REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

For Decision

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to present the recommendations of the Strategic Plan Working Group ("SPWG") on the Implementation Plan for the Global Partnership for Education ("Global Partnership" or "GPE") Strategic Plan 2012-2015. The Implementation Plan can be found in Annex 1. The proposed decision language is included below.

2. PROPOSED DECISION

The SPWG proposes that the Board of Directors consider the approval of the following decision:

> **BOD/2013/05-XX – Approval of the Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015:** The Board of Directors:
>
> a. approves the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015 contained in Annex 1 of BOD/2013/05 DOC 05 (the "Implementation Plan"), including the indicators to measure progress and impact of the plan;
>
> b. reiterates its request in decision BOD/2012/11-02 urging all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible;
>
> c. requests the Secretariat to report to the Board of Directors on an annual basis, starting with the first face-to-face meeting of 2014, on progress on the implementation of the Implementation Plan; and
>
> d. decides that the SPWG shall cease to be operational given the completion of the Strategic Plan and the Implementation Plan.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Strategic Plan 2012-2015 was approved by the Board of Directors at its audio-conference meeting in July 2012. At that time, the Board of Directors requested that the SPWG continue to work on an implementation plan. At its face-to-face meeting in November 2012 in Paris, the Board of Directors discussed the progress of the SPWG on developing an implementation plan and approved the following decision:

BOD/2012/11-02 — <u>Finalization of the Strategic Plan Implementation Plan:</u>

The Board of Directors:

a. notes the work to date of the Strategic Plan Working Group on developing an implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015;

b. requests the Strategic Plan Working Group, working with the Secretariat, to:
   i. continue its consultation of GPE partners to contribute to the development of the implementation plan; and

   ii. finalize the implementation plan, including possible amendments to the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Secretariat budget, and deliver it to the Board of Directors as soon as possible but no later than 28 February 2013, for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled;

c. urges all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible; and

d. requests the Secretariat to deliver to the Board of Directors, no later than the next face-to-face Board meeting in 2013, a risk management framework for review by the Board of Directors.

3.2 Following the meeting in Paris, the SPWG decided, as part of its consultation process, to establish five Thematic Groups to address each of the five Strategic Objectives in the Strategic Plan, namely:

- Education in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States
- Girls' Education
- Learning, especially in the early grades
- Teachers and Teaching
- Education Financing

The Thematic Groups would conduct a short-term consultation with a wide variety of GPE partners in order to develop recommendations on outcomes, activities, roles and responsibilities and a timeframe for implementation. Each Thematic Group was co-led by one developing country partner and one donor, civil society, or multilateral partner. The co-leads for each group included:

Education in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States (FCAS)	Afghanistan, Save the Children
Girls' Education	UNGEI/UNICEF, Ethiopia
Learning	The Gambia, USAID
Teachers	Education International, Senegal
Education Financing	Lao PDR, Australia

Terms of reference for the five Thematic Groups were developed in December 2012. The Thematic Groups began their consultations in early January 2013.

3.3 Reporting templates, background information and some support was provided to each Thematic Group by the Secretariat. In addition, Secretariat staff participated in the work of each Thematic Group. In parallel to the work of the Thematic Groups, the Technical Group on Indicators worked to finalize its revised priority and costing analysis of the Strategic Plan

indicators, and the Secretariat developed a report on issues that would not be addressed by each of the five Thematic Groups, characterized as "Strengthening the Partnership."

3.4 The Thematic Group reports, the report on indicators and the "Strengthening the Partnership" report were discussed at a face-to-face meeting in London on 18-19 February 2013. The result of those discussions is contained in the final Implementation Plan in Annex 1.

3.5 The SPWG was impressed by the engagement in the five Thematic Groups from all constituencies across the partnership and the dynamic and constructive debate. The Implementation Plan captures the most critical outcomes and actions identified by the five groups, though considerable more work will need to be done through various communities of practice that will ideally evolve from the groups. Moreover, the Secretariat work plan is being revised to take account of greater alignment with the Implementation Plan, based on the outputs of the five groups. The SPWG members believe that there is significant dynamism and goodwill in the partnership and a strong commitment to advancing the Strategic Plan agenda. Continuing efforts will need to be made to promote strong participation from developing country partners. This is an issue that requires further attention.

3.6 The Board of Directors considered an earlier draft of the Implementation Plan via audio-conference on 3 April 2013, following which extensive written comments were submitted to the Secretariat.

4. CONTEXTUAL ISSUES OF NOTE

4.1 Included in the comments of members of the Board of Directors to the earlier Implementation Plan draft were some issues that are worthy of separate consideration. More than one constituency raised the question as to why there was specificity of fundraising targets under Strategic Objective 1 (FCAS) and not under Strategic Objective 5 (Financing). The Strategic Plan itself, previously approved by the Board of Directors, included the specific FCAS target which is now currently reflected in the Implementation Plan. In addition, the Implementation Plan is not intended as a mechanism for new policy-setting, and any replenishment fundraising targets should be considered separately by the Board of Directors. Indeed, a full paper on replenishment will be presented to the Board of Directors at its face-to-face meeting in Brussels in May 2013.

4.2 Many constituencies of the Board of Directors emphasized their preference for the Implementation Plan to remain a living document, and this is also roundly endorsed by the SPWG. The SPWG acknowledges that the Implementation Plan should be reviewed regularly, particularly as additional partners opt-in and take forward various Implementation Plan activities.[1] It is expected that partners will indicate their intention to opt-in by the end of the third quarter of 2013.

4.3 There is some disagreement between members of the Board of Directors as to the level of specificity and detail that should be included in the Implementation Plan, including the call for explicit listing of the organizations or countries that will take responsibility for actions. The SPWG recommends that such an explicit assigning of responsibility should not take place at this time. The Secretariat continues to receive regular requests from members of the partnership to

[1] It should be noted that it is not the intention of the partnership to regularly rewrite the Implementation Plan to accommodate reviews of progress, additional partners opting-in, changes to actions as necessary, etc. Instead, these will be captured in the Secretariat's monitoring of the Plan and will be shared with the Board of Directors and the Partnership as appropriate.

join different thematic groups and to opt-in to certain activities. This will continue. By listing organizations and countries there is a strong danger that: i) partners will feel that they are being coerced into more than they have agreed to; and ii) other partners will consider themselves excluded from further engagement. The SPWG has done its best to balance the different views and needs of the partnership. The Secretariat will add or remove actors, as needed, as the implementation process proceeds.

4.4 The Implementation Plan contains a series of process indicators that will be used to monitor the progress of implementation. In some instances it has not been possible to specify an indicator, since further work is required from partners involved in delivery in specifying more clearly the outputs and indicators. In such cases, these will be added before the end of June 2013.

4.5 Cost projections have been included only for the Secretariat, not for other partners. It is clear that some partners, such as UNGEI, will need some additional support in order to implement the plan effectively. However, for the most part it is assumed that partner contributions for implementation will come from GPE partners' core funds. The Implementation Plan's inclusion of costs for the Secretariat is not a budget request, merely an indication of the costs of additional functions and actions not currently being performed. The CEO of the GPE Secretariat will be submitting a separate budget document to the Board at its Brussels meeting. Similarly, a separate paper will be presented to the Board on the costs associated with the independent impact evaluation.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

5.1 The Implementation Plan presented in Annex 1 was developed through extensive consultation and collaboration with a large number and variety of actors in the partnership. The plan lays out a series of outcomes and actions that will be important for successfully achieving the five strategic objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan by 2015. Although the SPWG recognizes that it was not able to capture the breadth of possible actions the partnership could take over the next few years, the actions that are included in the Implementation Plan will allow the partnership to demonstrate solid progress in the areas of its five strategic objectives. The SPWG has adopted an "opt-in" approach that will allow GPE partners to take the lead on, or participate in, particular outcomes and actions that are most aligned with their own organizational priorities. At the same time, having one central plan provides a mechanism to ensure that the actions listed in the Implementation Plan are being addressed and progress is made in each objective in a timely and satisfactory manner.

5.2 This final version of the Implementation Plan includes a section on monitoring progress of implementation, with suggested process indicators and also a section on cost implications for the Secretariat. It is premature to make changes to the existing Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy until November 2013 when final recommendations will be put to the Board of Directors on new outcome indicators.

6. NEXT STEPS

6.1 The Implementation Plan will be posted on the GPE website. The Secretariat will establish a focal point for implementation coordination and support and will regularly update the Implementation Plan based on progress. A report will be provided to the Board of Directors annually on progress.

6.2 Once approved, the Secretariat will conduct a review of the implications of the Implementation Plan to determine any relevant decisions that will need to be made by the Board of Directors and will develop a strategy and timeline for presenting them.

ANNEX 1

Global Partnership for Education
Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015

A. INTRODUCTION

The Global Partnership for Education (the "Global Partnership" or "GPE") Strategic Plan covers the period from 2012 to the end of 2015. Approved in July 2012 by the Board of Directors (the "Board"), it defines the partnership's vision as "A good quality education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies" and partnership's mission as "To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable."

The Strategic Plan outlines four long-term Strategic Goals, namely:

- Access for all: All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped space to receive an education with a skilled teacher
- Learning for all: All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades
- Reaching every child: Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states
- Building for the future: National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver, support and assess quality education for all

Within the context of these four longer-term Strategic Goals, the Strategic Plan highlights five Objectives to be achieved by 2015. This Implementation Plan is focused on these five objectives, which are:

- Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans
- All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment
- Dramatic increase in the number of children learning and demonstrating mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills by Grade 3
- Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education
- Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic funding and support to education in GPE-endorsed countries

The Global Partnership is a voluntary coalition built around a common vision and mission. The Implementation Plan aims to make greater cooperation and partnership more feasible, in order to help remove some of the obstacles to the collective achievement of the Strategic Goals and Objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan. It is expected that partners will support the Plan as a whole and choose to "opt in" to key areas of interest. This will also be a key indicator of the success and value-added of the Global Partnership and will be monitored closely by the Secretariat, with annual reporting to the Board.

Developed through a wide consultation process by the members of the partnership themselves, this Implementation Plan outlines the core outcomes and actions required to make significant progress against the five Objectives (Section B). It is not a plan simply for the Secretariat, but for the broader partnership, and it requires collective action to succeed. The Implementation Plan also tackles four areas of critical importance in strengthening the workings of the partnership (Section C), namely:

- Greater capacity for the Local Education Groups (LEGs)
- Greater focus on the value-added of the partnership
- Improved knowledge sharing across the partnership
- Greater focus on innovation by the partnership

This Implementation Plan also includes an approach to developing more comprehensive indicators (Section D) to monitor and validate the outcomes of the Strategic Plan. The use of this comprehensive framework marks a major step forward for the education sector as a whole.

