAC at its quarterly meeting</li> </ul>	Ongoing	MESC, EAC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical assistance requirements to support the establishment of the emergent ESAC should be identified</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	EAC and ESP II Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The monthly Informal Meetings of the ESP II partners is transformed into a broad membership GoS-DP Education Sector Working Group                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If agreed, C-DP will coordinate the development of the ESWG ToRs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	ALL C-DP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2-3 development partners are represented on the Education Sector Advisory Council, drawn from the Education Sector Working Group</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	ESAC and ESWG
<b>SchoolNet</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MESC leadership is requested to ensure Schoolnet accelerates</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	CEO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Package 1 procurement processed</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Package 2 procurement processed</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WAN Connectivity procurement processed</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coaches need to be extended until such time that the MESC makes a formal determination on the sustainable means to institutionalize e-learning support to schools</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement specialist recruited and hired</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	RTI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultant Management Coordinator needed following end of RTI Contract</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultant Structural Engineer needed following end of RTI Contract</li> </ul>	within three months of receipt of the final Aide Memoire	SEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain formal agreement between Schoolnet and CMAD and SOD</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	SEC CMAD SOD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Socialize idea of returning technology-focused JICA</li> </ul>	within six months of	SEC

**FINAL**

<b>RECOMMENDATION/ACTION</b>	<b>PRIORITY</b>	<b>STAFF</b>
volunteers as done in pilot	receipt of final Aide Memoire	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For sustainability, the Education Sector Plan (and other associated documents, e.g. MESC organizational plan) need to specify a Divisional lead on ICT</li> <li>ICT staff will need to be recruited within MESC, to develop and carry forward a strategic ICT vision across the school system</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	Core Exec
<b>Extension of ESP II</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loan Extension should be processed by ADB as soon as finances and activities are finalized.</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	ADB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant Extension should be processed by ADB as soon as finances and activities are finalized.</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	ADB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AusAID and NZAID should submit formal letter to ADB and GoS regarding their formal approval of extension of ESP II for 1.5 years closing December 2014 (Activities ending October 2014).</li> <li>DPs will work together to make any amendments to the CFA, as may be required.</li> </ul>	within one month of receipt of the Final Aide Memoire	AUSAID NZAID
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of JICA funds is limited to civil works only. If the Sagaga Secondary School construction is cancelled, JICA requires immediate notice, and would need to conduct discussions with MoF and MESC to determine eligible reallocations under the conditions of the MoU</li> </ul>	If necessary	JICA, MoF, MESC
<b>Monitoring</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPs must commit to conduct annual JRMs, to coincide with a key point in the MESC planning cycle (e.g. budget preparation and Annual Operational Planning for FY2014-15, with associated analysis of performance reporting). High level MESC staff presence is essential. Many surprises that were discovered during this JRM could have been mitigated if a 2012 JRM had been conducted in September 2012, as originally planned.</li> </ul>	Long-term	AUSAID NZAID JICA ADB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPs must also monitor. Locally based DPs can try to visit schools. Future JRM schedule must include visits to schools. JRM members should talk with beneficiaries and stakeholders inside and outside the GoS to gain varied perspectives on project progress.</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	AUSAID NZAID JICA ADB
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ADB must revise and update Schoolnet DMF and ensure Secretariat/PPRD to integrate changes into final ESP II</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide	ADB SEC

**FINAL**

RECOMMENDATION/ACTION	PRIORITY	STAFF
M&E Framework.	Memoire	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress on this Priority Action Plan needs to be actively managed and updated at least monthly, and should feature in the agenda of the Informal Working Group and/or the GoS-DP Education Sector Working Group (when established)</li> <li>Progress on this Priority Action Plan needs to be formally reviewed by GoS and DPs every three months</li> </ul>	Ongoing	MESC and DPs
<b>Forward Planning</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MESC Core Executive plan for the closure of ESP II in December 2014, to ensure that institutional structures and staff capacity are in place to maintain the proper functioning of MESC services</li> </ul>	within six months of receipt of final Aide Memoire	MESC CORE

Signed (Confirmation of Record)

1305 Wsu 15 May 2013  
Name Peseta No 100000 Sini Date

ADB Chini Thondeu Chini Thondeu  
Name Date 8 May 2013

Anthony Standard *AS*  
Name Date 8 May 2015

JICA Hiroshi Kawabata 川畑博司  
Name Date 10 May 2013

NZ MFAT Kathryn Panton   
Name Date 9 May 2013

## **Samoa Education Sector Project II**

### **Joint Review Mission**

#### **Terms of Reference**

**11 – 15 March 2013**

#### **Background**

On 29 May 2006, the Government of Samoa (GoS), ADB, AusAID and NZAID (the development partners – DPs) jointly signed a Partner Harmonization Framework (PHF) committing themselves to working together as partners in a six year, USD \$30 million program in support of the education sector in Samoa. The PHF also commits the four parties to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and to corresponding principles, and their application to cooperation in the education sector. In particular the PHF commits the parties to adopt one set of planning and implementation documents, with harmonized or joint formats and processes for sector program reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

The DPs have also signed two documents that provide the detailed legal, institutional, and financial arrangements required to support ESP II: the Consolidated Funding Arrangement (CFA) – the four partners are signatories; and the Loan Agreement (ADB Loan No. 2220 – SAM) – GoS and ADB are signatories. Further, GoS signed an agreement with ADB in 2007 for the inclusion of a two-phase Schoolnet program (ADB Grant 0097) for all secondary schools in Samoa. This program was integrated into ESP II in 2009.

