

AID EFFECTIVENESS 2005-10: PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE PARIS DECLARATION¹

*Including Preliminary Findings from the
2011 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector by the Global Partnership
for Education*

Summary of Preliminary Findings from the Global Partnership's 2011 Monitoring Exercise

- **Education Plans in place:** All 32 countries taking part in the 2011 monitoring exercise of the Global Partnership for Education (Chapter 7) have education plans in place that have been formally endorsed by donors in those countries (Global Partnership, forthcoming). (p. 31)
- **Engagement with the civil society:** In the education sector, the Global Partnership for Education promotes sustainable engagement with national CSOs through local education groups which serve as a platform for improved dialogue and coordination among government, donors and CSOs. National CSOs are members of these groups in about 60% of the countries surveyed for the Global Partnership's 2011 Monitoring Exercise (Chapter 7). Difficulties for national CSOs to engage fully in sector processes include weak capacity, lack of sustainable funding, weak CSO coordination, and lack of principles for engagement (Global Partnership, forthcoming). (p. 36)
- **Using country systems:** In the education sector, the Global Partnership for Education found that only 29% of aid in the education sector used PFM [public financial management] systems and 37% used country procurement systems in the countries surveyed (Global Partnership, forthcoming). However, donors used PFM and procurement systems for at least half of their aid in a third of these countries and a country's procurement systems in 11 countries. In countries with pooled fund arrangements (e.g. Lesotho, Nepal and Zambia), donors used the country PFM systems for more than 95% of their education aid. (p. 56)
- **Using parallel project implementation units (PIUs):** The Global Partnership's Monitoring Exercise shows that on median two parallel PIUs are operating in the surveyed countries and donors reported that they did not use any parallel PIUs in 2010 in a quarter of the countries. In some countries (e.g. Ethiopia, Cambodia), local education groups have attempted to track the reduction in the number of parallel PIUs and to discourage the establishment of new PIUs by demanding justification when donors are planning such structures. Establishing new PIUs or maintaining existing

¹ http://www.oecd.org/site/0,3407,en_21571361_39494699_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

ones reflects, at least in part, donors' concerns about weak absorption and implementation capacity on the part of partner governments. Although it was reported that reforms and capacity development initiatives have led to a reduction in PIUs, some donors still require PIUs as a funding condition, particularly when they do not have a country presence. (p. 56)

- **Coordinated technical cooperation:** The 2011 Survey, which draws on data from the larger sample of 78 countries, shows that 57% of technical co-operation provided in 2010 was considered coordinated. Experience at the sector level confirms these findings (IHP+ Results, 2011; and the Global Partnership for Education, forthcoming). (p. 62)
- **Development and strengthening of program-based approaches:** According to the Global Partnership (forthcoming), 40% of aid to the education sector was provided under program-based approaches. (p. 64)
- **Strong harmonization around joint missions and analytic work:** Sector evidence shows more encouraging results: 57% of the donor missions were joint and 80% of the analytical work was joint in the education sector (Global Partnership, forthcoming). In the context of PBAs, this again could be explained by the existence of strong sector plans that provide a good basis for donors to co-ordinate their efforts regarding programming and reviewing activities and reducing duplication. (p. 66)
- **Performance assessment framework in place:** Sector-specific evidence shows encouraging progress as well. More than three-quarters of the countries taking part in the 2011 monitoring exercise of the Global Partnership for Education use results oriented frameworks to monitor the implementation of their national education plan (Global Partnership, forthcoming). Such frameworks enable them to improve accountability within the sector and to identify bottlenecks for the achievement of education plan targets. (p. 87)
- **Joint education sector reviews strengthen mutual accountability:** Developing country governments are increasingly leading discussions about alignment and harmonization and using sector partnership initiatives to hold donors increasingly accountable for meeting their commitments at sector level. Sector reviews are jointly carried out in three-quarters of the countries taking part in the 2011 Monitoring Exercise of the Global Partnership for Education (Global Partnership, forthcoming) and enable the government, donors, CSOs and other local education stakeholders to review progress in implementing national education plans. (p. 93)
- **Monitoring aid effectiveness:** Complementary monitoring initiatives have also drawn on elements of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Framework. These include efforts to monitor aid effectiveness in the health and education sectors under the responsibility of the International Health Partnership and other related initiatives (IHP+) and the Global Partnership for Education. (p. 100)
- **About the Global Partnership and the 2011 Monitoring Exercise:** The Global Partnership for Education is a global partnership of donors, developing countries, multilateral organizations, civil society organizations, private foundations and private sector organizations dedicated to ensuring that all children receive quality basic education. Through the Global Partnership for Education, developing countries and their donors coordinate at both national and international levels to ensure greater donor harmonization, knowledge sharing and resource mobilization. At country level, the Global Partnership for Education supports the development and the implementation of comprehensive sector-wide education plans or interim education plans in fragile states. A monitoring and evaluation strategy is under development and includes a results framework that defines the objectives and the targets of the Global Partnership for Education. A Mutual Accountability Matrix will describe the roles and responsibilities of all partners – governments,

donors, civil society, international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector – that work towards achieving quality education for all. Monitoring the effectiveness of all aid to education is included in the regular monitoring of the Global Partnership’s Results Framework and draws upon selected Paris Declaration indicators. Progress is also tracked on the following aspects: three-year predictability of domestic financing and donor commitments; monitoring learning outcomes; and participation of civil society in education sector processes. To conduct monitoring, the Global Partnership’s Secretariat works with local education groups which bring together the education ministries, donors, international NGOs and national CSOs under the leadership of the government and/ or a donor. At the country level, one donor has been tasked with coordinating the exercise on behalf of the Local Education Group and working closely with the Ministry of Education. The 2011 Monitoring Exercise covers 40 developing countries and 30 of their bilateral and multilateral donors. (p. 100, 102)

Source:

OECD (2011), Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in implementing the Paris Declaration, OECD Publishing.

Access the OECD Report:

English - http://www.oecd.org/document/28/0,3746,en_2649_3236398_48725569_1_1_1_1,00.html

Français - http://www.oecd.org/document/28/0,3746,fr_2649_3236398_48742620_1_1_1_1,00.html

Additional Notes:

- a) In the OECD Report EFA FTI was still used because the official name change came after the production of the report. However, in this communication Global Partnership for Education is used.
- b) The preliminary findings are based on the data which were available in July 2011. In the meantime more partners of Local Education Groups have submitted their data. By October 2011, we have received data from 40 countries, including 7 countries that have not yet joined the Global Partnership. Currently country reports are being prepared and reviewed and a synthesis report is being prepared.