The Global Partnership is grounded in a country-led approach, based on the Paris Declaration and other development effectiveness principles. The Strategic Objectives contained in the Strategic Plan were developed through a highly consultative, consensus-driven approach involving all actors in the partnership. However, the way in which the Strategic Objectives are addressed in specific countries will be led and determined by countries themselves. The partnership as a whole will assess its collective impact against these Strategic Objectives.

The development of national education sector plans ("ESPs") and GPE program implementation grant applications is a country-led process, in accordance with the guiding principles laid out in the GPE Charter.[2] All partners at the country level are expected to take the Strategic Goals and Objectives into consideration, but the decisions over what should or should not be included in ESPs or GPE grant applications rest firmly at the country level.

Due to active partner engagement in the development of the Implementation Plan, there is a reasonable prospect of rapid progress and success in achieving the Objectives. Partners will opt-in voluntarily to different aspects of implementation, in part due to their respective organizational/national missions and objectives and in part due to their commitment to the Global Partnership. Some partners have already demonstrated real leadership in making progress in the areas of the five Strategic Objectives. Other partners are encouraged to support this leadership and indeed, take on leadership roles themselves. The Secretariat is tasked with supporting the implementation of the Strategic Plan and organizing itself accordingly.

The Implementation Plan is a living document, will be modified regularly based on progress and will take account of additional partners joining in its implementation.

Section E of the Implementation Plan outlines how it will be monitored, though the process indicators that will be used to track progress are included alongside the actions and next-steps. Section F outlines cost implications to the Secretariat.

[2] The Charter for the Global Partnership for Education can be found at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/media/docs/publications/Charter_of_GPE_English.pdf

B. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS

The core of the Implementation Plan lays out the process for achieving the five Strategic Objectives of the Strategic Plan. This section sets out the list of outcomes, actions, key actors and timeframes for each Strategic Objective. Each list has been developed by large thematic working groups and thus represents the collective wisdom of the partnership. More detailed actions for some partners have been developed, including the Secretariat, in support of each Strategic Objective, though such detail is not required in this document. Some of these more detailed actions will be taken forward by a number of partners and through communities of practice that have or will be established to support various aspects of the Implementation Plan.

This section is not intended to act as a complete "work plan" for the Secretariat or any other partner. Rather, the outcomes and actions outlined below represent a framework of the core activities that are essential to meeting the Strategic Objectives and will require collective action by the partnership as a whole. Process indicators are included for the purposes of assessing progress in achieving the outcomes of the Implementation Plan. In some instances indicators have yet to be determined, requiring further work by the primary actors, but will be finalized by 30 June 2013.

Objective 1: Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
1.1 More effective GPE support of fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS)	Develop and agree on an Operational Framework for FCAS	• Secretariat • Board working group on guidelines for fragile states • Other interested partners (e.g. INEE, Education Cluster)	• By May 2013 Board meeting • Begin applying the framework to GPE processes from second quarter of 2013 • Collect data on effectiveness of the framework and revise, as appropriate in first or second quarter 2015	• Operational Framework for FCAS approved by the Board • Number of countries/states/ provinces where the OF was used by end of 2013 and 2014 • Report on the effectiveness of the OF by first quarter 2015
	Establish new eligibility criteria for Managing Entities ("MEs")	• Secretariat • Board approval • Financial Advisory Committee (FAC)	• FAC to develop process and criteria following Board approval of assessment guidelines • Board to approve criteria November 2013 • Secretariat to communicate new criteria to all LEGs and potential MEs and provide clear guidance on timeline and implementation of criteria	• Process and criteria in place by first quarter 2014 • Communication of the Secretariat to the LEGs and potential MEs
	Once ME criteria are established, work to increase the number of active MEs and Supervising Entities ("SEs")	• Secretariat • Trustee • Developing country partners • Other partners	• Secretariat and other partners to communicate with LEGs regarding new eligible MEs (TBC) • Work with newly eligible MEs to establish Transfer Agreements under an agreed timeline	• Communication of the Secretariat to the LEGs • Financial procedure agreement process on going by the end of 2014
	Create a ME and SE Community of Practice	• Secretariat	• Identification of prospective	• Consultation

	("COP") in fragile contexts, where both active and prospective MEs and SEs can share information, experiences and practices	• Leadership by ME/SE with interest/experience in FCAS	members of COP by third quarter 2013 • COP actively engaging and sharing knowledge and experiences by first quarter 2014 • COP to share update regarding its utility to Board (TBC)	about the COP by third quarter 2013 • TORs for COP by end 2013 • COP active • Report of the COP
	Define the criteria and process for a mid-term transition of management of GPE-funded programs from MEs to Government and Local institutions	• Secretariat • Board working group on guidelines for fragile states • Other interested partners	• Criteria developed end of third quarter of 2013 • Process recommendations developed by fourth quarter of 2013 • Criteria and process recommendations used in at least one developing country partner context by fourth quarter 2015 • Provide support to LEGs in FCAS contexts to build capacity, including technical assistance when appropriate	• Process and criteria defined in GPE guidelines or framework by second quarter of 2015 • Use of the criteria and the process by the end of 2015 • Number of Secretariat missions including technical support to LEGs
	Greater and more consistent engagement from the Secretariat for FCAS	• Secretariat	• Clear terms of reference for focal point engagement including in fragile states set and shared with developing country partners • Resource implications for the Secretariat assessed in second quarter 2013 and new staffing approved by fourth quarter 2013 • Assessment of impact through GPE impact evaluation according to impact evaluation timeline	• Total number of missions in FCAS in comparison to previous years • Average number of missions in FCAS per year in comparison to other countries • Evolution of the staffing of the country support team • Impact of GPE in fragile states

				assessed in GPE impact evaluation
1.2 Greater alignment of funding and policy dialogue in support of education planning and implementation in FCAS	Operationalize, review and assess the provision of up to 20 percent of indicative allocation amounts to fragile and conflict-affected states on an urgent basis, with benchmarks developed to monitor implementation	• Secretariat • Board • FAC • Education Cluster	• Operationalization by end 2013 • Review ongoing, with an initial evaluation report by first quarter 2015	• Number of accelerated support implemented • Evaluation report prepared by first quarter 2015
	Countries develop transitional ESPs, when applicable and appropriate	• Secretariat (Country Support Team) • All partners represented in relevant LEGs • ME and SE partners	• Initial guidance provided to developing country partners by Secretariat as appropriate, including through publication and dissemination of transitional ESP guidelines by third quarter 2013 • Support for implementation (ongoing)	• Guidelines for development of transitional ESPs disseminated by third quarter 2013 • Number of countries where the guidelines were used in 2014 and 2015
	Countries work to develop full education sector plans during the implementation of the transitional plans	• Secretariat, donor and multilateral partners to provide support • LEGs	• Ongoing through transitional education sector process and Program Implementation Grants	Number of countries which developed or are developing full education sector plans during the implementation of the transitional plans in 2014 and 2015
	Undertake research designed to identify how Education Cluster and associated humanitarian actors can work more effectively with development actors	• Education Cluster • Secretariat • Other interested partners	• Begin in 2013 • Include identification of improved systems, procedures and aid architecture at the national, regional and local levels in analysis • Complete research and analysis by fourth quarter 2014	• Start of the research in 2013 • Research report finalized by first quarter 2015 • Dissemination of the findings by first quarter 2015

			• Share findings with all partners by first quarter 2015 • Convene a space to discuss how to operationalize relevant findings in second quarter 2015	
	Strengthen Education Cluster-LEG collaboration at country level through the implementation of appropriate findings identified through the research process outlined in the previous activity	• Education Cluster • LEG	• Begin operationalizing relevant findings in at least one country by December 2015	Activities undertaken to strengthen Education Cluster-LEG collaboration at country level based on the findings of the research by December 2015
	Engage in ongoing efforts to identify and agree on conflict analysis and resilience tools to support the development of conflict-sensitive ESPs and transitional ESPs	• Secretariat • INEE • UNICEF • Other partners	• Ongoing throughout Strategic Plan period	Consultations and collaboration to identify and agree on conflict analysis and resilience tools to support the development of conflict-sensitive ESPs and transitional ESPs
	Integrate the INEE Minimum Standards and other tools including conflict analysis and resilience, as appropriate, into the development of transitional education sector plans	• Secretariat • INEE • LEGs	• Conduct trainings and communications with LEGs on the application of the Minimum Standards and other tools, as applicable (ongoing) • Provide technical support to LEGs on the application of the Standards, as appropriate (ongoing) • Monitor uptake in new ESPs/transitional ESPs to measure success	• Number of trainings done and number of countries affected per year • Number and type of technical supports provided to LEGs

1.3 Increased resources for education in FCAS mobilized	Mobilize increased external financing for FCAS, with an additional US$500 million in bilateral and other funding beyond current commitments and pledges (not including contributions from the GPE Fund)	• Secretariat • Partners	• Resource mobilization efforts target emerging donors and re-prioritization of some traditional donor funding to FCAS • Progress toward target published on an annual basis • Resources mobilized by fourth quarter of 2015	Additional funding mobilized for FCAS by fourth quarter of 2015
	Analyze country-level pooled funding mechanisms in FCAS, focusing in particular on: • whether they contribute to increasing overall funding • their effectiveness for delivering services in FCAS	• Secretariat • Working group of interested partners	• Working group formed by third quarter 2013 • Analysis and recommendations produced by fourth quarter 2014	Report on country-level pooled funding mechanisms in FCAS by fourth quarter 2014
	With the Education Cannot Wait Group, advocate for an overall proportion of humanitarian assistance to education doubling from 2% in 2012, to at least 4% in 2015	• Education Cannot Wait Group • GPE Chair • Secretariat • Partners	• Establishment of intermediary targets for an increase in proportion of humanitarian assistance to education by second quarter 2013 • Convening of a semi-annual progress meeting of the participants of the UN General Assembly 2012 Education Cannot Wait meeting • Biannual publication of results of progress to target • Ongoing advocacy and profile raising	Increase in the proportion of humanitarian assistance to education