Among the provisions of the CFA is the requirement that Joint Review Missions (JRM) will be held at least annually. A Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the program was conducted in October 2009. The first phase of the MTR was an independent appraisal, which was later joined by DP specialists to further review the activities with a particular focus on the structural aspects of the review and their sustainability into the second half of the program and into the future. A financial analysis was undertaken by an ADB specialist in the latter part of the MTR. To date, seven JRMs have been held, the latest from 19 – 23 September 2011.

The September 2011 JRM record noted that ‘good progress has been made in all areas of the project and GoS and its DPs are confident that the project can reach successful completion in December 2012. However, there were a number of outstanding issues that required close attention and regarded as critical for the project – including usage of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework; progress on Schoolnet implementation and sustainability; and timely completion of civil works contracts. Subsequently, a formal extension has been requested by Government of Samoa of the ESP II/Schoolnet projects which were originally due to be completed on 30 December 2012, the physical completion date as in the CFA.

The new proposed close date for ESP II/Schoolnet will be December 31, 2014 with activities under ESP II/SchoolNet ending by October 31, 2014. Details of the extension will be considered further by the review team as well as the need to conduct subsequent monitoring and reporting on activities until the end of activities period (October 31, 2014).

With the broader program being designed, the JRM will necessarily focus on assessing overall achievements, any key implementation issues to completion, and the key strategies for sustainability and transition to the new program. The JRM will focus on the way forward with a specific look at

## FINAL

using the ESP II as the mechanism to deliver critical interventions that will be necessary to support the move to budget support. In doing so, the JRM must review what has been achieved to date and identify what is outstanding and need to be addressed in the immediate future.

### Mission Objectives

The mission has four main objectives:

- (v) Assess overall progress of ESP II and review any outstanding issues of importance and recommend strategies to address these issues;
- (vi) Review the extension agreement between the DPs and GoS and reach agreement with Government of Samoa on completing the goals and objectives of ESP II and using the ESP II extension as the vehicle to transition to the new education program;
- (vii) Clarify activities for the extension of ESP II and ensure there is a robust results focused plan for program completion;
- (viii) Determine an agreed approach for conducting a joint Program Completion Review.

### Mission Tasks

1. For the full ESP II period, review in broad terms the program's implementation, financing and impact. The JRM team will:
  - a. Review progress made in the implementation of ESP II, specifically the major achievements of objectives and key performance indicators.
  - b. Assess and summarise what the data (monitoring information) says about progress to date and as a result record clearly any shortfalls in M&E.
  - c. Determine and provide recommendations to address any outstanding issues of importance to the Education Advisory Committee, MESC or a specific DP.
2. In addition to the above, primarily to identify lessons learnt, as specific inputs to the Aide Memoire the team will:
  - a. Assess progress in implementing (and costing/budgeting) the National Teachers Development Framework.
  - b. Report ESP II expenditures and procurement by component (state to end of project).
  - c. Discuss the timeliness and quality of the Quarterly Statements of Expenditure and the QPPRs.
3. Determine which interventions are best supported through the ESP II extension and how they will be designed/framed, managed, monitored and financed.
4. Reach agreement on a robust results framework for 2013 and 2014.

## FINAL

5. Review the status of the Sector Plan and MTEF costings in the context of the ESP II extension and post-ESP II planning.

### Joint Review Mission Team

The Joint Review Mission Team will include representatives of the Government of Samoa and the three development partners.

GoS:	Peseta Noumea Simi
ADB:	Chimi Thonden, Susan Francisco & Mr Shigehiko Muramoto
NZAP:	Richard Crichton & Karen Punivalu
JICA:	Ms Sato Umino & Hiroshi Kawabata
AusAID:	David Coleman, Leota Valma Galuvao & Kate Wiencke

AusAID, as current Coordinating Development Partner, will coordinate Review Mission planning, in liaison with GoS. Individual team member's tasks will be agreed (once the team is better defined) and confirmed during a team meeting scheduled for the morning of 11 March 2013.

A tentative meeting schedule will be circulated on 18<sup>th</sup> February. The ESP II Secretariat will compile relevant documentation for the mission and circulate these (electronically where feasible) no later than 4 March 2013.

A Joint Review Record will be drafted and discussed with GoS representatives prior to mission members departing Samoa. The final Joint Review Record will be signed by a representative of each of the four partners.