Objective 2: All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment

Outcome	Next Steps	Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
2.1 Government-developed gender-responsive ESPs with implementation monitored, preferably through the Joint Sector Reviews ("JSRs")	Adjust the GPE Guidelines for ESP Development and Appraisal and other GPE mechanisms as needed to promote gender-responsive planning	• Secretariat • UN Girls Education Initiative ("UNGEI") • UNESCO International Institute for Education Planning ("IIEP") • Developing country partners	• GPE approach/priority related to girls communicated to countries and LEGs by third quarter 2013, including reference to role of UNGEI and other partners • Guidelines revised by fourth quarter 2013 • Supporting documents revised and others developed by first quarter 2014 • Conduct a desk review of ESPs/transitional ESPs to assess how far gender is prioritized and effectively monitored	Revision of GPE Guidelines for ESP Development and Appraisal completed by fourth quarter 2013
	Engage in ongoing efforts to identify and agree on gender analysis and planning tools	• Secretariat • UNGEI • UNICEF • UNESCO • Other partners	• Agree on set of gender analysis tools for use in education sector planning by fourth quarter 2013 • Tools piloted in 2014 with an evaluation of the pilots in 2015 • Ongoing collaboration with other partners on advances in gender analysis and planning throughout Strategic Plan period	• Tools identified and/or developed by fourth quarter 2013 • Tools piloted by fourth quarter 2014 • Pilot evaluation process begun by fourth quarter 2015
	Support LEGs to undertake gender analysis to inform ESP development	• Secretariat • UNGEI • UNESCO • LEGs • Local NGOs	GPE/UNGEI Girls' Education package developed and provided to LEGs from first quarter 2014	• Girls' Education package developed by GPE/UNGEI • Package shared with LEGs

				beginning first quarter 2014
	Promote the integration of gender analysis in the development, implementation and monitoring of the ESPs through knowledge-sharing and the exchange of good practice at national and regional levels	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI • Pôle de Dakar/ UNESCO	• See actions included in C.3 • Two regional workshops on planning for improved gender equality in education held in 2014	Two regional workshops successfully held by fourth quarter 2014
2.2 Countries with significant and persistent gender disparities reduce these disparities	Work with UNGEI and other partners to foster the exchange of effective approaches to address persistent gender disparities in education	• Secretariat • UNGEI • Other partners	• Mechanism for identifying countries with persistent gender disparities developed by third quarter 2013 • Analysis of GPE country experience and good practices by fourth quarter 2013 • Share country experiences and good practices at country level, for example through Sector Monitoring Initiative workshops, ongoing	• Mechanism developed by third quarter 2013 • Analysis conducted by fourth quarter 2013 • Country experiences in addressing gender disparities included in agenda of Sector Monitoring Initiative workshops
	Explore potential for developing and financing accelerated plans for girls' education within ESPs	• Secretariat	• Concept note developed in third quarter 2013 • Information session or request for decision proposed to Board in first quarter 2014	Concept note developed by third quarter 2013
2.3 Schools provide safe and supportive learning environments,	Promote the collection of evidence by governments and civil society organizations and the	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI	• Map current inclusion of strategies to reduce violence against girls in all ESPs by third quarter of 2013	• Mapping exercise conducted by third quarter of 2013

especially for girls	adoption of strategies to reduce violence against children and youth, especially for girls	• Education International • Developing country partners • Local NGOs • Other partners	• Disseminate findings at global and country level	• Findings disseminated through normal GPE communications channels beginning by first quarter 2014
	Promote more adequate sanitation, female teachers and managers and other safeguards to ensure girls remain in school	• Secretariat • Board • Other partners • LEGs	• Following decision by Board • See timeline actions for 2.4 below	• Board decision made
	Collaborate with other partners on the development of quality standards on safe and supportive learning environments for children and youth, especially for girls, including with reference to standards related to school based violence	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI • UNESCO • Other partners	• Quality standards available by first quarter 2014 • Ensure consistency with relevant Strategic Plan indicators to be agreed by the Board (timeline according to Indicators work plan) • Share standards at country level, including as part of the GPE/UNGEI Girls' Education Package	• If affirmative Board decision, standards developed by first quarter 2014 • Standards disseminated through normal GPE communications channels
2.4 GPE partners track enrolment, progression and learning of primary and lower secondary school girls (preferably disaggregated by age, grade, location and socio-economic status)	Disaggregation of results, including learning outcomes, by gender	• Secretariat • LEGs • Developing country partners	• Guidance on tracking girls' enrolment and progress developed in first quarter 2014 • Current practices followed in developing country partners in tracking girls' enrolment and progression identified by fourth quarter 2013 • Support provided throughout Strategic Plan period • Integrate gender	• Analysis of current practices in tracking conducted by fourth quarter 2013 • Guidance document developed by first quarter 2014

			perspectives in learning improvement and learning assessment in Learning Matrix Task Force and other efforts led by Strategic Objective 3	

Objective 3: Dramatic increase in the number of children learning and demonstrating mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills by Grade 3

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
3.1 Early literacy, numeracy and early childhood care and education addressed as core education issues at the global level	Promote concrete early literacy and numeracy outcomes, including Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) outcomes, in the broader education and development agendas	• Secretariat • Brookings Institution • UNESCO • UNICEF • Other partners	• March 2013-inputs to Dakar Meeting • Develop an advocacy approach, including possibly convening an event at the 2013 UN General Assembly • Learning Metrics Task Force outcomes in third quarter 2013	• Advocacy approach developed • Secretariat, on behalf of partners, contribute to LMTF reports (ongoing)
3.2 Countries, donors and education sector plans (ESPs) provide greater attention to early literacy and numeracy and use evidence-based strategies for program design	Increase ECCE services: • Identify effective and scalable programs that focus on emergent literacy, numeracy and social development • Support advocacy efforts for increased funding • Include ECCE in education sector plans	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNESCO • Donors • LEGs • Other partners	• Ongoing	• KM site on ECCE in place by mid-2014 at a suitable partner. • Checklist for working with ESPs and country programs developed by early 2014
	Improve country-level work on early literacy and numeracy through: • supporting country-level planning • identifying learning champions in developing country partners that mobilize support for and action on early literacy and numeracy • implementing Results-Based Financing pilot	• Secretariat • Developing country partners • LEGs • Donors	• Ongoing • Secretariat and others provide technical support, beginning the first round of GPE program implementation grant applications in 2014 • Results-based funding pilot running by fourth quarter 2013 after proper proof of concept assessment	• Checklist and process in place for reviewing ESPs and country grant applications by January 2014. • Consultant appointed and funded by a GPE partner to operationalize RBF by end of 2nd quarter 2013

	on improving learning outcomes and use methodology widely if successful			
	Develop capacity to monitor and measure learning outcomes through: • improving metrics for primary grade literacy and numeracy measurement, including through the ongoing work of the Learning Metrics Task Force • supporting strong and regular JSRs that take into account measuring literacy and numeracy progress against targets	• Secretariat • Donors and UN agencies focused on literacy and numeracy • Multilaterals	• Start immediately • Secretariat and other partners input into LMTF finalized by third quarter 2013 • Establish metrics by 2015	• GRA grant to UIS in place to convene early grade assessment tool developers and agree on best practices by July 2013. • Checklist for early-grade skills items for JSRs in place by July 2013
3.3 Developing country and other GPE partners have access to emerging evidence on best practices for early-grade literacy and numeracy	Continued building of early-grade literacy and numeracy COPs including: • supporting a global community of practice • supporting a global knowledge management platform • continued Global and Regional Activities program support for early literacy and numeracy • supporting research and evaluation to	• Secretariat • Relevant partners including AusAID, DFID and USAID • Community of Practice	• Initial follow up to All Children Reading workshops in second quarter 2013 • 1-2 Africa regional follow-up meetings in third quarter 2013 and 1 Asia follow-up meeting in third quarter 2013 • Regional numeracy workshops in 2013-2014 • Secretariat visits during ESP preparations (ongoing) • Establish and share an online evidence repository by early 2014	• Participation by opted-in countries in International Reading Association August 2013 conference side-meeting encouraged and finance brokered. • Mechanism in place to coordinate Africa and Asia follow-up in place by July 2013 • KM system in

	identify best practice • follow-up to All Children Reading workshops • follow-up to numeracy workshop			place by July 2013
3.4 Countries, donors and ESPs show evidence of plans to improve access and learning outcomes of the most marginalized, in particular children with disabilities (inclusive education)	• quality standards on safe and supportive learning environments for children and youth include standards for children with disabilities (x-ref 2.3) • disaggregation of results by disability (x-ref 2.4) • innovative approaches to support, assess and strengthen teacher effectiveness to improve learning outcomes for marginalized children, in particular children with disabilities (x-ref 4.1)	• UNICEF • UNESCO • Donors • NGOs • EI • Secretariat	• GPE's approach to inclusive education communicated to countries and LEGs • Desk review of ESPs to assess how far inclusive education/education for children with disabilities is prioritized and monitored 1st 1/4 2014 • guidelines developed on tracking accessibility and learning for children with disabilities developed by 2nd 1/4 2014 • proposals to improve teacher effectiveness include strategies for increasing capacity of teachers to support marginalized learners/learners with disabilities (timeline dependent on teacher effectiveness work)	• standards first quarter 2014 • GPE guidelines developed 2nd quarter 2014 • number of appraisals using inclusive education toolkit

Objective 4: Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
4.1 Improved effectiveness of teaching/ teachers at the primary and secondary levels	Strengthen the evidence base on teacher effectiveness to inform ESPs	• Secretariat • UNESCO • EFA Teacher Taskforce • UNESCO Institute for Statistics • UNESCO IIEP • EI	• Conduct a review of the EFA Teacher Task Force teacher policy database and analyze how it is applied to inform decision-making by fourth quarter 2013 • Identify gaps in the research (using the database and stocktaking research, and UNESCO's eAtlas on Teachers), including effective pre-service training and integrating untrained teachers in education systems and commission research to fill these gaps, as necessary by fourth quarter of 2013 • Encourage the use of the database as a tool to inform decision-making at the country level, including: utilization by LEGs and governments in developing ESPs by first quarter 2014 • Encourage a systematic focus on the measurement of teacher effectiveness at the country level with consistent tracking of progress during JSRs • JSR reporting on teacher effectiveness feeds back into Teacher Task Force database • Explore ways to converge with the existing work on	• This indicator needed as a preliminary to all other rows: Develop clarity with UNESCO and EI on division of labor with Secretariat • Board agreement with staffing and consultants required to do this work. • Consultants and/or staffing in place to do this work (if needed) in place by July 2013 • Develop checklist of teacher issues at country level to be tracked during JSRs • Link to indicators work and school report cards developed by August 2013

			School Report Cards and other global databases on teacher policies such as SABER and QEDAF • Explore dissemination of findings through a dedicated website and the launching of publications/reports in relevant regional and global conferences	
	Promote innovative approaches to support, assess and strengthen teacher effectiveness	• Secretariat • UNESCO • EFA Teacher Task Force • Education International • World Bank • OECD • Pan-African Teaching Council	• Organize a roundtable prior to the African Union ministerial on teacher development (PACTED3) with a group of teacher organization representatives and ministers of education on ways to support teacher effectiveness in June 2013 • Target a prominent role for the partnership in the next Teacher Task Force global policy forum • Envisage potential regional roundtables on teacher effectiveness followed up with national dialogue activities • Global and Regional Activities financing to fund innovative teacher effectiveness project in first round of GRA funding	• Develop clarity on Secretariat versus UNESCO versus EI on these issues • Secretariat puts bid into budget for Board approval by May 2013, anticipating much of the work may fall on Secretariat • Secretariat staffed up on teacher expertise by August 2014 to organize and lead on the roundtables • GRA concept note in place and presumably approved by May 2013

4.2 Improved employment terms and conditions for teachers	Promote dialogue between government and teacher representatives	• Secretariat • Education International • Other partners • LEGs • International Labor Organization (ILO) • UNESCO • Committee of Experts on the Application of Recommendations concerning Teachers ("CEART")	• Review UN standards on conditions of services for teachers and map out where each GPE partner is placed with regard to these standards • Support dialogue around steps to be taken to consider ways to improve how teachers are valued and supported in their work • Facilitate the reporting of the status of teaching conditions to the CEART	• Country Leads co-develop a process with teacher issues staffer at Secretariat for tracking level/type of teacher representation in LEGs and JSRs, as well other forms of reporting • UNESCO and EI communicate these key priorities to SEs and MEs at November 2013 Board meeting
	Assess how ESPs address the recruitment/deployment of female teachers and teachers for rural areas	• Secretariat • LEGs • EFA Teacher Task Force • UNGEI • UNICEF	• Analysis of ESPs by second quarter 2014 • Results disseminated by fourth quarter 2014 • Provide guidance on approaches to growing, keeping and deploying female teachers and teachers in rural areas, and provide guidance on keeping them safe	• Checklist for this analysis and for female teacher guidance developed by Secretariat in 2nd half of 2013 in collaboration with UNESCO, EI, and other teacher issues stakeholders

4.3 Greater engagement of teacher organizations in education sector planning	Conduct situational analysis of participation of teacher representatives in LEGs	• Secretariat	• Initial analysis completed by third quarter 2013 • Results posted on GPE website by fourth quarter 2013 • Using analysis above, identify gaps in the active participation of teacher representatives in the LEGs and in JSR processes and provide recommendations for solving these gaps	• See process indicators above
	Build the capacity of teacher organizations to contribute effectively to the development of ESPs, based on analysis conducted above	• Secretariat • UNESCO • Education International • Other partners	• Training on GPE processes and operations conducted regularly, with adequate participation from teacher organizations • Provide ongoing training and capacity-building for teacher organizations on education sector planning • Explore innovative or alternative funding sources for strengthening or scaling up capacity-building and training opportunities, including through the Civil Society Education Fund and Global and Regional Activities program	• GRA presumably in place to initiate these processes • Should GRA fail, immediately put in place alternative financing arrangements • Secretariat plays a proactive role with UNESCO, EI, and other partners in finding funding

Objective 5: Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic funding and support to education in GPE-endorsed countries

Outcome	Deliverables	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
5.1 Financing for basic education is more effective, efficient and equitable	Provide guidance and support for effective, efficient and equitable financing in the preparation of ESPs	• Secretariat • FAC • Board • COP/proposed partner working group	• Proposal on revised guidance/support prepared for Board approval by November 2013 • Secretariat and interested partners explore developing a framework for assessing value for money at the country level , (and similar for the Secretariat level)	• Revised ESP guidance includes strong financing section and approved by Board. • Draft VFM frameworks developed and approved by the Board by end 2013 • Proposed partner working group / community of practice actively engaged in all aspects of Outcome 5.1
	Strengthen FAC proposal review process	• Secretariat • FAC • Board	• Proposal on revised review process and training prepared for Board approval by November 2013 • Training for FAC members beginning immediately after approval of revised review process • Evaluate revised review process beginning first quarter 2015	• Board approval November 2013 • Trainings conducted • Evaluation in 2015 shows significant strength in FAC proposal review process
	Strengthen links to effective, efficient and equitable financing in the GPE Fund allocation process	• Secretariat • Board • LEGs	• Explore the feasibility of revising the methodology for allocating resources from the GPE Fund by fourth quarter 2013	• Revisions to NPF allocation process agreed by BOD in November 2013 • Impact

			• Guidance on country-level evaluation prepared for Board consideration by November 2013 • Monitoring, reporting and discussion of financial commitments in ESPs through JSRs • Disseminate findings by first quarter 2015	evaluation completed and published by early 2015
	Promote the alignment of external education financing with country education sector plans and greater use of aligned and harmonized funding arrangements (i.e. pooled funding)	• Donors • LEGs • Secretariat	• Reporting by developing country partners through JSRs • Reporting at the global level through annual pledge monitoring and results for development reports • Active advocacy by the Secretariat, CSOs and other partners • Inclusion in external impact evaluation	• Annual self-reporting by donors specifically addresses this issue • Secretariat annual portfolio review specifically addresses this issue • CSO constituencies provide annual assessment to the Board of progress on this issue
	Encourage and assist DCPs to maintain or increase domestic funding levels for basic education	• Secretariat • Donors • DCPs • LEGs	• Participate in increased engagement/dialogue with Ministries of Finance for increased and sustained investment in education • Encourage setting clear and increasing funding targets for basic education in ESPs and monitor through JSRs	Sustained real increases in domestic financing for basic education, as reported annually by partner governments

5.2 Better data and evidence on the quality and volume of education financing to improve the quality of education	Assess the volume of financing to education at the global and country level, including through the annual GPE pledge monitoring and Results reports	• Secretariat • Partners	• Partners provide timely and accurate annual information on financing to Secretariat • Pledge report released in second quarter of 2013, 2014 and 2015 • Results Report released in fourth quarter of 2013, 2014, 2015 •	• Timely production by Secretariat of annual pledge monitoring/financing reports • Timely production by the Secretariat of annual results report that captures country-level financing. • Active collaboration between UIS, GMR and Secretariat
	Promote evidence-based decision-making to improve the quality and volume of financing to education at the country level	• Secretariat • Developing country partners • LEGs	• Ongoing, from second quarter 2013 (following any potential guideline revision) • Use tools such as PETS, General Education Quality Analysis Framework (GEQAF), SABER and others in development of education sector plans • Revise JSRs to reflect analysis conducted in tools listed above	• *Further definition of process indicators required.*
5.3 Increased education financing through innovative approaches and more effective advocacy	Advocate at the global level (e.g. through the Global Education First Initiative)	• All GPE partners	• From April 2013	• By 2015 the level of funding to basic education from DCP, donor, multilateral and other sources has increased in real terms • GPE Secretariat demonstrably

				showing leadership in global advocacy
	Assess the feasibility of reforming the GPE Fund to encourage innovation and leverage other sources of funding, including contributions from private sector and emerging donors	• Secretariat • Board	• Proposal prepared for Board consideration by November 2013	• Board approval of any relevant modifications to the GPE Fund architecture in November 2013
	Encourage financial pledges, including at the 2014 Replenishment for the Global Partnership	• All GPE partners	• GPE replenishment strategy and timeline put to the Board in May 2013 • Campaign to begin in third quarter 2013 • Pledging Conference in June 2014	• Replenishment funding targets achieved
	Encourage non-financial pledges (such as alignment of bilateral programs with ESPs, in-kind or policy commitments, etc), including at the 2014 Replenishment for the Global Partnership	• All GPE partners	• See timeframe above	• Policy pledges from all partners are measurable, time-bound and aligned with the GPE Strategic Plan

C. STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP

The content of this section of the Implementation Plan is driven by the challenges involved in solving key bottlenecks in the core functions of the partnership. Progress made in removing these bottlenecks will impact positively on the achievements of all five of the Strategic Objectives.

Bottlenecks GPE intends to address

The **effective functioning of inclusive LEGs** is at the heart of the country-led approach of the partnership. The capacity of the LEGs to operate effectively must be strengthened for the partnership to deliver good quality education to all children.

It is difficult to define clearly the **value-added of GPE** as a partnership, beyond providing additional funding to support the development and implementation of national ESPs. While anecdotal evidence of the partnership's value-added is compelling, a more systematic definition is required for greater accountability and credibility.

Improved knowledge-sharing was raised by all five thematic groups in the development of the Implementation Plan (Thematic Group Terms of Reference found in Attachment 1). Knowledge-sharing is viewed as positive and desirable, although there is currently not a clear mechanism or model utilized across the partnership to allow for its efficient and effective functioning.

The roles of **innovation and technology** have been identified as major gaps in all aspects of the work of the partnership. Put simply, there is a tendency for many partners to function traditionally, with insufficient attention paid to innovation. Greater focus needs to be paid to utilizing innovative approaches across the partnership if the five Strategic Objectives are to be achieved.

In order for the partnership to function effectively and the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan to be achieved, **all partners will need to commit to, and actively engage in, delivering through implementation.** Adequate monitoring and reporting on this will also be necessary.

The following outcomes and actions address these issues.