**ESP II Joint Review Mission Schedule 11 – 15 March 2013**

<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Mission members</b>	<b>Venue</b>
<b>Sunday 10 March</b>			
4.00 pm	Mission team meets to discuss mission planning	AusAID, ADB	Tusitala Hotel
<b>Monday 11 March</b>			
8.30 am	Mission team meets to finalise schedule, ToR and review documentation	All	MoF Level 3 Conf room
10.00 am	Mission team meets with Development Partners	All	MoF Level 3 Conf room
11.00 am	Meet with MESC Acting Chief Executive Officer, Core Executive	All	Aute Conference Room
1.00 pm	Meet with ESP II Component Managers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Component 1 (1-2pm)</li> <li>• Component 2 (2-3pm)</li> <li>• Component 4 (3-4pm)</li> </ul>	All	Aute Conference Room
<b>Tuesday 12 March</b>			
9.00 am	Meeting with ESP II Component Managers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Component 3 (9 – 10)</li> <li>• Component 5 (10 – 11)</li> <li>• Component 6 (11 – 12)</li> </ul>	All	Aute Conference Room
1.30 pm	Meet with Education Advisory Committee	All	Aute Conference Room
2.30 pm	Meet with Ministry of Finance		Aute Conference Room
3.30 pm	Meet with SchoolNet Team	All	Aute Conference Room
4.30 pm	Team meeting to discuss findings	All	Aute Conference Room

**FINAL**

<b>Wednesday 13 March</b>			
9.00 am	Team meeting	All	Tusitala Hotel
11.00 am	Discuss the development and next steps for the Education Sector Plan, MTEF and M&E Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SQA</li> <li>• NUS</li> <li>• MESC</li> <li>• KVA consultants (MTEF)</li> </ul>	All	Aute Conference Room
1.00 pm	Discuss MESC progress on Recommendations from last JRM	All	Aute Conference Room
2.00 pm	Follow-up meetings with MESC personnel	Different meetings	MESC
<b>Thursday 14 March</b>			
9.00 am	Meeting with PINZ team	All	Aute Conference Room
10.30 am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional meetings if required</li> <li>• Report writing</li> </ul>	All	
<b>Friday 15 March</b>			
9.00 am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional meetings if required</li> <li>• Report Writing</li> </ul>	All	Aute Conference Room
10.00 am	SchoolNet MoU signing	ADB, MoF and MESC	Aute Conference Room
11.00 am	Draft final Joint Review Record sent to MESC	Review team	
2.00 pm	Presentation of key findings	All	Aute Conference Room
6.00 pm	End of mission social function	All	Samoa Fale, MESC



**List of Persons Met**

Quandolita Enari	ACEO Policy Planning and Research Division (PPRD)
Maimoana Petaia	ACEO School Operations Division
Sina Malietoa	ACEO, Culture Division
Polataivao Manutagi Tiotio	ACEO, Corporate Services
Seumanu Gauna Wong	Principal Education Officer, Curriculum Materials & Assessment Division (CMAD)
Fa’aea Roache	Principal Education Officer, Curriculum Materials & Assessment Division
Rosemarie Esera	ESP II/SchoolNet Coordinator
Salima Lasalo	Principal Education Officer, PPRD
Lealaolesau Fitu	Principal Education Officer, PPRD
Saleaula Reti	Education Officer, CMAD
Tailetai Falega	ESP II Secretariat, Project Officer
Enoka Enoka	ESP II Secretariat, Project Accountant
Faaso’o Ieti Ngg Cho	MESC Asset Manager
Safuneitu’uga N. Fepulea’i	Chair, Education Advisory Committee (EAC)
Dr Letuimanu’asina E. Vaai	NUS Deputy Vice Chancellor/ EAC
Tepora Afamasaga Wright	ACEO, Samoa Qualifications Authority (SQA)
Easter Manila	ACEO, SQA
Nevin Taufaga	JICA
Notiaki Nakamoto	JICA
Pete Zwart	NZAP
Anthony Stannard	AusAID
Ali’imuamua Esekia Solofa	School Net Consultant
Hitendra Pillay	School Net Consultant
Werner Kappus	School Net Consultant

**FINAL**

Professor Le'apai Asofou So'o	Vice Chancellor, NUS
Maeva B. Va'ai	World Bank/ADB Liaison Officer
Audrey Brown-Pereira	KVA Consult Ltd
Richard Gonzales	PINZ Consultants – Team Leader

**FINAL**

**Annex D**

Loan No. 2220(ADB)/Grants 0031(AusAID)/0032(NZAid)

**Available Funds per Cost Category** (as of 02Mar2013 - Mainframe Download) in US\$

Cat No	Category Name	Loan No. 2220-SAM				Grant 0031			Grant 0032		Availa ble Amount	GoS			Total (CFA Parties)		
		SDR Allocation	USD Value as of 02Mar201 3	Commit ments	Available Amount	Allocat ion	Commit ments	Available Amount	Allocatio n	Commit ments		Allocat ion	Commit ments	Available Amount	Allocatio n	Commit ments	Available Amount
01	Civil Works	2,848,000	4,382,113	4,154,462	227,651	5,290,000	4,646,716	643,284	5,290,000	4,646,716	643,284	2,910,000	2,561,504	348,496	17,872,113	16,009,398	1,862,715
01 A	Civil Works (ADB L 84%)	758,000	1,146,687	1,159,429	(12,742)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	220,844	(220,844)	1,146,687	1,380,273	(233,586)
02 A	Equipment Vehicles	38,000	58,642	57,221	1,421	61,000	60,396	604	61,000	60,396	604	60,000	33,907	26,093	240,642	211,919	28,723
02 B	Equipment Others	562,000	853,710	325,770	527,940	1,030,000	378,235	651,765	1,030,000	378,235	651,765	550,000	206,141	343,859	3,463,710	1,288,381	2,175,329
03	Learning Materials	330,000	506,581	241,402	265,179	570,000	269,645	300,355	570,000	269,645	300,355	320,000	148,703	171,297	1,966,581	929,395	1,037,186
04	Consulting Services	795,000	1,232,552	1,237,650	(5,098)	1,400,000	1,398,247	1,753	1,400,000	1,398,247	1,753	765,000	768,408	(3,408)	4,797,552	4,802,552	(5,000)
05	Training	72,000	113,499	219,134	(105,635)	149,000	243,838	(94,838)	149,000	243,838	(94,838)	85,000	134,630	(49,630)	496,499	841,439	(344,940)
06 A	O&M: Implementa tion Mngt	21,000	32,247	12,189	20,058	40,000	1,534	38,466	40,000	1,534	38,466	20,000	2,906	17,094	132,247	18,162	114,085
06 B	O&M: Recurrent Costs	28,000	42,358	-	42,358	60,000	12,061	47,939	60,000	12,061	47,939	30,000	4,595	25,405	192,358	28,717	163,641
07	Interest Charge	203,000	309,717	-	309,717	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	309,717	-	309,717
08	Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5,655,000</b>	<b>8,678,106</b>	<b>7,407,257</b>	<b>1,270,849.00</b>	<b>8,600,000</b>	<b>7,010,671</b>	<b>1,589,328.54</b>	<b>8,600,000</b>	<b>7,010,671</b>	<b>1,589,329</b>	<b>4,740,000</b>	<b>4,081,638</b>	<b>658,362</b>	<b>30,618,106</b>	<b>25,510,238</b>	<b>5,107,868</b>
Less: Interest Charge (ADB) <u>-309717</u>															Less: Interest Charge (ADB) <u>-309717</u>		
Available for Commitment 961,132.00															Available for Commitment 4,798,151.08		

Note - Allocation for 04-Consulting Services and 05-Training were lumped in the CFA. Using the current allocation above, percentage used in the split is about 90 and 10% respectively of total alloc for these 2 categories.

## Parallel Financing for Civil Works Cost Overrun (for MOF's confirmation)

Donor	Amount (in USD)		
AusAID	1,258,040.00		
NZAID	384,498.00		
JICA	1,242,699.15		
Total Amount of Parallel Financing			
	2,885,237.15		
Less:	ST Amount	Approx USD	
Avele School	5,216,000.00	2,307,000.00	
(84% financing)		1,937,880.00	(1,937,880.00)
Balance Available			<b>947,357.15</b>