Outcome	Next steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe	Process Indicators
C.1 Strengthened capacity of LEG composition and functioning in developing country partners	Review of LEG composition and functioning in developing country partners	• Secretariat • LEGs	• By fourth quarter 2013 • Post LEG composition to the GPE website by second quarter 2014 with regular updates	LEG composition posted to GPE website by second quarter 2014
	Improved guidelines on the composition and functions of LEGs	• Secretariat • LEGs	• Guidelines finalized by second quarter 2014 • Guidelines disseminated beginning in third quarter 2014	Guidelines shared through normal GPE communications processes and posted to the website by third quarter 2014
	Greater guidance and support (technical, capacity, financial) to governments to provide for sustainable LEGs	• Secretariat • Donors • Other partners	• Board decision on additional capacity and financial support by fourth quarter 2013 • Ongoing training on GPE processes and procedures in LEGs	Proposal on decision shared with Board and Board decision by fourth quarter 2013
	Encourage representation of all partners in LEGs, including local and international civil society and the private sector and private foundations	• Secretariat • LEGs • Other interested partners	• CSEF to support local CSO participation in sector monitoring • Encourage donors to sponsor local CSO participation in sector monitoring • Commission a desk study on the nature of engagement of the private sector and private foundations at country level by first quarter 2014	• Increased participation of local CSOs • Desk study begun by first quarter 2014

C.2 Value-added of the Global Partnership at the local and global levels delineated, backed by solid evidence	Establish where the GPE adds value and undertake systematic monitoring of GPE processes at the country and global level to assess GPE's "value add" beyond existing processes,	• LEGs • Secretariat • Donors • Other partners	• Secretariat will conduct value-added assessment as part of the preparation for 2014 replenishment • Partners will be caucused for their views on value-added	• Assessment conducted in 2013 and results included in replenishment documentation • Partners respond to questionnaire
	Conduct independent impact evaluation of GPE support	• External entity	• By fourth quarter 2015	Evaluation completed, on time
	Improve the communication of the ways in which GPE adds value to education outcomes	• Developing country partners • Secretariat • All other partners	• Conduct data visualization exercise for GPE partner countries by July 2013 • GPE Results Report ongoing • Use the 2014 replenishment campaign as a major communications opportunity on value-added of the partnership • Regular results reporting	• Data visualization up and running on GPE website • Successful replenishment in 2014

C.3 Knowledge and experience on best practices in education shared widely	Use the convening power of the Global Partnership to facilitate knowledge sharing through: • Secretariat country focal points broker access to knowledge for their countries • Annual partner conferences/ knowledge events based around the Strategic Objectives • Hold information sessions in the margins of Board meetings • Use the 2014 GPE replenishment conference as an opportunity for structured debates around the five Strategic Objectives	• Secretariat • Other partners	• Annual conferences • Ongoing	• Partner conference/know ledge event conducted • Information sessions on knowledge and experience on best practices held in margins of Board meetings at least once annually • 2014 replenishment conference includes sessions on each of the five Strategic Objectives
	Establish links with existing knowledge platforms through: • Survey existing platforms to determine appropriate links • Facilitate engagement and linkages with appropriate platforms and ensure that the partnership is informed of these available platforms	• Secretariat • Other partners	• By first quarter 2014	Increase in the number of non-Secretariat knowledge platforms in which the Secretariat is actively engaged

	Provide an interaction space for COPs, as appropriate	• Secretariat • COPs	• Space created by third quarter 2013 • Report on effectiveness of space provided on regular basis	Space created by third quarter 2013
	Synthesize and disseminate information and experience gathered through Global and Regional Activities program-funded activities	• Secretariat • Global and Regional Activities funding recipients	• Monitor activities on an ongoing basis • Develop annual report on activities • Disseminate annual report widely • Highlight information and experiences on the GPE website	• Report on activities developed and disseminated with partnership annually • Activities articulated on GPE website
C.4 GPE partners significantly more engaged and supportive of innovation and technology in delivering the Strategic Objectives	Establish dynamic COPs for innovation and for technology	• Secretariat • Partners	• COPs established in second quarter 2013 • COPs involved in implementation of additional actions listed under C.4 • COPs provide update on interaction to Board on semi-annual basis	• Secretariat and lead partners worked out protocol or TORs for a COP by June 2013 • Secretariat investigates the possibility of creating an innovation fund by June 2013; for discussion with Board by November 2013
	Promote the use of technology where it supports improved learning for teachers and learners in developing country partners	• Secretariat • Teaching organizations • Developing country partners • Private Sector • Donors	• GRA-funded activities to support • Promotion and mainstreaming of what works	• Secretariat to encouraged GRA applications in this area for 2nd round 2013; or otherwise propose channeling this work to an innovation fund

	Explore the options of increased use of technology in the functioning of the governance and operations of the Global Partnership	• Secretariat • Partners	• Audit and first stage plan to improve GPE efficiency and effectiveness through information and communications technology • Ongoing, with a possible report to the Board in November 2013	Report to Board on progress through November 2013
	Advocate for greater partner contribution toward scaling of innovation process and innovative practices	• Private sector • Civil Society • Other interested partners	• Ongoing, with communication to the partnership and externally	Private sector and/or philanthropic sector engage other Board members through COP; indicator is functioning COP by August 2013
C.5 GPE partners engaged in the delivery and monitoring of the implementation plan and reporting on its effectiveness	Develop Communities of Practice around key issues for the delivery of the Plan, according to need and relevance	• All partners	• Ongoing	COPs established as needed
	The Technical Group on Indicators helps to drive implementation of any Board-approved recommendations	• Technical Group on Indicators	• Ongoing	The Technical Group on Indicators provides the expected support
	Secretariat reports on progress to the Board annually, including through the Pledge Monitoring Report and/or the Results Report	• Board • Secretariat	• Annually starting at the first face-to-face Board meeting in 2014	Secretariat reports to the Board
	2014 replenishment will include pledges from partners on how they are and will continue to support implementation of the Strategic Plan	• All partners	• Second quarter 2014	2014 replenishment include monitoring pledges on support to the implementation of the Strategic Plan

	Conduct an assessment of the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan and its implementation	• Board • Secretariat • Other partners	• By 2015	• Assessment report delivered by second quarter 2015
	Conduct a "soft-touch" review of the potential impact of the Implementation Plan on LEGs	• Secretariat • LEGs • Other partners	• Conduct analysis of expectations of LEGs with a focus on tasks added to LEG responsibilities from the Implementation Plan by third quarter 2014 • Once analysis conducted, communicate implications with LEGs through normal communications process and Sector Monitoring Initiative	• Review delivered by third quarter 2014

D. IMPACT INDICATORS: THE WAY FORWARD

The Strategic Plan contains a series of impact indicators aligned to the four Strategic Goals and five Strategic Objectives. While these indicators are not set in stone, they are considered to represent an acceptable idea of the indicators to be used to monitor the impact of the partnership and the Strategic Plan.

For the development of the Implementation Plan, a technical group on indicators was tasked with developing a proposed approach to the finalization of indicators and their adoption, as well as the collection of data, analysis and reporting. The group was asked by the Board at several audio meetings to produce a list, which while not final, would be definite enough to be able to provide some cost estimates. The final report of the technical group is attached as Attachment 2 but this should ideally note as background the earlier, more detailed paper called "Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators." Attachment 2 recommends a structured approach to reporting on all but four of the indicators contained in the Strategic Plan at a marginal cost of approximately US$ 8 million per year for five years. This is significantly less than what was predicted in November 2012 when the first report of the technical group on indicators was presented to the Board. The recent report represents the development of an approach that makes optimal use of data collection through simple additions to existing sampling methods, such as school surveys, household surveys, systems diagnostics (such as GEQAF, SABER, etc.) and finally, traditional, simple, administrative in-country data collection systems. That is, much cost can be saved by better exploiting existing information systems and approaches, including administrative systems, and by making some additions to existing school censuses and household surveys which will be able to improve coverage of indicators needed. (SABER and GEQAF are a different matter as they produce information about systems, not schools, households, etc.).

There is no presumption that these indicators would be produced by the GPE Secretariat but it is assumed that they would be mostly produced by current members of the partnership (UNESCO, UNICEF, etc.) Nor is it assumed that the GPE Fund, per se, would cover the cost of the indicators. The indicators group, if the Board approves, will be tasked to "broker" funding for these indicators from the partners with funding to the partners who could implement.

The recommendations of the technical group are creative, efficient and realistic and would see a wholesale improvement in the education sector's ability to establish key baselines and report on outcomes. Developing country partners may be encouraged to support the collection of the additional data and the reporting associated with it.

The next steps in terms of implementing the proposal on indicators are the following:

- In May 2013 the Board approves, in principle, the proposed approach to finalizing a set of indicators and implementing the data collection and reporting associated with them.
- From May to June 2013 the Technical Group on Indicators works with the co-leaders of the five thematic groups to finalize the suite of indicators that are fit for purpose and feasible for countries to monitor. However, the number of indicators cannot be increased: only changes and substitution can occur.
- From June to October 2013, liaising closely with the Technical Group on Indicators, the Secretariat will work with partners (such as UIS, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, GMR etc.) to develop a fully costed, integrated program for the implementation of the agreed indicators, to be submitted to the Board with options for funding.

- In November 2013 the Board approves the final suite of indicators and the means of their implementation.
- Thereafter the Secretariat will monitor whether funding and indicator efforts are in place and report biannually to the Board.

E. MONITORING THE PLAN

Monitoring of the Implementation Plan will be integrated into regular Secretariat functions, and the Secretariat will solicit information and feedback from relevant partners as necessary. To help enable the success of this effort, a "soft-touch" review of additional responsibilities placed on the LEGs as a result of the Implementation Plan will be conducted. The intent of this review will be to identify relevance and appetite of the additional responsibilities as well as to identify areas in which other partners can help to build capacity.

Specific tasks the Secretariat will undertake in the monitoring of the Plan will include:

- annual reporting to the Board;
- regular updates on progress posted on the GPE website; and
- one full-time Secretariat position working to facilitate partner engagement in implementation and acting as a focal point for Implementation Plan-related information and assessment of progress.

F. COST IMPLICATIONS

The Secretariat has done a thorough review of the Implementation Plan and assessed the required additional resources that will be required within the Secretariat in order to ensure effective implementation on its part. It is not possible to elaborate the costs to other partners of Plan implementation.

The analysis only considered additional work requirements and resources above existing budget/staffing levels. No consideration has been given to things that the Secretariat may not need to do. The analysis includes no reprioritization of existing resources. Accordingly, the requirements outlined here should not be seen as an overall "net" increase, simply the additional work associated with the plan. The costs should also not be viewed as a budget request for the Secretariat.

Overall, some 17 additional full-time equivalent (FTE) staff positions have been identified, principally in the Country Support Team and in External Relations. Short-term consultancy requirements run to some 670 days over the life of the Strategic Plan with significant workshop cash requirements and minor increases in travel costs. In addition, approximately US$ 3 million is required for the independent impact evaluation.

The breakdown of the resource needs for the Implementation Plan is outlined below:

- The most important additional resourcing is greater supplementation of the Country Support Team, some 9 FTE positions. Six of these have been captured under the Fragile States objective and the other two under Girls' Education and Teaching.

- Fragile States: Much of the Secretariat work requirement is already programmed into the core functions of the CST. Therefore, the key resource issue here is an additional **six FTE staff**. Travel budget will amount to US$ 150,000 per year. In addition, a total of 80 days of senior consultancy time and US$ 120,000 in 2013/14 assumed for the assessment of three potential Managing Entities.

- Girls' Education: Much of the work will be conducted by UNGEI and existing staff resources. Additionally, **one FTE staff** position, US$ 40,000 in travel, 70 days of consultancy. 2014 workshop costs of up to US$ 400,000.

- Learning: The Secretariat has already been doing much of the heavy lifting and there are no additional FTE requirements. However, approximately 90 days of consultancy work and around US$ 1 million for workshops and other targeted technical support will be required. Funding for this latter aspect would need to be secured separately.

- Teachers: The bulk of the Secretariat work is additional since it has not been a priority historically. **Two FTE staff** will be required, 220 days of consultancy work and roughly US$ 1 million for workshops and other targeted technical support. Again, funding for this latter aspect would need to be secured separately.

- Financing: Much work will need to be done by the Country Support Team at the country level (though its increased compliment is already accounted for under the other objectives). The finance team requires **one FTE staff** and 110 days of consultancy. US$ 3 million will be required for the impact evaluation (the same amount as in 2009). The External Relations and Resource Mobilization team will require an additional **five FTE staff** covering Europe, political advocacy, private sector engagement, emerging donors and pledge monitoring. Consultancy coverage for 150 days will also be required.

- Strengthening the Partnership: **Two FTE staff** for innovation and technology will be required plus vendor costs of US$ 170,000. For LEG strengthening: 30 days of consultancy will be required and some US$ 300,000 in immediate workshop costs. Most of the LEG strengthening work will be included in the increased resourcing for the Country Support Team already included above.

ATTACHMENT 1: FINAL INDICATORS PRIORITIZATION AND COSTING REPORT

Executive Summary

The GPE Strategic Plan approved by the Board of Directors contained a series of impact indicators aligned to the four Strategic Goals and five Objectives. While these indicators were completely final, they were considered as a good final draft of the indicators to be used to monitor the impact of the partnership and its Strategic Plan.

As part of the development of the Implementation Plan, a technical group on indicators was tasked to develop a proposed approach to the finalization of indicators, their adoption, collection of data, analysis and reporting. This note is the final report of the technical group. An intermediate report called "Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators," more technical and longer than this one, recommended an approach to prioritizing the indicators and contained detailed discussion on all the indicators and the issues that needed to be confronted in producing them. The Strategic Plan Working Group suggested that the indicators group finalize the priorities and actually cost out the indicators.

In thinking about the problem, the indicators group came up with a solution to some of the more difficult indicators, by realizing that even the more difficult indicators can in all likelihood be derived from the same data sources (e.g. the same school surveys) as the simpler ones.

In summary, this final report then recommends a structured approach to reporting on all but four of the indicators contained in the original Strategic Plan at a marginal cost of approximately US$ 8 million per year as a 5-year project that puts the indicators in place. The price tag assumes that some countries will not opt in to some of the indicators and/or that existing donor or national projects will fill in some of the cost, either by simply continuing to do what they already do, or re-purposing some data work. The price tag does include a significant amount of capacity building so as to make the indicators work more sustainable. Without the capacity building the price tag is a little lower.

The price tag is significantly less than was predicted in November 2012 when the issue of indicators was presented to the GPE Board of Directors and represents the development of an approach that makes optimal use of data collection through simple additions to existing sampling methods, such as school surveys, household surveys, systems diagnostics (such as GEQAF, SABER, etc.) and finally, traditional, simple, administrative in-country data collection systems. In addition, this final report costs capacity development for countries. It is assumed that household surveys could gather cross-sectoral information. However, it should be noted that some of the current household surveys are reluctant to add more education information as they are currently very loaded with health information and general household information. Thus, to be risk-averse, the group costed out the surveys as if they would be stand-alone education surveys. It is assumed that Partners in the GPE with experience in household surveys would carry them out, or commission them.

The next steps in terms of implementing the proposal on indicators are the following:

- In May 2013 the GPE Board of Directors approves in principle the proposed approach to finalizing a set of indicators and implementing the data collection and reporting associated with them.

- From May to June 2013 the technical group on indicators work with the five Objectives thematic groups to finalize the suite of indicators that is best fit for purpose. However, the number of indicators cannot be increased: changes and substitution can only occur.
- From June to October 2013, liaising closely with the technical group on indicators, the Secretariat will work with partners (such as UIS, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, GMR etc.) to develop a fully costed, integrated program for the implementation of the agreed indicators, to be submitted to the GPE Board with options for funding.
- In November 2013 the GPE Board approves the final suite of indicators and the means of their implementation.
- Thereafter the GPE Secretariat will monitor whether funding and indicator efforts are in place and report twice-yearly to the GPE Board.

Background

This document accompanies an earlier document ("Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators," or "Feasibility report" for short), which was produced by the technical indicators task team and was reported to the SPWG. That document provides a description of what it would take to produce all of the indicators in the GPE Strategic Plan. It was concluded in that document, that the technical and institutional challenges of producing all the indicators starting immediately are too large, and that the indicators needed to be prioritized and costed. In addition, it was concluded that an "opting in" approach for engaging with country partners to stimulate them to produce the indicators is superior to a top-down approach. However, GPE does plan to publicize which countries are producing which indicators. Thus, there would be some gentle public-relations and accountability pressure on country partners to increase their output of indicators. The SPWG asked the indicators task team to reaffirm the priority list (and make any needed changes) and to focus on costing in some detail the indicators that had the highest priority.

The "Feasibility report" noted how far behind the education sector is, relative to the health sector, in both data gathering and data use to set policy and management directions. The nearly total lack in the education sector, for example, of a series of surveys comparable to the DHS surveys in health, or the relative size of the health parts of the UNICEF MICS questionnaires, as compared to education, were noted. It was also noted that the lack of data, as well as the tendency not to use what exists, probably undermines the funding and regard with which the education sector is held by global and national decision-makers. Thus, a strong argument was presented for greatly improving the data situation in the sector.

Re-statement of priorities

The team looked at the indicators again and revisited the original indicator prioritization. In most cases, members of the technical group cited technical complications and intricacies associated with the collection of the Strategic Plan indicators, and in a few rare cases disagreed with the original prioritization while recognizing that certain indicators were categorized as low priority due to the challenging and costly nature associated with their collection, or the lead time that it would take to come to agreement on them (in cases where their absolute cost would not be high). The results of this slight change in prioritizations are presented in this section and in a table at the end of this report.

A few specific differences included in the reprioritization are as follows:

1) Two members of the technical working group ranked "Safety and condition of schools, including reporting violence" as a "1" or highly important as opposed to the original ranking of "3". One group member noted that these indicators are not standardized and vary as a result of the vast contextual differences between countries, thus making them exceedingly difficult to track. However, one suggestion included tracking the percent of schools reaching national standards for key dimensions: space per student, water, sanitation, quality of building, state of repair, etc. On the question of reporting of violence against children, one group member cited the challenge of creating a single collapsible indicator to measure violence, and the need to rely on an effective reporting system, while the other group member cited work being conducted by CIDA as well as Plan International that could contribute to the data gathering associated with this aspect of the safety indicator.

2) The same two working group members ranked "Disability Factors" as a "1" compared to the group's original "3" ranking. Again, despite it being ranked as highly important, the group members cited the huge challenges associated with definitional questions and data collection issues. One member noted the need to assess disability based on local criteria, and questioned how, as a result, global standards of provision for disability would therefore not likely be helpful or possible. The working group member representing civil society noted the strong desire for civil society's need to have disaggregated data on disabled children with respect to their enrollment, attendance, performance, retention, and transition.

3) In the case of several indicators included in the strategic plan, it was noted in the reprioritization that many of the indicators are useful only for GPE's internal monitoring and as a result were prioritized lower by members of the working group. This was done with a lens on costing indicators that would be broadly viewed as contributing to the global discourse on the state of education, rather than to use as a benchmark for GPE's progress with its strategic plan. Examples include input indicators like number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education plans.

4) A group member raised the issue that indicators for process, such as the meaningful participation of CSOs in LEGs (and note that the issue has also been raised by the teaching profession) should be part of form of process tracking. This highlights the importance of having something akin to the Accountability Matrix as proposed in the GPE Evaluation Strategy (or the Accountability Matrix as proposed).

5) Another group member submitted very detailed comments on the indicators; these could be of use at the implementation stage. They are very useful and available upon request.

6) On the learning outcomes indicator (SO3), it was suggested that GPE closely work with the Learning Metrics Task Force effort of Brookings/UNESCO. GPE Secretariat staff are doing so in the working groups, and the GPE Chair is actually a member of the Task Force.

The suggestions made during the reprioritization exercise were taken into consideration; however, the costing exercise was very minimally impacted by the slight changes in prioritization that were originally presented in the "Feasibility Report." Furthermore, most group members were happy with the original prioritization exercise. Because there was minimal change, and because the indicators had been worked through over a few phone and email conversations, the team moved forward with costing the indicators in their originally prioritized order. At the same time, however, it was noted, as we proceeded with the costing exercise, that if one focuses on the source of data (e.g. a household or schools survey), and if (though this is a big if) the indicator can be derived without creating too much addition to household or schools surveys that are to be recommended to gather the priority 1 indicators, then one may as well consider it, and if (again a big if) a committee of experts can agree on how to do it, then perhaps one may as well begin work even on the indicators that were deemed initially to be lower feasibility/urgency, such as disability and safety. For that reason, we proceeded to actually cost the creation of some of these even if in the prioritization exercise they might have been rated as a 3. However, it should be noted specifically with regard to disability that some of the competencies needed to properly design approaches to better measure disability, and to then actually measure it, might require expertise not normally found in the education sector, and hence require collaboration with health authorities and experts.

The rest of the sections present the assumptions and results of the costing exercise.