29

# FINAL

Loan No. 2220(ADB)/Grants 0031(AusAID)/0032(NZAid)/GoS																					
Overall Disbursements		(as of 02 Mar 2013) in US\$																			
		Loan No. 2220-SAM					Grant 0031				Grant 0032				GoS a/				Overall Totals		
Cat No.	Category Name	SDR Allocation	USD Value as of 02Mar2013	Commitments	Disb	%	Allocation	Commitments	Disb	%	Allocation	Commitments	Disb	%	Allocation	Commitments	Disb	%	Allocation	Commitments	Disb
			(A)	(B)	©	(C/B)															
01	Civil Works	2,848,000	4,382,113	4,154,462	3,891,962	94%	5,290,000	4,646,716	4,340,642	93%	5,290,000	4,646,716	4,340,642	93%	2,910,000	2,561,504	2,407,814	94%	17,872,113	16,009,398	14,981,060
01A	Civil Works (ADB L 84%)	758,000	1,146,687	1,159,429	-	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	220,844	-	0%	1,146,687	1,380,273	-
02A	Equipment Vehicles	38,000	58,642	57,221	57,221	100%	61,000	60,396	57,586	95%	61,000	60,396	57,586	95%	60,000	33,907	33,907	100%	240,642	211,919	206,300
02B	Equipment Others	562,000	853,710	325,770	126,724	39%	1,030,000	378,235	147,720	39%	1,030,000	378,235	147,720	39%	550,000	206,141	120,184	58%	3,463,710	1,288,381	542,349
03	Learning Materials	330,000	506,581	241,402	241,402	100%	570,000	269,645	269,645	100%	570,000	269,645	269,645	100%	320,000	148,703	148,703	100%	1,966,581	929,395	929,395
04	Consulting Services	795,000	1,232,552	1,237,650	1,052,994	85%	1,400,000	1,398,247	1,162,224	83%	1,400,000	1,398,247	1,162,224	83%	765,000	768,408	653,147	85%	4,797,552	4,802,552	4,030,589
05	Training	72,000	113,499	219,134	218,666	100%	149,000	243,838	243,372	100%	149,000	243,838	243,372	100%	85,000	134,630	134,630	100%	496,499	841,439	840,039
06A	O&M: Implementation Mngt	21,000	32,247	12,189	12,189	100%	40,000	1,534	1,534	100%	40,000	1,534	1,534	100%	20,000	2,906	2,906	100%	132,247	18,162	18,162
06B	O&M: Recurrent Costs	28,000	42,358	-	-	0%	60,000	12,061	12,061	100%	60,000	12,061	12,061	100%	30,000	4,595	4,595	100%	192,358	28,717	28,717
07	Interest Charge	203,000	309,717	-	108,312	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	-	309,717	-	108,312
08	Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	5,655,000	8,678,106	7,407,257	5,709,470	77%	8,600,000	7,010,671	6,234,784	89%	8,600,000	7,010,671	6,234,784	89%	4,740,000	4,081,638	3,505,886	86%	30,618,106	25,510,238	21,684,925
a/ breakdown of disbursement per category were based on MESC's records																					
		Total Disb	Undisbursed	Total Commts	Uncommitted																21,684,924
	2220	5,709,470	1,697,787																		
	31	6,234,784	775,887																		
	32	6,234,784	775,887																		
	GoS	3,505,886	575,752																		
		21,684,924	3,825,314	25,510,238	4,798,151.08																
			25,510,238		30,308,389.00																

## Activities with Costings for the ESP II Extension Period

(MESC Submission 14 March 2013)

		2220	0031	0032	GoS	
Activities	Est Amount in USD	26%	29%	29%	16%	Total
Extension of Core Trainers for additional 7 months	270,000	70,200	78,300.00	78,300.00	43,200.00	270,000
Extension of PINZ contract until end of the extension period	150,000	39,000	43,500.00	43,500.00	24,000.00	150,000
Additional funding for the supervisory consultant for the remaining civil works	81,000	21,060	23,490.00	23,490.00	12,960.00	81,000
Consultant/support staff in the areas of procurement and contract management	50,000	13,000	14,500.00	14,500.00	8,000.00	50,000
Consultant/support staff to post evaluation of the ESP2 Program in the area of assessment and outcomes of learning outcomes	160,000	41,600	46,400.00	46,400.00	25,600.00	160,000
Training for secondary curriculum officers and teachers (as a result of the curriculum review)	60,000	15,600	17,400.00	17,400.00	9,600.00	60,000
Printing of Samoan version of all Teachers Manuals and selected curriculum statements	100,000	26,000	29,000.00	29,000.00	16,000.00	100,000
Training on the translated manuals and curriculum statements	50,000	13,000	14,500.00	14,500.00	8,000.00	50,000
Training for primary curriculum officers	60,000	15,600	17,400.00	17,400.00	9,600.00	60,000
Support for the implementation of NTDF	250,000	65,000	72,500.00	72,500.00	40,000.00	250,000
Training of 50 teachers for the second cohort of the Fellowship Program (expected fees for Sem 1 and 2)	156,000	40,560	45,240.00	45,240.00	24,960.00	156,000
Training of 20 teachers for the second cohort of Mentors	92,000	23,920	26,680.00	26,680.00	14,720.00	92,000

	FINAL					
Teacher Registration System (inclusive of Quality Assurance)	295,000	76,700	85,550.00	85,550.00	47,200.00	295,000
Implementation Phase II of Fagaloa Community Centre (including recruitment of support staff)	280,000	72,800	81,200.00	81,200.00	44,800.00	280,000
Review, training and finalization of the new Year 8 tool	120,000	31,200	34,800.00	34,800.00	19,200.00	120,000
Implementation of initiatives to support the implementation of the bilingual policy and curriculum developments	155,000	40,300	44,950.00	44,950.00	24,800.00	155,000
Procurement of supplementary Primary readers	320,000	83,200	92,800.00	92,800.00	51,200.00	320,000
Printing of learning materials for the Item Bank system	30,000	7,800	8,700.00	8,700.00	4,800.00	30,000
Review of the secondary school curriculum (inclusive of external reviewers/writers)	70,000	18,200	20,300.00	20,300.00	11,200.00	70,000
Office equipment, materials and software for all ESP II components (Comp 5)	90,000	23,400	26,100.00	26,100.00	14,400.00	90,000
Literacy research study	60,000	15,600	17,400.00	17,400.00	9,600.00	60,000
Support for the established AEU Unit	140,000	36,400.00	40,600.00	40,600.00	22,400.00	140,000
Printing and training on the school facilities handbook	80,000	20,800	23,200.00	23,200.00	12,800.00	80,000
Provision of resource kit for school community partnership (learning materials)	20,000	5,200	5,800.00	5,800.00	3,200.00	20,000
Capacity building for SOD staff in policy making/analysis and professional development	30,000	7,800	8,700.00	8,700.00	4,800.00	30,000
Introduction of school improvement process and teacher performance data	45,000	11,700	13,050.00	13,050.00	7,200.00	45,000
Training of school principals and SROs to become professional school teachers and education managers (Phase 2 of the School Principal Leadership Course)	180,000	46,800	52,200.00	52,200.00	28,800.00	180,000
Implementation of the recommendations from the IIEP Report			11,600.00	11,600.00	6,400.00	40,000



	FINAL					
	40,000	10,400				
Training, workshops and seminar for the Student Enrolment Number System, SPECA and other ESP2 management information	140,000	36,400	40,600.00	40,600.00	22,400.00	140,000
Total Projections	3,574,000	929,240	1,036,460	1,036,460	571,840	3,574,000
Remaining Uncommitted Fund per DP		961,132	1,589,329	1,589,329	658,362	4,798,151
Remaining Uncommitted Fund per DP		31,892	552,869	552,869	86,522	1,224,151
from Parallel Financing (Balance)	947,357					
Sagaga School						

## Special Purposes Account Balance, as of March 2013



**CENTRAL BANK OF SAMOA**  
P.O. BOX: Private Bag, Apia, Samoa

PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE  
TO THE GOVERNOR

Telephone 34-100  
Swift CBSAWSWS  
Fax (685) 20293/24058  
E-mail [cbs@lesamoa.net](mailto:cbs@lesamoa.net)  
In reply please quote

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE  
APIA

GOVERNMENT OF SAMOA

NAME OF ACCOUNT: SAMOA EDUCATION SECTOR PROJECT PHASE II  
USD ACCOUNT

ACCOUNT NUMBER: 06-043

STATEMENT OF INTEREST ACCRUALS FOR FEBRUARY 2013

VALUE DATE PARTICULARS	REFER	DEBIT	CREDIT	BALANCE	INTEREST ON	RATE	DAYS	INTEREST
01-Feb-13 Balance b/forward				\$3,624,961.42	Cr	01-Feb-13	01-Feb-13	2.375%
01-Feb-13 Deposit	Interest		\$7,750.89	\$3,632,712.31	Cr	04-Feb-13	05-Feb-13	2.375%
04-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Kramer Ausenco	\$12,796.71		\$3,619,915.60	Cr	06-Feb-13	06-Feb-13	2.375%
04-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$1,218.73		\$3,618,696.87	Cr	07-Feb-13	12-Feb-13	2.375%
05-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Health Equipment	\$11,941.36		\$3,606,755.51	Cr	13-Feb-13	13-Feb-13	2.375%
05-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Schwarz Construction	\$53,801.64		\$3,552,953.87	Cr	14-Feb-13	17-Feb-13	2.375%
06-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$5,123.97		\$3,547,829.90	Cr	18-Feb-13	18-Feb-13	2.375%
06-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Schwarz Construction	\$50,334.62		\$3,497,495.28	Cr	19-Feb-13	19-Feb-13	2.375%
06-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$4,793.77		\$3,492,701.51	Cr	20-Feb-13	24-Feb-13	2.375%
06-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Agriculture Store	\$15,068.71		\$3,477,632.80	Cr	25-Feb-13	28-Feb-13	2.375%
06-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Agriculture Store	\$15,068.71		\$3,462,564.09	Cr			
07-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Commercial Printers	\$8,063.24		\$3,454,500.85	Cr			
07-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$767.93		\$3,453,732.92	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Segi Jakopo	\$1,293.14		\$3,452,439.78	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,452,296.10	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Tofai S Isara	\$1,293.14		\$3,451,002.96	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,450,859.28	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Elenise Lemutua	\$1,293.14		\$3,449,566.14	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,449,422.46	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Theresa Paleanua	\$1,293.14		\$3,448,129.32	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,447,985.64	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Penina Paulo	\$1,293.14		\$3,446,692.50	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,446,548.82	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Syrene Lauamoli	\$1,293.14		\$3,445,255.68	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,445,112.00	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Tiavi Kolose	\$1,293.14		\$3,443,818.86	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,443,675.18	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Maiava Asefo	\$1,293.14		\$3,442,382.04	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,442,238.36	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Elelelele Reii	\$1,293.14		\$3,440,945.22	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,440,801.54	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Faialata Uia	\$1,293.14		\$3,439,508.40	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68		\$3,439,364.72	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Agriculture Store	\$45,053.27		\$3,394,311.45	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	SSAB	\$25,785.04		\$3,368,526.41	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	BSL	\$25,862.85		\$3,342,663.56	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Strickland Brothers Ltd	\$16,428.82		\$3,326,234.74	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	trf 002	\$1,564.65		\$3,324,670.09	Cr			
13-Feb-13 Withdrawal	Ah Liki Construction	\$189,892.24		\$3,134,777.85	Cr			