Assumptions and methodology used

An important proviso needs to be made about the relationship between prioritization and cost. In the "Feasibility report" some indicators were given a relatively low priority because of their assumed cost or degree of difficulty. This made sense if one thinks of each indicator singly. However, in thinking about the costs as a whole, it was noted that some indicators might be relatively easy to acquire if they are nearly a by-product of either a household or school survey that one is already recommending for some other indicators that were judged to have higher priority or to be easier. In those cases one can perhaps go ahead and gather those indicators whose cost and technical complexity was originally deemed high relative to their immediate utility.

The costing assumptions and process was as follows.

First, the institutions or individuals in the task team with the most experience in certain areas were identified, as follows. UIS was targeted mostly (but not exclusively) for traditional access, enrollment and completion indicators (this was for costing purposes only; for eventual indicators work the experience of UIS in other forms of data gathering, such as school surveys, would be tapped); USAID for its experience with DHS and other types of household surveys; World Bank for its experience with SABER; UNESCO for its experience with GEQAF; and UNICEF for its experience with MICS. In some cases individuals within these organizations were tapped in addition to those who are part of the indicators task team and in some cases (UNICEF and UNESCO home office) an institution that was not originally part of the indicators task team was tapped. In addition, individual team members have experience with surveys and indicators work and drew upon that experience.

Second, a more or less standard set of steps needed was set out. These steps would not be needed for all indicators. For instance, some indicators are already widely known (mostly those pertaining to access, enrollment, completion, etc.) and their methodologies are agreed upon and have been standardized by UIS. In those cases, steps involving methodological development or

agreement could be skipped. The important remaining tasks, in those cases, may simply be to build more capacity in reporting them, motivate countries to report on time, etc. In other cases, however, such as learning assessment in the early grades, or the assessment/measurement of disability, there are not only no standardized assessments, but there is not even a completely known set of best practices that are widespread amongst the various partners. In these cases, prior to widespread data-gathering, it would be beneficial to take on a set of prior steps where best practices could be determined, agreed upon, and disseminated. The following set of steps is, therefore, a "maximal" set of steps:

1) "One off" or start-up steps/costs
   a) Rapid assessment of the literature and practices on the indicator
   b) Workshop(s) to drive an agreement on the best way to define and collect the indicator
   c) Pilot surveys to test the agreed-upon methodology
   d) Re-convene experts to assess the results; write up the methodology
   e) Offer the methodology to countries via capacity building and training at regional workshops

2) Ongoing or yearly "steps" at global data institutions
   a) Staff time to support and maintain the indicator (request data, clean and collate, report)
   b) Travel to trouble-shoot and improve global data institution's understanding of how countries report
   c) Regional maintenance workshops every two years to improve data gathering and reporting, include new countries "opting in"

3) Per country cost of each survey application
   a) HH surveys
   b) School surveys
   c) Systems surveys (e.g. SABER or GEQAF type)

The various experts in the task team, or experts tapped from within their organizations, were asked to think about all these steps and to prepare estimates of what costs the steps imply. Using this list it is possible to note that:

1. At one extreme, some indicators can already be produced using value-added analysis applied to entirely secondary data that are already gathered and reported by UIS, or household surveys such as MICS and DHS, even if not with 100% complete coverage of all countries on a timely basis. All that is required in these cases is that calculating these on a regular basis be the "mandated" and budgeted responsibility of staff members at UIS, GMR, GPE Secretariat, other global institution with data analysis capacity, or consultants contracted by these institutions. An example of this area would be some sort of efficiency analysis and indicators, or age-grade analyses that can reveal important quality and efficiency gaps, as requested by several partners for the indicators list.

2. Some indicators (including those that would underpin the secondary analysis noted above) are already being gathered with a standard methodology. Improved reporting and capacity building in usage is "all" that is needed. In just a few cases might there be merit in ascertaining, via expert workshops, how to improve the data-gathering and reporting

on them. These would include all the standard access and enrollment indicators. At the same time, not all GPE countries can even count their pupils, teachers and spending. There are still some very weak systems which are not able to deliver even basic information. For this reason, if the Board approves of the overall plan, it may be well to revisit the cost assumptions for funding and improving "traditional" data collection.

3. For some indicators there has been quite a bit of experimentation and methodology development, but relatively few countries participate. These would include pencil-and-paper written assessments such as the regional assessments (LLECE, SACMEQ, or PASEC) or PIRLS, TIMSS, and PISA. In addition, there will be recommendations emanating from the Learning Metrics Task Force regarding these and other assessment outcomes, that GPE will take into account (both as a current active member of the LMTF and as an eventual user of its recommendations).

4. For some indicators there has been some experimentation and exchanges of papers and technical approaches, but not under official auspices, and not enough for some widely shared sense of "best practices" to have emerged. An example would be the various early-grade assessments, assessments of school safety, and assessments of disability.

It was further assumed that the ongoing costs of interest are:

1. The costs (both one-off and ongoing or maintenance costs) at the global data institutions
2. Per-survey costs of household or school surveys
3. Costs of capacity building for reporting on new and existing indicators
4. Less urgently but important for long-run: fundamental capacity building in surveys and EMIS

The reason for these assumptions is that these are the only "unusual" or "new" sorts of costs that the use of the new or standard (but with improved quality and timeliness of gathering and reporting) indicators would suppose. For instance, most education systems do not routinely carry out school or household surveys, and typically would not (and maybe should not, because it is a specialized task perhaps better outsourced to other Ministries) have the in-house capacity to do so. Thus, there is a need to budget and explicitly plan for them, if one wants them to be carried out. It is assumed that marginal increases in EMIS costs for standard or traditional indicators would be up to each country or its local development partners, and that this marginal cost is factored into each country's decision to "opt in" to reporting on certain indicators.

Finally, to operationalize the concepts, it was decided to focus the thinking in terms of the specific data-gathering *approaches* that would be needed, since it is the data-gathering approach (and whether the indicator is new or not) that drives the cost, regardless of the specific indicator.

1. Data gathered through existing EMIS (Education Management Information Systems—the standard enrollment and teacher numbers data system)
2. Other administrative records systems (financial, HR)
3. Special-purpose institutional surveys (a la SABER or GEQAF)
4. Household surveys
5. School surveys

6. Purely secondary analyses (thus not requiring any improved data gathering)

International and regional pencil and paper tests are left out of this list for two reasons: a) because coming to agreement on how to facilitate country access to these would require a completely different level of complexity and analysis; and b) because they measure at a level of the school grade structure that is not part of the Strategic Plan. At the same time, there are other important consensus-generating processes, specifically the Brookings-UIS Learning Metrics Task Force, working on this issue. Thus, this is not to say that funding country participation in these assessments and forging closer links between these assessments is an unimportant task. Similarly, population censuses are not mentioned in this list as they would seem to be far beyond the remit of the education sector.

As noted above, the realization that one could focus the costs by parsing them by type of data-gathering method, rather than indicator by indicator, might make it possible to include more indicators than originally thought. Since, within limits, surveys have a considerable fixed cost component, extra indicators need not add cost proportionally as long as those indicators do not add too much time to the surveys, which means that they may need to be less elaborate than the specific interests advocating for the indicator might want. For that reason, it makes sense to analyze the costs, and present them, by focusing on the types of data gathering efforts needed.

Finally, it is assumed that though for some indicators there is already some "lore and literature" on technical approaches (for instance, INEE has done work on school safety, various actors have done work on early grade literacy, others have done work on measurement of disability, and so on), the following are also the case: a) this "lore" may be dispersed amongst various special technical or subject-matter interest groups and is not centralized or vetted by global data institutions; b) the tradition may not emphasize the needed standardization of data-gathering and reporting methods by experts on data; and c) insufficient capacity at country level may exist, again, from the data-gathering and reporting point of view. Thus, while the effort described in this document should not "reinvent the wheel" on some of the key indicators, and should instead rely on the "lore and literature" that do exist, there will nonetheless be a need to re-approach the indicator from a comprehensive data point of view and to take stock of what exists in a manner that allows comparison across indicators and that can allow analysis of what it would take to place the indicators into multi-purpose household or school surveys.

Cost and finance issues

The detailed cost assumptions are presented as footnotes to the Results table in the next section. To drive the costs, "standard" costs were used per type of input (inputs: workshops needed to drive agreement on the indicators, pilot surveys to learn how to apply them, manuals written up, training sessions, etc., defined to a "standardized" size as per the footnotes to the results table). To create those "standard" costs, in turn, we relied on input from the institutions with membership in the technical working group, plus the personal experience of technical working group members, and by reaching out to one or two key institutions in some cases. These were then judgmentally (that is, they were not a simple average but a judgmental blend) blended or averaged by one of the co-chairs, and vetted again by the working group members wishing to give opinion.

The one important aspect to note here is that these are pure cost estimations and have nothing to say about where such costs are incurred, who finances them, what the source of funding is, or how the funding is transferred. It is likely that a very complex mixture of mechanisms will be needed, perhaps with some multilateral partners simply increasing the effort they already carry

out, but with more funding from bilateral partners; some bilateral partners may take accountability for measuring certain issues in certain countries; others for measuring the same issues in other countries; countries themselves taking responsibility for certain measurements, etc. Given this complexity, which is no different from the complexity in implementation (as studied by the strategic plan implementation working groups) this is another area that needs to be considered in some sort of mutual accountability matrix or else there would be a real danger that key aspects would not be done.

Similarly it is important to note that these are fairly serious cost estimates, but they are not meant to signify a budgetary "promise" from or liability to any particular institution, in the sense of those institutions undertaking that the work can certainly be done for the estimated budgets. The cost estimates are thus more of a general way to alert the educational community as to the approximate envelope required to significantly increase the data production, along the lines needed for the GPE Strategic Plan (and inter alia making a significant contribution to the world community in general, at least in the GPE countries).

Lastly, the cost estimates are carried out assuming today's technologies and methods. It may be possible in future, and perhaps even today (but consensus would be needed on the best tools) to utilize mobile technology to lower the cost of some of these indicators. One should be open-minded but cautious about these possibilities. Some partners are already working on ideas in this area (e.g., USAID's Grand Challenge) and other partners (e.g., IT groups in the GPE Board) could be challenged to come up with interesting technical approaches.

Suggested next steps

The following table suggests next steps.