CENTRAL BANK OF SAMOA  
P.O. BOX: Private Bag, Apia, Samoa

Telephone: 34-100  
Swift: CBSAUSWS  
Fax: (685) 20293/24058  
E-mail: cbs@esamoa.net  
In reply please quote:

PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE  
TO THE GOVERNOR

13-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 002	\$18,084.98	\$3,116,692.97	Cr
13-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Motivate Training Pty Ltd	\$63,958.46	\$3,052,734.41	Cr
13-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 033	\$9,593.77	\$3,043,140.64	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Mama Aotete Apeta	\$1,293.14	\$3,041,847.50	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68	\$3,041,703.82	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Aloesepi Sisilo	\$1,293.14	\$3,040,410.68	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 002	\$143.68	\$3,040,267.00	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Health Equipment	\$17,851.47	\$3,022,415.53	Cr
14-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Imulan's Catering	\$889.93	\$3,021,525.60	Cr
18-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Jeremia Gale	\$286.67	\$3,021,238.93	Cr
18-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 002	\$31.85	\$3,021,207.08	Cr
19-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Imulan's Catering	\$455.44	\$3,020,751.64	Cr
19-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Imulan's Catering	\$124.67	\$3,020,626.97	Cr
19-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Tano Beach Pales	\$469.63	\$3,020,157.34	Cr
19-Feb-13	Withdrawal	trf 002	\$44.23	\$3,020,113.09	Cr
20-Feb-13	Withdrawal	DBS	\$2,142.11	\$3,017,970.98	Cr
20-Feb-13	Withdrawal	SSAB	\$4,337.43	\$3,013,633.55	Cr
25-Feb-13	Withdrawal	Polytechnics International	\$20,174.00	\$3,993,459.55	Cr

Total interest due and capitalised on 01 March 2013

== =====  
28 \$5,890.85  
== =====

**Revised Baseline Projections of Contract Awards and Disbursement**

(up to revised closing date of 31 December 2014)

2220-SAM

Contract Awards (in USD Million)						Disbursements (in USD Million)					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
2010					0.000	2010					0
2011					0.000	2011					0.000
2012				7.206	7.206	2012				5.709	5.709
2013	0.231	0.127	0.196	0.119	0.673	2013	1.025	0.317	0.396	0.444	2.183
2014	0.146	0.155	0.111	0.074	0.486	2014	0.185	0.152	0.137	0.085	0.559
						2015	0.03				0.028
					8.36						8.48

1/

Note: Total actual disbursements (Q4 2012) includes IDC of \$0.108 million.

CA	8.365	Actuals
IDC	0.108	1/
	8.473	

**Note: actual cumulative contract awards and disbursements from effectivity to end December 2012 are reflected under Q4 2012.**

(as of  
14Mar13)

0031-SAM and 0032-SAM (same actuals and projections for both Grants)

Contract Awards (in USD Million)						Disbursements (in USD Million)					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
2010					0.00	2010					0
2011					0.00	2011					0
2012				6.77	6.77	2012				6.30	6.30
2013	0.29	0.12	0.23	0.11	0.75	2013	0.06	0.32	0.36	0.37	1.10
2014	0.16	0.17	0.12	0.08	0.54	2014	0.20	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.62
						2015	0.03				0.03
					8.07						8.06

Notes: CA-cumulative as per latest CTL worksheet

**Note: actual cumulative contract awards and disbursements from effectivity to end December are reflected under Q4 2012.**

## Progress on Recommendations identified in the 2011 JRM

7<sup>th</sup> Joint Review Mission (JRM) - September 19-23, 2011

	Recommendations	MESC COMMENTS
Assessing progress in ESP II since the joint review team last met	1. MESC considers extending the curriculum trial period to include all of 2012 and that the roll-out is delayed until 2013. The belief is that the trial period is not adequate to comprehensively identify problems or shortfalls.	<p>MESC fully supports the recommendation for the trial period to be extended.</p> <p>MESC shall conduct the necessary consultations with the relevant staff and consultants to inform them of this recommendation.</p> <p>MESC is also mindful of the possible budget implications for the PINZ contract and the learning materials as a result of the delay and will factor this into the proposed roadmap for ESPII for the remaining months.</p>
	2. MESC extends information system training to school principals and appropriate MESC staff to enable them to utilize this developing system for management and student tracking purposes.	MESC notes the recommendation and will deploy a Ministry- wide approach for this type of training to run in parallel with the infrastructure required to successfully conduct the training.
	3. The Policy, Planning and Research Division develop the capacity to lead discussions in the ministry and perhaps with the Education Advisory Committee that take research findings into the arena of policy dialogue.	Agree and support the recommendation.
	4. The GoS acquire detailed information on the China's investment in fibre-optic cable installation so that the SchoolNET team can assess how the component on public-private partnership may be influenced by this investment.	<p>Secretariat to follow up with the MCIT on the status of the signed MOU with this investor and a timeline of the implementation/roll out plan.</p> <p>MESC will explore options of the PPP approach as one of the measures for the sustainability of SchoolNET.</p>

## FINAL

<p><b>Ensuring that ESP II can close on schedule and its impact assessed in a timely manner</b></p>	<p>5. MESC develop a strategic monitoring framework in addition to its implementation milestones for ESP II and SchoolNET.</p> <p>6. MESC revisits 2011-12 ESP II/SchoolNET annual plan and their plans for civil works under ESP II to ensure that all available funds are made good use of.</p>	<p>Fully support the recommendation for a consolidated M &amp; E Framework. This will be in line with developments of a sectoral approach and the initiative by Development Partners for budget support.</p> <p>MESC fully support the recommendation #6 to ensure also there is no duplication. This will also enable funds to be secured for other developments.</p>
	<p>7. A final project review mission takes place in September 2012 and that draft ToR for an Implementation Completion Report (ICR) is discussed at that time.</p>	<p>MESC support the recommendation. In the meantime, MESC should also be able to identify gaps that will not be able to be covered under ESP II. This will provide the roadmap for further projects.</p>
<p><b>Recommending a road-map and responsibilities to develop a high-level results-based sector policy support program to follow ESP II, including the steps necessary to determine what the education sector will be defined as</b></p>	<p>8. MESC examines the Strategic Policy and Plan 2006-15, alongside MOF's sector goals for the budget estimates, and determines the key high-level policy areas to be prioritised over the period 2012-15, and how the operational policy areas contribute to achieving results</p>	<p>Fully support recommendation. MESC to take the lead in formalizing and developing sector plan, where priority areas from the SPP and the SDS can be highlighted. This task is urgent to ensure that the priorities feed into the MTEF.</p>
	<p>9. MESC develops and tests a means to monitor the sector against policy goals as a step towards a sector programme. A critical part of this exercise will be the establishment of a 2011-12 baseline against which post ESP II gains can be assessed.</p>	<p>MESC notes the recommendation and will seek TA assistance for this activity.</p>
	<p>10. MESC develop a three-year rolling plan for implementation once the key policies are identified for 2012-15, – detail in Year 1, with indicative activities in Years 2 and 3. This should be costed, with the costs drawn from the education sector MTEF to be developed in late 2011</p>	<p>Noted and supported by MESC</p>
	<p>11. The GoS look to making the Education Advisory Committee a body that meets quarterly reports to Cabinet via the Minister</p>	<p>MESC currently reports to the Cabinet Development Committee on a quarterly basis. Would this be considered as a duplication?</p>

## FINAL

	12. GoS determine whether or not DPs have a role on the Education Advisory Committee. The JRM team is not convinced that they do – except when invited to participate in discussions on specific issues – as it is intended that the committee develop to a point where it is a leading high-level forum for sector policy dialogue.	DP co-opted if needed.
	13. That the GoS reinstate the informal meetings between the DPs and GoS : “as frequently as necessary	MESC believes that this is a good forum – bimonthly and the month before or after the EAC Quarterly meeting.
	14. That future annual joint review meetings should be focused on agreed high-level policy objectives, forward planning, and results	Too donor-focused and centered. GOS/Ministry should be given a chance. If the stakes of Budget Support is too high it is perceived right now that this will be too highly strung a process. Must analyze and assess the capacity of MESC and beef the O/S before it goes to PSC.
	15. MoF considers how to manage currency risk, both for contracts in foreign currencies, and for its debt servicing obligations maintained on the CS-DRMS system. a. The PFM Task Force commission further analysis of GoS foreign currency exposures, possibly in consultation with the Central Bank, and consider whether it is feasible for MoF to develop and maintain a capacity to manage these risks.	MOF to comment.  Refer MESC comments of the TOR of the Finance Management Assessment.  Also MOF comments.
	16. That MESC refer to ADB’s Loan and Grant Information Services, for official project financial management accounting and monitoring information.	MESC agrees. Secretariat to note and have available documentation for frequent usage and for reference.
	17. MESC/MOF identify how the funding gap of US\$1.59m for the remaining four schools will be filled, and confirms formally to the DPs that the MESC HQ over-run will be covered by GoS	The ESP Coordinator and ACEO CSD will work together on this issue and prepare the necessary paperwork for the relevant forums.
	18. That the draft roadmap be further refined and agreed among the partners: MoF, MESC, AusAID and NZ/MFAT. ADB may consider extending the grant based assistance beyond 2012 to support the draft roadmap.	MESC to discuss draft Roadmap at Core Executive meeting.  Would welcome ADB Grant extension beyond 2012

**FINAL**