Action/step	Responsible	Timeline
Board to decide how much of the indicators proposal to accept.	Board	As part of approving the SP implementation
Setting out options for either collective or individual funding of the work, seeking out interest of specific partner institutions in production of indicators	Secretariat	May-August 2013
Board to decide on individual and collective funding and division of labor on production	Board decision	2nd Board meeting 2013
Monitoring whether funding and indicator efforts are in place, as part of mutual accountability	Secretariat to report to Board	Ongoing twice-yearly

	Steps needed (approximately sequential from left to right)												Resulting "total" costs			
	Establish methods for new indicators						One-off trainings		Ongoing costs of staffing, monitoring, training			Other ongoing costs		Cost w.o. specific country surveys and w.o. survey training, assuming, for the ongoing or recurrent costs, a 5-year project	Sub-totals per broad area to left	Cost as to the left, but with 1 round of surveys in approx 1/2 of the countries[10]	Cost as to the left, but with survey capacity building in approx 1/2 of the countries[10]
	Commission background lit review (1 per new indicator)[1,2]	Initial workshop (1 per new indicator)[3]	Pilot surveys - HH (1 for the HH-level indicators as a whole)	Pilot surveys - School (1 for the School-level indicators as a whole)[4]	Second workshop (after pilot) (1 per new indicator)	Write-up of manual or approach	Initial capacity-building regional trainings (two sets in each of three regions: one for new and survey-based indicators, one for existing and EMIS-based)[5]	Finalization of manuals for systems indicators, then capacity-building regional trainings on systems indicators[6]	Ongoing staffing at global data institution(s)[7]	Ongoing supervisory / troubleshooting / lesson-learning travel[8]	Repeat trainings every two years for each type of indicator[5]	Per country cost of combined HH and school surveys[9]	Country-specific survey training (if interested in capacity-building)				
"New" HH-survey-based include:[11]			3					3		4	7	1.5			4,896,800	5,505,350		
Disability status of learners by attendance or not	2	2				1	1								240,900			
Safety perceptions of school by parents	1.5	1.5				1	1								202,850			
"True" or effective attendance	1	1				1	1								164,800			
"New" School-survey-based include:[11]				3						4	7				2,790,800	3,652,850		
Disability status of learners attending															-			
Literacy and numeracy in early grades	1	1				1	1								164,800			
Opportunity to learn and school efficiency	1	1				1	1								164,800			
Input supplies															-			
School safety esp for girls	1.5	1.5				1	1								202,850			
School conditions	1	1				1	1								164,800			
Proxies for learner SES for inequality calculations, SES inequality ca	1	1				1	1								164,800			
"Traditional" and EMIS or other admin records-based include:[11]								3		2	5	1.5			3,478,000	3,635,300		
GER or equivalent in early childhood															-			
Primary completion															-			
Transition to secondary															-			
Proportion and number out of school	0.5					1									31,500			
Class size proxies and PT ratio	1					0.5									25,200			
"Pure" inequality in PT ratios and other inputs	1					1									37,800			
Gender parity in management positions	1			0.5		1									62,800			
"Systems" include (SABER or GEQAF type or based on institutional surveys):[11]								3	3	5	1.5				4,513,000	4,513,000		
Teacher policies, procedures, codes of conduct															-			
Learning outcomes assessment															-			
Aid effectiveness indicators															-			
Proportion of Education Sector Plans adequately addressing teacher issues															-			
Levels of mobilization of education finance, and other finance data[12]															-			
Progress of country's own-source finance against own targets															-			
Secondary analysis only[11]									2	4					1,337,600	1,337,600		
Efficiency of expenditure															-			
Unit cost															-			
															-			
Total inputs required	13.5	10	3	3.5	8	11.5	6	3	15	28	4.5							
Total cost	170,100	635,000	150,000	175,000	508,000	289,800	1,404,000	1,137,000	2,250,000	240,800	1,053,000				18,644,100	18,644,100		
"Price" of inputs[13]	12,600	63,500	50,000	50,000	63,500	25,200	234,000	234,000	150,000	8,600	234,000	700,000	234,000					
For systems indicators, the finalization of modules noted here as	fixed cost:							435,000										
Double-check cost															18,644,100		36,144,100	41,994,100
Memorandum note: all indicators would be disaggregated, where feasible, for:																		
Fragile and non-fragile countries																		
Sex																		
Poverty																		
Linguistic/ethnic factors																		
Disability																		

Technical notes:

[1]To keep things simple, the "size" or length of literature reviews or workshops or other standard inputs needed to come to agreement on key modules of surveys or indicators is signalled simply by using a larger number anchored on a standard of 1. Thus, the number 2 rather than 1 might not imply 2 studies or 2 workshops. It might imply 2 studies or workshops, but it might also simply imply a longer study or a larger/longer workshop, and it would typically signal the fact that less current agreement exists on how to measure those issues.

[2]The "standard" review is assumed to take 1 person month of senior consultant time.

[3]The "standard" workshop (value=1) assumes 10 non-paid experts meeting for 3 days, with attendant airfare and per diem costs, as well as time for temporary staff to organize. These are not conferences but simple working meetings. All fares economy class.

[4]There is only 1 pilot or 1 ongoing survey needed per type of survey to capture all the needed indicators. Thus, the cells for surveys (and other similar instruments) are "merged" across specific indicators. This is the case for survey applications only. For methodological development (e.g., background papers, workshops) it is assumed that indicator-specific experts would need to meet.

[5]The three "assumed regions" are Francophone Africa, Anglophone Africa, and Asia. The trainings are assumed to be for 3 days, for 40 persons per region, and the cost assumes travel and per diem. Staff and organizational costs are assumed to be part of ongoing costs of providing institutions. All fares economy class.

[6]It is assumed that a judicious mix of SABER tools and GEQAF is used, depending on purpose and country interests. It is also assume that, when it comes to SABER, the modules pertaining to EMIS, teachers, ECD, assessment, finance, autonomy/accountability, standards are used, given the interests and strategic directions set by the GPE Board. Finally, it is assumed that, in the cost of the training, the cost of finalizing modules is included. Also note that while actually applying SABER or GEQAF in each country would require local work, for the sake of consistency with the approach proposed here, we are visualizing it as a capacity-building activity simply for "accounting" purposes.

[7]Person-years of mid-level staff.

[8]Assumes a 2-week, 2-country trip to representative countries or those showing important lessons learned. All fares economy class.

[9]Assumed to be combined HH and school surveys with reasonable (10-point wide for key indicators) 95% confidence intervals capable of detecting largish movements over time. The cost may be lower than currently indicated but it seems safe to put in a little higher cost as, undoubtedly, more indicators will likely be put on the list (e.g., right now there are no cost-to-family indicators in the school surveys).

[10]Only 1/2 of the partnership countries are considered on the assumption that the rest have ongoing bilateral help and/or already have the capacity and/or will not opt in to actually measuring the new indicators.

[11]There is no implication here that these are the only indicators that would be covered by the surveys or the "traditional" EMIS work. Indeed, it would not be worthwhile to carry out surveys for just these indicators. We have costed things explicitly on the assumption that there is already some infrastructure that, at least for HH surveys and EMIS work, is already capable of doing some of the extra work. On the schools surveys, it is also not logical to use a survey to calculate only the given indicators, so a few more could be considered, if the decision is made to do a set of school surveys. Finally, the assumption is the basic infrastructure for calculating some of the basic or traditional indicators, or the primary data for them, exists. (That is why there are no methodological workshops in those rows.)

[12]Note that many other data sources already collect information on finances, at the macro level, including UIS itself, but also the Results Forms from GPE. The idea here is to round out a few more systemic finance data pieces that may not be otherwise already collected. Some school-level finance data could be collected via the school surveys.

[13]Prices are derived from templates using different worksheets, submissions from experienced staff at various GPE partner institutions, and judgmentally blended. The documentation is available.

Priority or phasing of each indicator in the Strategic Plan

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SG	SG1. Access for All	Various	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) or equivalent in early childhood education or development	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Primary completion ratio (PCR)	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Effective transition rate from primary to secondary or proportion of population entering grade 1 of lower secondary	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Number or proportion of children of primary school age who are out of school	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) in primary school	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Safety and condition of schools, including reporting of violence	3 – 2 members of the group recommended upping this to 1
SG	SG2. Learning for All	The proportion of students in the early grades who demonstrate against credible national systems that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text according to national curriculum	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG2. Learning for All	The proportion of students in the early grades who have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Income or wealth quintile	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Sex	1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Disability factors	3, two members of the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Subnational levels of governance	4

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Fragile and conflict-affected regions/countries	1 for countries, 4 for regions
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Inequality of pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) in primary school	2
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Quality assurance or benchmarking systems that are in place, are linked to information systems, and are being actively used at regular intervals	2
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Educational sector that is supported according to aid effectiveness principles by GPE partners	1
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Credible national student and teacher assessment systems for multiple learning outcomes in use	2, one member recommended upping to 1
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Improvement in donor coordination and in operation in GPE fragile states	1, one member recommended reducing to 3
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education plans	1, one member recommended reducing to 3
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Core access and learning indicators disaggregated at the Global Partnership level by fragile vs. non-fragile states	1, subject to the rating of each individual indicator
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Gender parity in effective transition rate from primary to secondary or in proportion of population entering grade 1 of lower secondary transition to secondary education and/or in entry into grade 1 of lower secondary	1
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Percentage of staff members in management positions who are female (sex disaggregation of management)	2
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Parity in reading and numeracy results by grade 3	2, one member suggested reducing to 1
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	The proportion of students who, by grade 3, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text	2, one member suggested possibly 1
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	The proportion of students who, by grade 3 of primary schooling, have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations	2, one member suggested possibly 1

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	Percentage of children receiving early childhood education with meaningful (cognitive and non-cognitive) content	3, one member suggested upping to 2, another to 1
SO	SO 4. Teacher effectiveness improved	Proportion of education plans that adequately address the issues of teacher availability, quality, and conditions of employment	2
SO	SO 4. Teacher effectiveness improved	Proportion of countries with agreed and applied teacher practice and professional standards	3, one member suggested 2
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Percentage of total government budget that goes to education and to basic education	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Percentage of total resources spent, and effectively used, at school level, including those procured centrally	4
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Indicators of unit cost, waste, and efficiency in resource allocation, including time on task	Has to be dis-aggregated, too many concepts involved in this one, see below.
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Levels of mobilization of adequate and sustainable external financing for education	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Progress of developing country partners against their own targets	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Efficiency and waste	2, if simple method is used, 3 or 4 if more complex methods are chosen
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Unit cost	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Time on task and other such measures of opportunity to learn	2
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Efficiency of resource allocation patterns.	4